

**CENTRE FOR NURSERY DEVELOPMENT AND ERU PROPAGATION
(CENDEP)**



Samco Qtr. Bonadikombo-Mile 4, C/O P.O Box 437 Limbe, CAMEROON
Tel: + 237 776 75 61 Email: cendep2001@yahoo.com Website: www.cendep.org

**CONTRACT No. CM019011
(ERU-NTFP)**

**Final Technical Report
(June 1, 2006 to December 31, 2007)**



Limbe, March 2008

Table of contents

<u>I.</u>	<u>PROJECT IDENTIFICATION</u>	<u>- 2 -</u>
<u>II.</u>	<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>- 3 -</u>
<u>III.</u>	<u>PLANNING</u>	<u>- 4 -</u>
<u>III.1:</u>	<u>PROJECT OBJECTIVES</u>	<u>- 4 -</u>
<u>III.2:</u>	<u>PROJECT ACTIVITIES</u>	<u>- 4 -</u>
<u>III.3</u>	<u>EXPECTED OUTCOMES/OUTPUTS</u>	<u>- 5 -</u>
<u>IV.</u>	<u>IMPLEMENTATION</u>	<u>- 5 -</u>
<u>IV.1</u>	<u>METHODS APPLIED</u>	<u>- 5 -</u>
<u>V.</u>	<u>SUMMARY OF RESULTS</u>	<u>- 8 -</u>
<u>VI.</u>	<u>DEVIATIONS</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>VII.</u>	<u>DIFFICULTIES</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>VIII.</u>	<u>EFFECT OF THE PROJECT ON CENDEP</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>IX.</u>	<u>CONCLUDING REMARKS</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>X.</u>	<u>BUDGET AND EXPENDITURE</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>XI.</u>	<u>EXPENDITURE PER CATEGORY</u>	<u>20</u>

I. Project Identification

Implementing organization: CENTRE FOR NURSERY DEVELOPMENT AND ERU PROPAGATION

Contact person: YOUNDJIE KOLEOKO GABRIEL
E-mail address: cendep2001@yahoo.com
Website: www.cendep.org
Tel: + 237 776 75 61 or +237 762 72 17
Address Samco Quarter Bonadikombo-Mile 4, C/O P.O Box 437 Limbe, Cameroon.

Contract number : CM019011
Contract name : ERU -NTFP
Project Title: Cultivation And Sustainable Management Of Eru (*Gnetum spp*) In The Buffer Zone Of The Korup National Park

Project Duration: 18 months
Amount granted in Euro: €56000

Report type: Technical Report
Stage: Final Report
Reporting Period: June 1, 2006 to December 31, 2007

Report submitted by YOUNDJIE KOLEOKO GABRIEL
Position Chief Executive Officer
Date: March 2008

II. Introduction

This project centred on the production and marketing of *Gnetum spp* (Eru), a highly priced and harvested Non-Timber Forest Product in the forest regions of Cameroon. Because of free access and high demand, wild stocks are disappearing from the forests in Anglophone Cameroon shifting the harvesters to the Francophone part of the country where the forest vegetable is still found in commercial quantities. In order to conserve this vegetable, the Limbe Botanic Garden researched and developed sustainable ways of cultivating it for both income generation and biodiversity conservation purposes. In addition the LBG made the following outstanding advances in the domestication and conservation of eru:

- the establishment of experimental/demonstration farms;
- the organisation and training of farmers and extension workers on how to cultivate eru;
- the production of an eru cultivation manual and
- the establishment of a gene bank.

As a result of the training, individual farmers now cultivate eru in their farms with satisfactory results. However, what is produced or harvested is fed into the local restaurants and individual consumers. Despite the potential of eru in improving livelihoods in the rural areas market entry remained limited due to high capital, lack of information, perishable nature of the product and transportation difficulties, which often resulted in increased price risks.

CENDEP, a community based organization in Limbe, Cameroon has the know-how and technical capacity to extend eru domestication techniques to farmers. However, despite growing demand from women's groups for training and assistance, a lack of funds has limited the ability of CENDEP to extend the eru domestication model to willing farmers. In June 2006 ICCO addressed the difficulties of CENDEP and the women groups through a grant to train 150 farmers in 5 communities in the Buffer Zone of the Korup National Park (KNP).

The purpose of the project was to assist local farmers to contribute to forest conservation and improve their livelihoods by diversifying their production through the introduction of a high value NTFP into their farming system.

This report presents the results achieved at the end of the project as well as the challenges and recommended actions necessary to take the process to a logical end.

III. Planning

The planned project objectives, activities and expected outputs were:

III.1: Project objectives

The planned objectives of the project were to:

1. Sensitize at least 150 farmers in 5 villages through village meetings;
2. Create 5 farmer groups to champion the domestication, marketing and sustainable management of eru in the buffer zone of the Korup National Park;
3. Build the capacity of 150 farmers, 4 Agricultural Extension Workers (AEWs) and local NGOs on the production and marketing of eru through the organisation of 5 village training workshops and technical support visits;
4. Establish and manage 5 village nurseries;
5. Establish 5 pilot community/demonstration farms;
6. Assist trainees to establish their individual eru farms;
7. Assist trainees in the processing and marketing of eru harvested from the wild and/or farms.
8. Increase the post harvest life of eru through post harvest treatment;
9. Assist trainees in the sustainable management of wild stocks (enrichment planting, sustainable exploitation)

III.2: Project Activities

To attain the project objectives, the following main activities were planned:

1. Valuation of the eru market in the South West Province of Cameroon
2. Selection and sensitization of the project beneficiaries
3. Organization of technical training workshops on eru domestication
4. Establishment and management of seed multiplication farms
5. Technical support visits
6. Establishment of individual farms
7. Establishment of an eru processing unit
8. Processing and marketing of eru
9. Training of farmers on processing and marketing of eru
10. Organization of farmers into producer and harvesters' groups/unions

III.3 Expected outcomes/outputs

The expected outcomes of the project were:

1. The population of the Korup National Park area and its environs is aware and participate in project activities
2. Rapid market appraisal findings are disseminated for informed decision making
3. Farmers acquire knowledge and skills on eru cultivation
4. Functional producer and harvester groups/unions are put in place.
5. Seed banks are available for seed multiplication and distribution
6. Farmers adopt the cultivation of eru
7. Farmers gain and apply the skills of improving the market value and profitability of eru
8. Farmers gain greater income from the eru trade
9. Eru in the KNP support zone is exploited in a sustainable way

IV. Implementation

The activities that were implemented as well as the way they were carried are presented below.

IV.1 Methods applied

In order to achieve the objectives mentioned above, the following activities were carried.

IV.1.1 Market analysis

The project began with a rapid market appraisal on eru to see how a thrust in production could be translated into financial and social gain. The appraisal was conducted by a six-man multi-disciplinary team including a consultant and five CENDEP staff. Tools used in the survey included review of secondary data, direct observation, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions. A concise checklist of semi-structured questions was developed and used during interviews. Review of secondary data was carried out prior to field visits to designated sites. A test run of the semi-structured questions developed was carried out, followed by a debriefing session to analyze the results before staff went out to the field. Regular team debriefing sessions were held during field appraisal for reporting, preliminary data analysis and planning.

Urban, rural and border markets were earmarked and visited during the survey. The survey included semi-structured interviews with individuals at different levels of the market chain. In addition, one focus group meeting involving a village chief and 15 female eru small scale harvesters was also held. Findings of the market analysis are

presented in a separate report: "A Rapid Market Appraisal on Eru in the Support Zone of the Korup National Park"

IV.1.2 Preliminary contacts

In order to mobilise local support for the project contacts were made with local stakeholders and potential development partners. Representatives of KfW (German Investment Bank) and RUMPI project, organisations operating in the project area were briefed at CENDEP headquarters, while all other stakeholders (village chiefs, government officials etc) were met in the field.

During the contact meetings agreements were made with hierarchy of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MINADER) for their extension staff to participate in the project. Through the contacts the local agriculture extension workers, local administration, village chiefs etc were informed of the project, the new agricultural crop (eru) was introduced and ground work set for mass sensitisation.

IV.1.3 Sensitization Meetings

The next step was farmer sensitisation. This was principally through village meetings. Posters prepared for this purpose were distributed to participants during the meetings and to various stakeholders. At the regional level the local FM radio station was used to sensitise the general public on the project. Over 239 people were reached through the village meetings. Working with its collaborators and learning from its past experiences in training, a baseline appraisal was conducted to:

- i. Determine the entry knowledge of the target population on eru and the relevant environmental issues as well as the potentials for learning to take place on the project and the challenges;
- ii. Develop strategies for overcoming learning challenges based on sound educational principles & practice and knowledge of the eru cultivation process.
- iii. Identify the indicators that should be monitored and addressed along the project cycle in order to ensure attainment of project objectives and achieve positive change towards sustainability.

Choice of the project beneficiaries was based on the outcome of the sensitization that took place. Through this interested farmers were identified and both organized and unorganized farmers benefited from the training.

IV.1.4 Training workshops:/capacity Building

Skill transfer on the cultivation and sustainable management technique of the new agricultural crop was through the organization of training workshops. These workshops were hands on and took place in the respective communities. During the workshops participants were trained on technical aspects of eru cultivation (Module 1) comprising but not limited to: importance of eru, threats, choice of nursery site, building the

propagators, preparing the rooting medium, obtaining cuttings, sowing/setting of cuttings, routine watering and propagator cleaning. The rest of module 1 comprising preparation of polythene bags with fertile soil, transfer of rooted cuttings into the polythene bags, weaning & hardening processes, followed during technical support visits. Through the training workshops community nurseries were put in place and daily management entrusted to members proposed by the community.

Interaction with the trainees and local stakeholders together with the guidance from ICCO (project donor) provided useful information that permitted CENDEP to suggest a modification of its action plan. The modification was not meant to change project objectives but to improve on the outcomes.

IV.1.5 Trial processing and marketing

In order to address one to the recommendations that resulted from the rapid market appraisal, trial processing and marketing was done. The fresh vegetable was collected from selected harvesters in the Eru producing areas and conveyed to the processing facility in Limbe. The drying (processing) process consisted of picking the leaves from the vines, cleaning with water to take off any soil particles; tying the cleaned leaves into small bundles and shredding manually with knives. The shredding was done by women who received compensation for their services. Drying was done with a locally designed electric dryer. The dry product was then weighed and packaged in plastic bags that were eventually placed in local super markets and shops. Some attempts were made to exploit the external market in Europe and America with little success in America.

V. **Summary of results**

A rapid market appraisal on eru was carried out in the project area. The market analysis constituted a useful tool for informed decision making as far as production and marketing of eru is concerned in the area. The findings of the market appraisal were later presented to stakeholders in a workshop. This study reshaped the project as its recommendations led to a revision of the project's action plan. As a result of the market appraisal a trial processing and marketing of eru was done instead of the previewed trial sales of unprocessed eru.

Consultation meetings were held with key development organisations and government services operating in the project area to inform them of the project and to seek their collaboration. This support was obtained and in addition CENDEP was briefed on potential challenges. This paved the way for sensitisation meetings, five of which were held and 239 farmers sensitized. As a result of consultation and sensitization meetings there was general awareness of the project as well as support by all the stakeholders contacted. Notwithstanding, some villagers doubted if eru would grow in their community. This doubt was later cleared when the trainees themselves were independently producing eru seedlings and planting them on their individual farms. Another proof was through the demonstration farms that were established using eru seedlings supplied by the project.

In total 5 communities were trained and their community nurseries established. 215 farmers participated in the training. Details are presented in table 1 below. In addition to the farmers one local NGO and 8 staff of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MINADER) were also involved in the training workshops. The objective was to build capacity of local development agents to continue the domestication work when CENDEP leaves. Technical support was provided on a monthly basis by CENDEP staff. MINADER staff in the course of executing their routine activities did monitoring of the trained groups. Outcomes of this exercise were discussed with CENDEP technical team on a monthly basis.

Table 1: Participation at training workshops

Village	No trained			Agricultural	Farmer
	Male	Female	Total	Extension workers	groups
Dikome	14	23	37	2	3
Ikiliwindi	16	23	39	1	7
Ikondokondo	14	23	37	2	0
Meka Ngolo	21	41	62	1	1
Mudemba	16	24	40	2	1
Total	81	134	215	8	12

Through the technical training workshops farmers were organized into groups in the villages of Mundemba, Ikondo kondo, Meka Ngolo, Ikiliwindi and Dikomi Bafaw. The five groups were assisted to elaborate their constitutions and articles of association. They are currently being monitored to see the value they have for their groups and how they manage the problems that come up before they can be legalized. The groups created are:

- i. "Uchum unne unwey" of Iko ndokondo
- ii. "Eya Sumene" of Meka Ngolo
- iii. "Dikomi Eru farmers" of Dikomi Bafaw
- iv. "Ekindi Eru Farmers" of Ikiliwindi
- v. "Together We Share" of Mundemba

Out of the 215 farmers trained only 87 are active members of the groups created. Several reasons were identified for this drop in membership in groups. First, a bitter experience in common property management dissuaded some members from adhering to the created groups and secondly the slow growth rate of Eru, the unfavourable environmental conditions that led to retarded growth and a delay in obtaining the desired economic benefits that farmers expected from the crop. Last, but not the least, was the inability of CENDEP to deploy field staff on her project sites on a permanent basis to promote the adoption of the Eru domestication technique by willing farmers. Notwithstanding, there was high enthusiasm in communities where Eru cultivation was already providing economic benefits.

Apart from organizing the farmers, efforts were made through a series of meetings and workshops to organize harvesters into groups and eventually into a union. This could not be followed to an end because of the long distances separating the villages,

inaccessibility of the area especially in the wet season and absence of permanent field staff.

The rapid market appraisal on eru conducted at the beginning of the project highlighted the constraints of Eru marketing and amongst other things recommended processing to reduce post harvest losses. In order to address this recommendation CENDEP embarked on trial processing and the search for market avenues. The primary aim of this intervention was to establish a training facility for Eru processing and/or commercial component within CENDEP to collect eru from farmers, process and market it. Trial processing was done followed by trial sales. The objectives were to:

- a) determine if processing would really enable farmers to gain extra revenue from the sales of dry Eru as compared to the fresh type, and to
- b) identify opportunities and constraints in the marketing of processed Eru both nationally and internationally.

Since no sources of information existed CENDEP had to learn by doing. Trial sales were carried out in the South West, North West and parts of the Littoral provinces of Cameroon. In addition to these provinces trial sales were done in New Jersey in the United States of America. These trials proved that if better market outlets were identified, adding value to Eru through processing would be more profitable than selling it fresh as is currently done in the export trade to Nigeria.

The preliminary results indicated that there is potential for the development of a value chain for Eru. In addition through the trial sales an external market venue for dry Eru with contact details was identified. It was however not possible to get detailed information on sale prices in the identified market as CENDEP depended on email correspondences.

An indication was also got as to the necessary transactions, documentation that farmers/entrepreneurs would require in order to embark on processing and marketing especially if the external market were targeted.

Also the project was able to identify elements of a cost efficient processing unit to undertake the processing. It also sensitized a pilot community on the advantages of embarking in such a venture or collaborating with any entrepreneur that had the financial and technical know how.

Through this initiative, 11 women (shredders) were employed on a temporal basis for over three months. This enabled them to gain additional income. The initiative also contributed to national objectives of the Cameroon forestry policy which include:

- ⊕ The rational and sustainable management of forest resources,
- ⊕ An efficient processing industry producing value added products, and
- ⊕ The creation of revenue and its equitable distribution

The trial processing and marketing was discontinued because of the local availability of fresh Eru, low consumption of dry Eru near the Eru producing sites. There was therefore the need for a market study to identify market avenues for dry eru far off the Eru producing sites. In addition there is still need for research to design low cost shredding equipment to reduce the hard work and high cost involved in manual shredding.

In the absence of economic operators in this sector CENDEP management considered the option of creating a Commercial component to handle the processing and marketing of Eru. In preparation for this a draft business plan was elaborated. Despite the potential risks of this venture the business offers enormous benefits for the local population. These include the creation of direct jobs as was the case with the women recruited on temporal bases to undertake shredding during the trial processing exercise. The harvesters also had a market for their product which resulted in less product spoilage.

The major constraint remained the difficulty to convince local consumers to buy dry Eru when they can easily get the fresh type. This meant that the market for dry Eru remained external.

The training on processing and marketing earmarked for farmers was not conducted because none of the farmer groups that were created had the means to implement the training. Also no economic operator was identified.

Table 2 presents progress made against targets.

Table 2: Achievements

	Specific objectives	Targets	Achievements	Indicators
1	Sensitize at least five communities and all stakeholders operating within the Korup National Park area on the eru project	By December 2006, all the relevant stakeholders are informed of the project.	Representatives of KfW (German Investment Bank), KREOKOGAN and RUMPI project, operating in the project area as well as MINADER staff, government and traditional authorities participated in the some project activities	KREOKOGAN, and MINADER staff participated in project monitoring
		By March 2007 at least 13 pilot villages are aware of and participate in the project	10 villages were sensitized through workshops and meetings organized to form farmer and harvesters' groups	5 additional villages (comprising harvesters) participated in project activities.
2	Train at least 150 farmers, 4 agricultural extension workers and 1 local NGOs on eru domestication techniques,	By December 2007 at least 150 farmers 4 Agricultural Extension Workers and 1 local NGO are trained.	215 farmers and 8 agricultural extension workers were trained on module 1 of the eru domestication process which comprises seed multiplication techniques, nursery management, farm establishment and management and harvesting techniques. Also a local NGO KREOKOGAN was trained	87 of the trainees have organized themselves into 5 functional groups. KREOKOGAN has adopted eru training as part of their activities.
		By December 2007, at least five eru farming groups are registered	Five groups were assisted to elaborate their constitutions and articles of association. Registration is pending.	Functional groups made up of 40% of the trainees

	Specific objectives	Targets	Achievements	Indicators
3	Assist 5 pilot communities to establish at least 5 pilot community seed multiplication farms	By December 2007 all seed multiplication farms are well maintained.	Five seed banks were established in the five communities trained	At least 60% of seedlings planted survived
3	Assist trainees to produce and plant at least 10,000 eru seedlings in their individual farms and forest (Promote on farm cultivation of eru)	By December 2007 at least 150 farmers are cultivating eru in their farms.	87 farmers have stands of eru on their private farms	4500 eru seedlings were raised and distributed
4	Gather baseline market information to guide decision making vis a vis production and marketing of eru	By March 2007, market analysis report is presented to all the stakeholders and a follow up plan established.	Market analysis report was presented to 47 stakeholders and followed by meetings to create harvester groups	Harvester groups were created in five eru producing villages.

	Specific objectives	Targets	Achievements	Indicators
5	Assist eru farmers and harvesters to increase shelf life and market value of eru	By December 2007 processed eru is found in supermarkets in the cities of Limbe and Douala and contacts made to explore the external market	Pilot sales of processed eru were done in three provinces of Cameroon and one state in the US (New Jersey)	Revenue from trial sales is reflected in CENDEP's income for 2007
		To by December 2007, pay bonuses to farmers	During trial phase farmers were only paid for their produce. However 11 others earned additional income as compensation for their services (shredding of eru)	Expense in shredding and purchase of fresh eru is reflected in CENDEP's accounts for 2007
6	Assist 5 eru producing communities in the sustainable management and marketing of wild stocks	By December 2007 eru producing communities are sensitized and take stronger control of the eru resource base.	Harvester groups were created in five villages	Harvester representatives are now involved in decision making as regards giving permits to outsiders to exploit eru from communal forests.
7		At least five functional groups and two unions in place by December 2007	Harvester groups were created but not followed up because of distance, inaccessibility and limited human resources.	

VI. Deviations

The rapid market appraisal conducted at the start of the project constituted a useful tool for informed decision making as far as production and marketing of eru is concerned in the area. The question that followed the survey was, what next? Would this report end in drawers in the project office? What about the recommendations? Who would care to address them? Based on the capacity of her staff CENDEP agreed on the revision of the project action plan. This led to the introduction of new activities and the dropping of some that were deemed not very necessary for the project. Amongst the new activities was workshop to present the results of the market appraisal to stakeholders. This workshop led to the organisation of meetings that brought about the organization of harvesters in five villages. Instead of a trial marketing of fresh eru previewed in the project, trial processing and marketing was adopted to address the problems of post harvest losses identified along the eru production and marketing chain. The establishment of a processing unit that was supposed to precede this activity did not materialize due to the failure of CENDEP to obtain funds for the project. However trial processing was done using project office and nursery space. This has been elaborated in the section on implementation. The project successfully introduced dry eru in local and international supermarkets/food stores albeit for a short while.

Impact assessment programmed for the end of the project was dropped in favour of an internal evaluation to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the project. Funds intended for the impact assessment were reallocated for the workshop to present the market appraisal report. CENDEP would build the impact assessment into the baseline studies that shall be conducted before phase two of the project. This phase will seek to spread cultivation techniques to new farmers and assist old farmers to improve and/or expand existing farms in order to raise production beyond traditional levels to meet local, national and international market demands in the long term. Farmers in these communities will be closely followed up in the next 3 years to enhance performance and production. Activities to be carried out shall include the following:

- Awareness raising to educate farmers on the economic potentials of key NTFPs;
- Organization of resource users to facilitate production, training and coordination of interventions (encourage individual farms, bring together

- individual farmers into groups – to be registered as legal entities and empowered to enhance performance, interventions and coordination);
- Technical training (seed multiplication techniques, nursery management, farm establishment and management, harvesting techniques, monitoring, etc.);
- Institutional capacity building

VII. Difficulties

Two principal problems were encountered, one at the farmer level and the other at the level of CENDEP.

At the level of the farmers a technical problem which is common with new trainees came up. Because of excitement too much water was put in the rooting propagators. This suffocated the cuttings delaying rooting. In fact the cuttings had to be changed.

The other technical problem was the loss of viability of eru cuttings brought from the forest or from CENDEP seed multiplication farm at Limbe. This was the first experience of CENDEP in training a distant community which lacked propagation materials. To solve the problem a wooden insulated box was built for long distance transportation of planting material. Our field staff had problems transporting the box as people suspected it was a ballot box. Most of the time he had to open it to prove he was not carrying a filled ballot box!

The Korup Rainforest Ecotourism Organisation (KREO/KOGAN), a local tourism based organisation was one of the stakeholders that worked with CENDEP. They considered the Korup Project Area their territory and a no go area. When CENDEP indicated she did not require approval from them to work in the area they decided to collaborate. Then suddenly they suggested that CENDEP put signboards in the eru seed multiplication farms she had established stating the farms were a joint venture of KREO/KOGAN and CENDEP. This was rejected by CENDEP. Rather than waste energy fighting this organisation CENDEP has been cementing links with the project beneficiaries and the collaborating stakeholders like MINADER, the Park Conservator, local administration (village chiefs, divisional officers etc). However, KREO/KOGAN was very instrumental in introducing CENDEP to the villagers. They indicated their desire to learn the new technology thorough a protest addressed to CENDEP for not

involving them during a technical support visit depriving them of the opportunity to learn. This was a positive change in their relationship with CENDEP.

VIII. Effect of the project on CENDEP

This grant is the largest single grant CENDEP has received since its registration in 2000. An immediate consequence for the organisation was the need to improve on the transparency of her financial management. This led to the use of the services of professionals in the auditing of her accounts. CENDEP adopted annual auditing by external auditors and with the help of consultants developed a financial manual for herself. Still in line with the grant was the need to develop terms of reference (ToR) for all team members, some of who now had to operate full time. The ToRs were based on the technical know-how and current role of the members within the organisation.

Team members could not work full time in the premises of its leader which served as an office. Therefore the office was transferred from the delegate's house to the two rooms attached to the organisation's plant nursery. It is now fully operational and weekly management/planning meetings are a routine activity. The beginning was difficult and every one had the choice to comply with the current needs of the organisation or loose membership rights and benefits.

Because of the growth of the organisation there was the need to admit and manage staff. No one had personnel management skills in the organisation. This coupled with the fact that the organisation was still basically run by volunteers led to high staff attrition rates. However, key positions have remained very stable.

In the course of the project CENDEP and ICCO maintained communication on organization development. Through this CENDEP has made remarkable progress in her growth. The project enabled CENDEP to realize her weaknesses as a grass roots institution especially the lack of experience in financial and project management which limits her access to donor funds to implement her activities. It is also worthy to note that this capacity is being strengthened by some international donors who have identified some potential in the organisation.

IX. Concluding Remarks

This project did not bring about any change in livelihood because the beneficiaries are still to start reaping financial gains from their investment in eru. This is a result of the slow growth rate of the vegetable requiring sustained efforts. The recognition of this and the decision by ICCO to support a second phase of the project is a welcome initiative and an indication that the resources invested so far shall not be wasted because of farmers losing hope and abandoning. The case of farmers trained in 2004/5 using a start up grant from IUCN NL who have continued to receive technical support despite the end of the project is testimony that good results can be obtained if farmers are supported for a longer period of time.

ICCO remained very flexible allowing CENDEP to revise her action plan to enable her achieve results. The results obtained with trial processing and marketing as well as presentation of market analysis to stakeholders would have been lost if this flexibility were not there. Some activities like the impact assessment would have provided nothing but reports and recommendations that no one may ever care to read or address.

More time is required to develop a full blown value chain for eru because of the constraints involved in producing eru seedlings. The threat on wild stocks continues to grow despite efforts to curb it down. This is also because interventions are not coordinated amongst the different actors acting independently in different parts of the eru producing areas of Cameroon. CENDEP has good capacity in production but lacks capacity in lobby and advocacy and so can not influence national policies on NTFPs especially eru. Synergy between ICCO partners working on production and policy issues can be useful in promoting good policies on the development of the NTFP sector in Cameroon.

Processing and marketing, either at the local or international level is still above the scope of the local farmers because the capacity to handle this does not exist in the villages. The most promising approach would be for these communities to partner with economic operators who have the financial and technical capacity to undertake this venture. This requires political will and the recognition by government that by promoting the development of an efficient processing industry producing value added products, Cameroon stands to gain more from her forestry resources. This already is

a national objective of the Cameroon forestry policy. But implementation is not followed up as the NTFPs continue to be exported out of Cameroon unprocessed.

X. Budget and expenditure

The detailed expenditure is provided in the financial report attached.

Receipts

Date	Amount (Euro)	Amount (Local Currency)	Bank Charges (Local Currency)	Balance (Local Currency)	Exchange Rate (Euro/local currency)
27/06/2006	25,000	16,398,925	23,850	16,375,075	655.957
25/10/2006	6,000	3,935,742	13,118	3,922,624	655.957
12/3/2007	25,000	16,398,925	13,118	16,385,807	655.957
Totals	56,000	36,733,592	50,086	36,683,506	

XI. Expenditure per category

Activity	Amount previewed	Amount Spent	Difference	Remarks
Sensitization				The conservator of the Korup National Park supported the project by providing a vehicle that CENDEP fueled during the sensitization exercise. Radio programmes were discontinued because of the remoteness of the target population and failure of radio signals to reach those who were most likely to benefit from them.
	3,225,000	2,650,000	575,000	
Baseline educational studies (to advice on sensitiation strategy and content)	1,335,000	1,345,000	(10,000)	
Marketing				In addition to the budgeted CENDEP staff time ICCO made an additional financial contibution (€5000) to enable CENDEP to make use of the services of a consultant to support its team conduct the eru market analysis.
	2,870,000	5,183,000	(2,313,000)	
Opertational budget CENDEP				CENDEP reported a surplus in her budget due to over budgeting of an item (propagators) and was authorised to use this surplus as part of her operational budget for 2007.
	-	5,250,000	(5,250,000)	
Production (training workshps, demonstration materials)	11,580,000	6,567,900	5,012,100	Over budgeting for propagators leading to a surplus of 5250000
Technical support visits				Technical support was conducted for 14 months instead of 18 as in original time frame due to the abridged timeframe based on contract (June 2006 to December 2007)
	9,030,000	7,670,000	1,360,000	
Trial sales (equipment, fresh eru, shredding, publicity etc)				Following recommendations of the eru market survey, CENDEP embarked on trial processing and marketing instead of on her initial intention of supporting farmers to identify and exploit market venues for fresh eru. Expenditure represents turn over and not result of single action. Profits were reinvested into the activity/CENDEP.
	850,000	2,135,741	(1,285,741)	
Monitoring and evaluation	600,000	610,000	(10,000)	
Administration (communication, salary administrative assistant, stationaries)	2,000,000	2,100,000	(100,000)	
Additional consultancy costs	3,275,000	1,220,000	2,055,000	Part spent to pay eru market survey consultant (See marketing above)
Unplanned activities/events				Impact assessment not conducted as per CENDEP's revised action plan. The main activity that replaced this activity was the workshop organized to present results of the eru market survey to stakeholders in the region.
	1,951,865	1,951,865	-	
Totals	36,716,865	36,683,506	33,359	See receipts. Bank exchange rate not exactly same as that used in budgeting