The Rufford Small Grants Foundation

Final Report

Congratulations on the completion of your project that was supported by The Rufford Small Grants Foundation.

We ask all grant recipients to complete a Final Report Form that helps us to gauge the success of our grant giving. We understand that projects often do not follow the predicted course but knowledge of your experiences is valuable to us and others who may be undertaking similar work. Please be as honest as you can in answering the questions – remember that negative experiences are just as valuable as positive ones if they help others to learn from them.

Please complete the form in English and be as clear and concise as you can. We will ask for further information if required. If you have any other materials produced by the project, particularly a few relevant photographs, please send these to us separately.

Please submit your final report to jane@rufford.org.

Thank you for your help.

Josh Cole, Grants Director

GRANT RECIPIENT DETAILS	
Your name	Marcel Quinten
Project title	Population and Habitat Viability Analysis for the Pig-tailed Langur (*Simias concolor*) in the Mentawai Archipelago, West Sumatra (Indonesia)
RSG reference	49.08.09
Reporting period	Final Report
Amount of grant	£ 5,486
Your email address	marcel.quinten-dpz@gmx.de
Date of this report	06. November 2010

1. Please indicate the level of achievement of the project's original objectives and include any relevant comments on factors affecting this.

Objective	Not achieved	Partially achieved	Fully achieved	Comments
Land-cover analysis of the Mentawai Archipelago in order to generate an up -to-date and reliable classification of the remaining primate habitat in the region, based on satellite remote sensing data (Phase 1)			x	While an up-to-date land-cover classification was produced as s result of this project, its reliability is at least somewhat limited. Any land-cover classification primarily relies on the quality of the basis data used (satellite imagery). Located in a very cloud-prone zone (just below the equator) it proved impossible to obtain cloud-free images of the region, so not all of the land mass could be properly classified, esp. in the island's South.
Comprehensive series of surveys to determine the population size and density of the Simakobu on Siberut Island (Phase 2)	Achieving the objectives of Phase 2 and Phase 3 of the overall project was not part of this grant application. Phase 2 has already started, and in the meantime, a first survey is being carried out in the semi-protected study area of the Siberut Conservation Programme (SCP) in North Siberut. Phase 3 will commence at a later stage.			
Examination of Simias' sensitivity to anthropogenic disturbance, in particular with regard to habitat destruction and hunting, and quantitative analysis in order to produce an estimate of population viability (Phase 3)				

2. Please explain any unforeseen difficulties that arose during the project and how these were tackled.

Coinciding with the arrival of the PI in Indonesia at the end of September 2009 (to conduct the necessary fieldwork on Siberut Island), two heavy earthquakes hit the region of West Sumatra. Located more than 100 km off Sumatra's West Coast, Siberut is only reachable by boat (no airstrip). As a result of the earthquakes, the already irregularly operating ferry boats ceded operations completely. This lack of transportation as well as the resulting scarcity of food in the region, led to a total delay of the fieldwork of ca. 3 weeks. As a consequence less ground reference data than initially hoped for, could be collected from the island. However, this had virtually no impact on achieving the objective of Phase 1, because – despite the limited fieldwork time available enough ground reference information could be collected for successful data analysis.

A second unforeseen difficulty would be that the PI contracted Dengue Fever immediately after the fieldwork period. As symptoms began to show only after the PI had returned to his home country, the fieldwork period was not affected by this. Nevertheless, hospitalisation was required, and the infection was severe enough to postpone the start of the data analysis period for approximately 1 month. Common-sense protection measures (repellents, appropriate clothing, mosquito nets, etc.) were used throughout the

fieldwork phase, and as there is no prophylactic treatment for this disease, nothing, despite regular treatment was possible to deal with this situation.

3. Briefly describe the three most important outcomes of your project.

The primary outcomes of this project are the mapping products (see appendix at the end of this report):

1) Land-cover map of Siberut Island

2) Forest vs. Non-forest maps of Siberut Island

3) Elevation reference map (based on ground reference data & NASA/CGIAR SRTM information)

4. Briefly describe the involvement of local communities and how they have benefitted from the project.

Representatives of most of the communities visited throughout the fieldwork phase of this study have participated in the expedition either as field guides, boat operators, porters, cooks or in various other positions. They were remunerated appropriately for their work, and thus, additional income was generated for a number of families on Siberut. Furthermore, two regular guides were trained in the use of survey equipment such as compass, maps and GPS.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

As mentioned under 1) the basis data for this project was not ideal, due to the unavailability of satellite images with little or no cloud cover in the island's south. Considering that the south is the part of the island with the highest human population density, the production of a reliable classification map as well as a close monitoring of the region is very important, and therefore, it is highly recommended to repeat the classification process as soon as higher quality basis data becomes available in the future. In fact, rather than using SPOT archive data, as done for this study, it should be considered to have the SPOT satellite specifically programmed for the acquisition of images over Siberut island. An application could be put in with the SPOT ISIS programme potentially enabling to obtain the required imagery for a fraction of the standard costs.

Furthermore, it was mentioned under 1) that the overall Simias-PVA project consists of 3 separate phases, and only the achievement of Phase 1 was part of this grant application. Phase 2 (Primate Survey Phase) has already started, and in the meantime, a first survey is being carried out in the semi-protected study area of the Siberut Conservation Programme in north Siberut. Additional surveys within the island's National Park, carried out in close collaboration with the National Park authorities, are also in planning (_ coordination visit to Indonesia in November 2010). These efforts will then be followed by Phase 3, at a later stage.

6. How do you plan to share the results of your work with others?

The analysis of the project data and production of maps was just finished recently. It is planned to now share the information (maps and project report) with relevant stakeholders operating on Siberut Island (National Park authorities, Forestry Department, PASIH, etc.) as well as regional conservation agencies (e.g. UNESCO, Conservation International Indonesia). This is planned to happen during the course of the next visit of the PI to Indonesia which will take place in mid-November 2010. In addition, it is planned to make the report available via the website of the Siberut Conservation Programme under www.siberut-island.com.

7. Timescale: Over what period was the RSG used? How does this compare to the anticipated or actual length of the project?

The RSG was used, as anticipated, primarily during the project's field work period between Sept. – Dec. 2009. Data analysis and completion of the final report were somewhat delayed due to the above mentioned Dengue fever infection of the PI as well as the PI's increased contribution to the overall management and coordination of the Siberut Conservation Programme, which underwent substantial changes throughout the year 2010 (_ improvement of local management structure).

8. Budget: Please provide a breakdown of budgeted versus actual expenditure and the reasons for any differences. All figures should be in £ sterling, indicating the local exchange rate used.

Grants received	
German National Academic Foundation (GNAF) German National Academic Foundation (GNAF)	6.900,00 € (*PHD-subsistence scholarship*)[1] 1.575,00 € (*PHD-research bursary*)[1]
Twycross Zoo Columbus Zoo & Aquarium	3.451,11 € *("Conservation Welfare Fund" - £3,000)* 3.301,92 € *(" Conservation Fund" - $5,000)*
The Rufford Small Grants Foundation	6.152,00 € *(" RSGF" - £5,486*)
Total grant money available to the project	21.380,03 €

Grants spent on	**Expected Grants spent on** [2]	**Actual Costs**	**Difference**	**Comments**
	€	**€**	**€**[3]	
Principal Investigator				
PhD subsistence stipend (6 months – paid by GNAF)	6.900,00 €	6.900,00 €	£6.075,55	
Travel costs (international)	2.800,00 €	1.139,72 €	£1.003,54	2 international flights planned, but only 1 was necessary.
Travel costs (Indonesia/Siberut)	1.600,00 €	1.547,59 €	£1.362,67	
Visa & Permits	200,00 €	499,24 €	£439,59	Many more permits than anticipated were required
Health & Vaccinations	250,00 €	501,22 €	£441,33	Increased health expenses due to Dengue fever infection
Food & Accommodation	800,00 €	848,77 €	£747,35	
	12.550,00 €	11.436,54 €	£10.070,03	
Local Assistants (+ boat operators/drivers etc.)				Costs for local assistants, esp. food, were somewhat overestimated in the grant application, because an Indonesian student assistant was supposed to be assigned to the project. This did not work out in the end, which reduced these costs substantially.
Salaries	900,00 €	483,28 €	£425,53	

Travel costs	300,00 €	162,20 €	£142,82	
Permits	150,00 €	--- €	£ ---	
Food & Accommodation	500,00 €	57,14 €	£50,31	
	1.850,00 €	702,62 €	£618,67	
Equipment & Material				
Misc. Field Equipment (first aid kit, batteries etc.)	350,00 €	499,19 €	£439,54	
Global Positioning System Garmin 60 Csx	400,00 €	472,60 €	£416,13	
Small 10”-Display Field Laptop	550,00 €	262,00 €	£ 230,69	
Rem. Sensing Software: ENVI4.6 (2x lt. period license)	75,00 €	150,00 €	£132,08	
GIS Software: ArcView 9.3 (Core + Spatial Analyst)	4.195,00 €	3.525,00 €	£3.103,81	Acquisition of the software via DPZ saved VAT-payment
SPOT Satellite Images of Siberut island	--- €	1.100,00 €	£968,57	Initially it was planned to use satellite imagery from the cost-free Landsat system, however this proved impossible (see full report).
Water Filter System	--- €	93,63 €	£82,44	
Hard Disc (500 GB - Sat-Image storage + Data Backup)	--- €	79,95 €	£70,40	Necessity for the latter 3 items was not known at the time of the grant application
Literature	--- €	66,71 €	£58,74	
	5.570,00 €	6.249,08 €	£5.502,40	
Other				
DPZ overhead (20 % of total grant sum –> 12.905,03 €1)	--- €	2.581,01 €	£2.272,62	
Misc.	350,00 €	434,39 €	£382,49	
	350,00 €	3.015,40 €	£2.655,10	
Total	**20.320,00 €**	**21.403,64 €**	**£18.846,20**	

Upon request, it is possible to supplement this overview with a more detailed breakdown concerning the disposition of funds. All original receipts were submitted to and crosschecked by the finance department of the DPZ. If necessary, copies of all individual receipts are available

1 This is a personal PhD scholarship + a PhD bursary from the German state. They are not included in the calculation of the “DPZ overhead”.

2 Expected costs, based on the initial application to all grant-giving institutions (_ *see previously submitted grant proposals*)

3+4 **Currency conversion factor based on the actual grant sum the project received per funding institution in Euro (via DPZ account):**

3 Twycross (3.000 £) _ 3.451,11 € _ CCF: 0,86928 / Rufford (5.486 £) _ 6.152,00 € _ CCF: 0,89174 _ Used for conversion: Mean = 0,88051

4 Columbus (5.000 $) _ 3.301,92 € _ CCF: 1,51427

9. Looking ahead, what do you feel are the important next steps?

→ please see points 5

10. Did you use the RSGF logo in any materials produced in relation to this project? Did the RSGF receive any publicity during the course of your work?

The RSGF logo was used on the cover page of the main project report. It was furthermore used on the website of the Siberut Conservation Programme (http://www.siberut-island.org/html/scp_support_us.html) in order to acknowledge RSG's substantial contribution towards this study. Further publicity was received when the PI talked about project funding as well as general funding opportunities to various people either somehow involved in this study or others, interested in working with the Siberut Conservation Programme in the future.

11. Any other comments?

I'd like to express a heartfelt THANK YOU to the entire RSG-team for their work and the initiative to provide funding for many a conservation project that would have been impossible without RSG's contribution. Except for the German National Academic Foundation which provided the necessary subsistence scholarship for the PI, RSG has provided the majority of the funding, and everyone involved is enormously grateful for this input.

So once again: Thank you very very much!