

# **Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species Annual Report**

## **1. Darwin Project Information**

Project Ref. Number	13/008
Project Title	Establishing community-based forest biodiversity management around Sapo Park, Liberia
Country	<i>Liberia</i>
UK Contractor	Fauna & Flora International
Partner Organisation(s)	<i>The Liberian Forestry Development Authority (FDA), the Liberian Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA)</i>
Darwin Grant Value	Total grant: £126,080 Original Year 1 grant: £79,034 Proposed revised Year 1 grant: £49,189
Start/End dates	1 April 2004 – 30 March 2007
Reporting period and report number	1 Apr 2004 to 31 Mar 2005 Annual Report 1
Project website	None
Author(s), date	Jamison Suter, 30 <sup>th</sup> April 2005

## **2. Project Background**

Liberia contains two of the three large forest blocks remaining in the Upper Guinean Forest: the Lofa-Gola-Mano block in the north-west, and the south-east forest block contiguous with the Taï forest massif in south-western Côte d'Ivoire. Because many West African species will survive only in large forest blocks, in 1999 the scientific community recognised Liberia as the highest priority country for biodiversity conservation in the Upper Guinean rainforest. However Liberia has only 2 fully protected areas – the small Nimba Nature Reserve in the centre-north, and Sapo National Park in the heart of the south-east forest block (161,400 ha).

For Liberia's biodiversity to be conserved, models for conserving biodiversity in the productive landscape must be developed and replicated widely across the country. Otherwise strictly protected areas in Liberia will not have functional buffer zones, and forested corridors will not be maintained between these areas. Because of rural Liberians' present destitute economic conditions (post-conflict), they may rapidly degrade Liberia's forest biodiversity without external assistance. But they could also be guided to re-establish their livelihoods in sustainable ways, consistent with sustainable use/CBD principles, using forest biodiversity as a source of subsistence, income and a safety net, maintaining traditional knowledge and uses of biodiversity.

Liberians – urban and rural – are economically and culturally dependent on their forests. Especially in rural areas, the loss of forests would result in the loss of the economic goods & services they provide, in products used in the cash economy, in subsistence safety nets and in cultural identity. Establishing a model, with the intention of wide replication, that not only protects forests but integrates sustainable forest-based livelihoods is essential to Liberia pursuing its economic development while remaining a largely forested country.

Since 1980, and especially since civil war started in 1990, Liberia has emphasised commercial timber production at the expense of ecosystem goods & services provided by forests, biodiversity conservation, and non-commercial or small-scale commercial uses of forests. Timber (round-log) export became worth two-thirds of official foreign exchange receipts and 26% of GDP by 2002. Furthermore forests became coveted as a prize of political office under the

Taylor Administration where they were used to fund warfare in Liberia and in neighbouring countries from 2000 onwards. This in turn led to the UN Security Council imposing world-wide sanctions on the international trade of timer products originating in Liberia since July 2003.

Reform of the forest sector in Liberia is central, therefore, to restoring economic prosperity and political stability to Liberia, over and above Liberia's forests' international biological importance and their importance it has to ensuring subsistence and cultural identity to rural Liberians. All this was recognised in December 2003 when the National Transitional Government of Liberia officially adopted a policy of "balancing the three Cs" of forest management: Commercial use, Community use and Conservation.

This Darwin-funded project attempts to pilot one of the never-before-tested legal categories of protected forest: Communal Forest. The Protected Forest Area Network Act of 2003 states that a " 'Communal Forest' means an area set aside legally or temporarily by regulation for the sustainable use of non-timber forest products by local communities on a non-commercial basis" (Section 1.3). Section 9.10 continues "Acts prohibited in **Communal Forests** shall include: No prospecting, mining, farming or commercial timber extraction. Other uses are to be regulated by the designated local community with assistance from local authorities and declared by Regulations of the [Forestry Development] Authority."

If successful in establishing a replicable model for this protected forest type, this project will help set legal precedent for empowering rural Liberians to control the forest resources they depend on for their livelihood, as well as provide a practical model for supporting sustainable forest-based livelihoods in Liberia. It will also contribute to establishing a balance between the three Cs of forest use and remove one of the driving forces of political instability in the country.

### **3. Project Purpose and Outputs**

The project purpose is to ensure conservation of threatened Upper Guinean rainforest biodiversity and sustainable rural livelihoods in forested areas of Liberia based on a legally grounded, working model of community empowerment and forest resource use. This will be pursued through piloting communal forests in 3-4 sites with up to 40 villages around Sapo National Park, securing in perpetuity a forested buffer zone around the Park. To do this, project partners will implement and establish operational links between four activity themes: (1) refining and testing the legal/regulatory framework for CFs, (2) building the community-based, NGO and governmental institutions to implement CFs, (3) ensuring sound management of environmental/ biological resources in the forest, and (4) assisting local communities to pursue sustainable livelihoods and common property resources management. The model developed at Sapo Park will be replicated across Liberia in the following years.

The specific outputs listed in the project logical framework, as well as the objectively verifiable indicators, are as follows:

<i>Outputs</i>	<i>Objectively verifiable indicators</i>
1. Regulatory framework and legal amendments for CFs adopted 2. 3-4 communal forests/ tribal reserves in Sapo Park buffer zone established 3. Model for sustainable natural resources & common property-based livelihoods developed 4. Capacity of FDA, MIA, Liberian NGOs and communities strengthened to create and manage CFs/TRs 5. Model developed for replication of sustainable forest livelihood integrated with biodiversity conservation, supported by written materials (guidelines, evaluations, recommendations, training materials)	1. FDA promulgates regulations through a communal forest manual, resolving any incongruencies/issues between MIA and FDA policy 2a. At least 3 CFs/TRs legally established around SNP, covering 70,000-80,000 ha 2b. Each communal forest has a mgt. plan under implementation 3. Sustainable forest resource-based livelihood programmes underway for 3 communities with CFs, possibly incl. agro-forestry, rattan furniture, others tbd. 4. Efficient, effective monitoring and management of CFs, including formalising and implementing the mechanism within FDA to support recurrent costs of CFs, i.e. allocating certain forestry fees to CFs 5. Report with clear lessons learned, procedures, recommendations for future CFs

Of the outputs listed above, none have been completed yet. Significant progress has been made towards the Output 1, although no legal or regulatory framework has been formally adopted since this act must be part of broader forests sector reform efforts underway (see later). Progress towards the others remains minimal (see Annex 1).

Overall, project fieldwork has been severely delayed by persistent security concerns that were not foreseen at the time of project submission. Soon after civil war ended in August 2003, rebels in south-east Liberia entered Sapo Park to pursue alluvial gold mining. Guided by a few local residents, they set up camps. In the absence of any resistance, the camps grew and grew. Locals began importing goods like food, palm wine and other consumables and non-consumables into the camps. Local authorities, government officials and even Monrovia-based officials from the Liberian Forestry Development Authority (FDA) got involved, accepting kick-backs in return for not stopping the mining. Professional hunters arrived, feeding the miners and exporting ivory to buyers, allegedly from the UN forces. Government collusion at many levels has made it extremely difficult to pressure Government into taking action against the illegal invasion of the Park. As of early 2005, the number of inhabitants inside the Park was estimated at several thousand, consisting mostly of former combatants and entrepreneurs from around the country with relatively few local villagers.

At the national level, starting in August 2003, West African and later UN peace-keepers focused on establishing peace and stability in more populated areas which almost by definition are the non-forested areas in Liberia. So forested areas were left for last in the disarmament, demobilisation, rehabilitation, resettlement and reintegration (DDRRR) process. Not until late 2004, over a year after the peace-keepers arrived in Liberia, was any effort paid to disarming the Sapo Park area, and even then an wholly insufficient job was done. Reports of heavy weaponry persisted through March 2005.

FFI had good reason to believe that the lack of serious effort to disarm and demobilise fighters in and around the Park, coupled with the collusion of Government officials, represented serious security risks and for this reason refused to deploy the Project Manager (PM) and other project personnel and equipment to the Park as originally planned for November 2004. As of the end of this reporting period, the PM still had not deployed to the Park but it appeared imminent (planned for May 2005).

Starting in January 2005, a concerted effort by environmental NGOs (FFI, Conservation International and several Liberian NGOs), the US Embassy in Monrovia, the US Forest Service, UNEP, UNOPS and outraged staff within the FDA finally succeeded in pressuring top officials of Government and the UN peace-keepers to take action. This was greatly aided by a humiliating article that appeared in the International Herald Tribune on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2005 (Attachment 1). FFI continues to participate in meetings and field actions to rid the Park of its invaders, and is seeking complementary funds for newly planned actions.

When FFI learned of the incursions into the Park in late October 2003, they were at a small scale and did not represent anything more than a minor illegal activities such as had been dealt with readily by the FDA in the past. Thus when this project was designed and submitted, incursions were small and not anticipated to pose a serious problem.

The other major development that has forced FFI to alter its work programme is the dramatic shift in short-term priorities of communities surrounding the Park. Prior to the war of 2003, these villages were outraged at their lack of control over the surrounding forests that they used and managed according to traditional practices. Logging companies, professional hunters and gold miners would arrive with a permit issued in Monrovia and demand that communities move aside for them to extract whatever they wished, leaving few if any benefits locally. Demands for local consultations, benefit-sharing or employment were brushed aside irreverently.

The offer of establishing communal forests according to *national* law, rather than *traditional* custom/law, was extremely appealing locally and the idea was overwhelmingly endorsed by communities at Park planning workshops in November and December 2002. However during the fighting of 2003, Sapo Park communities once again saw their crops stolen, their physical goods looted, their villages at times burned, some of their youth abducted to fight a war they had no interest in, and their traditional authority systems undermined. In the absence of any clear law enforcement system since the UN forces arrived, and with the presence of rebels nearby challenging either UN or traditional systems, communities appear unsure of the usefulness of communal forests. Furthermore they are far more concerned about re-establishing basic livelihoods than getting legal title to forest areas where no one is challenging their rights of use.

The above problems have been presented to the UK's FC representative in Monrovia, Mr David Lelliott, who has witnessed the problems firsthand at the Park, as well as to Darwin Secretariat in various letters and most notably that of 28 February 2005 (Attachment 2). As of 5<sup>th</sup> May, FFI had not received a response to this letter.

#### **4. Progress**

One-paragraph summary: The policy work of the project has proceeded well with the development of and public training in a (draft) manual to establish communal forests in Liberia. The policy development and review process has been extremely timely as a much broader reform effort of Liberia's forest sector is underway and FFI has been able to contribute to and influence this significantly. This has taken time and energy that had otherwise been planned for field work. FFI hired a project manager to lead field work, Dr Samuel Koffa, a Liberian national who had studied and worked in the Philippines since 1978. Due to persistent security concerns at the Park, he was not deployed there as of April 2005. Field work remains stalled until the UN can guarantee no significant risk remains, which should happen by mid-May 2005. To plan FFI's deployment, and because many other agencies are scrambling to intervene around Sapo Park without adequate co-ordination or understanding of the context, FFI is to undertake a review in April 2005 of all development and conservation interventions around the Park since 1997 and of all available information on affected communities. This will permit FFI to engage communities in as knowledgeable a manner as possible, unlike what is currently happening.

Project achievement/developments: Since this project began in April 2004, FFI has focused heavily on establishing the appropriate policy framework for piloting communal forests. This has included finalising, training in and presenting for public comment, through numerous discussions, informal consultations and in a public workshop in late January 2005, a draft manual for establishing communal forests. A copy of this manual is enclosed.

Another principal focus has been on advocating for community concerns as national-level forest sector reform proceeds. This initiative is occurring within the broad context of Liberia's forest sector reform whose overarching goals are (1) to balance the three Cs of forest management in Liberia, (2) to reform and strengthen the FDA, and (3) to reform management of forest sector revenues in line with macro-level financial management reform. Because this project is currently the only funded intervention in support of the Community 'C' of the three Cs, it is playing an important role in advising the reform efforts led by the Liberia Forest Initiative (LFI), a collaborative effort whereby several donors and technical agencies – the US Forest Service, the US State Department, the US Embassy in Liberia, the US Treasury, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the FAO, IUCN, FFI, Conservation International, ICRAF, CIFOR, the Environmental Law Institute, Forest Partners International and several Liberian environmental NGOs – share information and collaborate within an agreed framework to achieve the common goals above. The LFI did not exist when the project proposal for this grant was submitted and approved, thus it was not mentioned in the proposal. However the LFI is proving to be invaluable for ensuring co-ordination, for effective strategic lobbying and for comprehensive reform of the forest sector.

Thanks to this Darwin project, FFI is providing strategic input into forest sector reform through participation in regular Liberia-based and international forums like steering group meetings, workshops (on restructuring the Department for Conservation and Community Services of the FDA, and on the emerging land-use planning process for Liberia) and informal consultations. Attachments 3 and 4 are think-pieces recently prepared and submitted by FFI to the FDA and LFI partners on communal forest establishment and on how community concerns should be incorporated into forest sector reform.

At the international level, too, FFI has promoted the concept of communal forests as a means to integrate rural empowerment, supporting livelihoods, peace-building and biodiversity conservation. J Suter presented a paper on the challenges of establishing communal forests in Liberia at a DGIS-supported conference on livelihoods and conservation in September 2004 (Attachment 5), as well as an article published in the European Tropical Forest Research Network Newsletter of Winter 2004/05 on 'Forests and Conflict' (see <http://www.etfrn.org/etfrn/newsletter/news4344/index.html> and Attachment 6). Dr Samuel Koffa, Project Manager (PM), presented a paper entitled 'Putting a Human Face on Biodiversity Conservation' at the University of Turin's the master's degree programme in Development Studies in March 2005.

FFI feels that, particularly within the context of the LFI, these activities have been extremely timely even if not included in the original project work plan. However we readily concede that in recent months they have been pursued *instead of* field activities, and this imbalance – due to persistent security concerns at the Park – must change quickly or the project should be restructured significantly.

At an administrative level, FFI hired Dr Koffa, a community forestry specialist who began his PhD in tropical forestry at the University of the Philippines at Los Baños in 1978 and worked ever since on agro-forestry and community forestry, mostly in the Philippines but also elsewhere in Asia and Africa. Apart from a 1-week assessment in December 2004, Dr Koffa has been unable to spend time at the Park for security reasons. He therefore has spent his time in Monrovia working on policy aspects of communal forests, writing about the challenges of communal forests and community forestry more generally in Liberia, and working with FDA staff on these topics (mostly informally rather than in formal sessions). Dr Koffa has worked

with J Suter as well as Mr James Murray, a consultant to FFI for this initiative<sup>1</sup>, to revise the project work plan in light of the numerous changes that were unforeseen when the original project timetable was planned. See Attachment 7.

FFI observed that with the publicity accorded to Sapo Park in Liberia over the past 6 months, especially since it is a glaring example of the failure of Government and the UN to establish full control over the country, many different organisations are scrambling to do something at the Park. Liberian and international ENGOs, UN peace-keepers and humanitarian organisations, staff from the FDA assigned to the Park<sup>2</sup> and others have carried out assessments, promised different things at different times, and made plans in isolation from others. Nearly all actors at Sapo Park are intervening without adequate knowledge of who has done what before them, or is planning what after them. No one has a good grasp of what information (demographic, anthropological, NRM, traditional authorities, resource use, resource management, etc.) is available and where are the gaps in terms of designing a local community engagement & support strategy and plan. The 5-year park management plan developed by the FDA, local communities and a host of other Governmental and NGO partners in November-December 2002, with FFI's facilitation, is not referred to adequately.

FFI fears that the lack of co-ordination will cause significant confusion, unrealistic expectations and wasted efforts particularly among local communities but also between agencies which are trying to improve the situation.

In response, in April 2005 FFI conducted a review of all information available on what has happened at the Park (since about 1997), who is doing what now, what information is (and is not) available, the quality of this information, the degree to which interventions at the Park have been truly participatory, and what plans exist for future interventions. The report will be shared with all actors at the Park in the hope of improving everyone's performance and co-ordination. It will also be used to plan and improve FFI's interventions at the Park beginning in May.

The following reviews specific milestones set out in the original project proposal. The project appears about 6 months behind schedule:

<i>Project implementation timetable</i>			
Date	Financial year:	Key milestones	Progress towards achieving milestones
Aug 04	FY 04/05	Reconciliation of MIA and FDA (tribal reserve (TR) vs communal forest) law & regulations; completion of communal forest manual and adoption as FDA regulation	Draft CF manual prepared and publicly debated, training provided. It integrates Forestry laws and the Hinterland laws as best possible. However because both sets of laws will undergo revision in the coming years, this will be an on-going task.

<sup>1</sup> This project's staffing has evolved since it was proposed to DEFRA in January 2004. Dr Kay Farmer (British, planned to work 50% on this initiative) had to return to the UK for personal reasons while Dr Samuel Koffa (Liberian) was hired instead full-time for the same monthly cost. Neither Dr Karen Lawrence nor Tunde Morakinyo were considered as appropriate as James Murray (all three British nationals) for advising and re-planning this project since Mr Murray has significant Liberian experience and post-conflict experience, making him better able to 'hit the ground running'.

<sup>2</sup> It is worth emphasising that while certain individuals in the FDA headquarters are allegedly seeking rents for permission to mine and hunt in the Park, the FDA staff assigned to the Park has been extremely courageous and dedicated to re-establishing law and order there, as well as to establishing positive relations with communities surrounding the Park.

Sept 04	FY 04/05	Training of FDA, MIA and NGO partners in TR/CF law and regulations, community consultations and awareness-raising techniques	Training sessions were held for small groups of FDA staff on CFs and their establishment, as well as a 1-day workshop presenting, training in and debating the CF manual at which MIA, FDA, EPA, NGOs and many others participated. Documents of differing sophistication were prepared and distributed, too, on CFs to these audiences. No training on community consultations or awareness-raising yet held because of security concerns at the Park.
Jan 05	FY 04/05	Initial information/awareness campaigns completed for all Sapo Park communities on the possibility to establish, process to create + requirements for TRs/CFs. Tribal authorities meet to review establishing TRs/CFs	Almost no progress in FY04/05. A 1-week trip to the Park occurred in December 2004 but this is the only field work to occur to date because of persistent security concerns.
Jan 05	FY 04/05	First technical feasibility and market study underway on sustainable forest-based income generating activities	No progress in FY04/05. This can occur only after the project personnel have unrestricted access around Sapo Park. However the review of activities done to date, as well as a CIFOR-ICRAF mission scheduled for May-05, will inform this.
April 05	FY 05/06	On-the-ground seminars in sustainable forest use to CFECs and Mercy Corps delivered, on-going TA on this topic initiated; sustainable livelihood initiatives begun for at least 1 site targeting low-impact agriculture around and sustainable forest-based activities within proposed CF	No progress for the same reasons as above.

The reasons for differences between the expected and actual milestones being met are explained above. The project has consequently underspent what was planned for FY04/05. The French Global Environment Facility (*Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial* or FFEM) has expressed significant interest in funding this initiative for another 4 years after Darwin support ends. Thus FFI is not currently worried that funding will dry up. While the proposal has been approved through the first of the FFEM's two stages, the FFEM will not give final approval to a proposal intervening in a place with numerous squatters present. Thus this problem must be resolved before the FFEM will move forward.

Producing a definite revised work programme depends on when the project team is deployed to the field. A provisional plan was developed by James Murray and Sam Koffa in February 2005, and later revised for deployment in May (see Attachment 7).

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

Not yet applicable since no comments were received back after the half-year report.

## **6. Partnerships**

Collaboration with the Forestry Development Authority has been good overall. Political will to take communal forests seriously has been adequate within the FDA. The FDA has accepted that communities have a significant role to play in forest management, and that they have rights to forest resources. This is witnessed in the recent re-organisation of the FDA into three overall departments, one of which is entitled 'the Department for Conservation and Community Services' which has three divisions including one for 'Community-based Forest Resource Management'. However the FDA's understanding of how to address community needs and rights is limited and has required a lot of time and effort to increase.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA) has not received significant attention by Government or donors recently and thus it has been unable to start rebuilding itself like the FDA. Furthermore it suffers tremendously from at least 15 years of institutional neglect where its staff had few operating resources. The concepts of enhancing rural Liberian's rights and integrating traditional authority systems with national Government and Law, which are the MIA's mandate, went counter to the interests of the national Government or rebel factions. Thus MIA was starved and intimidated into not functioning. It has few knowledgeable or trained staff, and FFI has not been able to identify staff we can work with despite having requested this in writing and meeting with the Minister.

The Liberian Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) continues to function as the private fiefdom of the Interim Executive Director Designate, who uses his role as its head and consequently as GEF Operational Focal Point for Liberia, to channel projects through the Agency. The EPA has shown little initiative, despite the efforts made by FFI and now the FDA, to participate in this initiative in the limited ways it is foreseen. The person responsible for setting up environmental committees in the counties and districts, where FFI hopes to pilot communal forests, appears committed. Thus hopefully once we can deploy to the field, we will be able to engage this person more actively and avoid dealing with the Agency in Monrovia.

Relations with the Liberia Forest Initiative partners, in particular the international ones as well as Liberian NGOs, were unforeseen when this project was conceived. However they have been fruitful and allowed FFI to both learn and hone its thinking on communal forests, as well as to help present community voices in the broad debates and action on forest sector reform. In May 2005, CIFOR-ICRAF will conduct a mission to Liberia during which time FFI will be able to plan with them how to co-ordinate the CF initiative with their applied research, for instance on NTFP use and other sustainable forest-based livelihoods.

## **7. Impact and Sustainability**

This project has been widely promoted within the FDA, however at a national level it is not visible (yet). Until field work is done to establish CFs, and comprehensive policy reform occurs addressing rural land tenure issues (i.e. how to integrate national law with traditional tribal systems), this project is not planned to be widely promoted. Once one or more CFs are functional, then FFI plans to promote it to the general public. The project is, however, being used to convince villagers around Sapo Park that they will receive benefits from respecting the Park. It is well known that the UK Darwin Initiative is funding it by LFI partners, including the World Bank, the US Forest Service, the US State Department, UNOPS, UNDP, Conservation International, the FAO, IUCN, CIFOR, ICRAF and others.

The exit strategy for this project remains the same, although FFI has not focused on it since we are concerned with our ENTRY strategy for the time being.

## **8. Post-Project Follow up Activities**

N/A – This project is not nearing completion for now.



## 9. Outputs, Outcomes and Dissemination

The differences in actual outputs against those agreed in the initial 'Project Implementation Timetable' are shown in section 4.

As discussed above, formal dissemination activities in the host country were limited to (1) working groups and small training/information sessions targeting the key project partners like the FDA, MIA (when possible) and EPA (when possible), (2) a 1-day workshop held to present, train in and debate the CF Establishment Manual (January-05) at which 50 or so participants from FDA, MIA, EPA, NGOs, the Ministry of Planning & Economic Affairs, the Ministry of Agriculture, and donor and diplomatic agencies participated, and (3) a 1-week visit to communities along the western and northern boundaries of the Park (December-04) to familiarise the PM with current conditions and to present the idea of CFs again to potential beneficiaries.

International dissemination efforts have targeted the LFI partners as well as the papers and publications discussed in Section 4.

**Table 1. Project Outputs (According to Standard Output Measures)**

Code No.	Quantity	Description
6A	Est. 50	1 day training session (Dec-04) for 5 FDA staff in communal forests: their objectives, what they are, how they can be created, issues and risks, laws, regulations, etc.
6B	11 weeks (55 people-days / 5 days/week)	1 day workshop (Jan-05) to train Liberian officials and NGOs in and debate the CF Establishment manual. ~50 participants came from FDA (including all those from Dec-04), MIA, EPA, NGOs, other Govt ministries, the press, donors.
7	1 (2?)	Dr Koffa prepared a paper on CFs for the FDA training session. A related CF primer was also prepared to be used later in awareness-raising in the field.  (The Communal Forest Establishment manual is not specifically intended for training but is a fundamental guide to CF creation.)
8	4 (J Suter)  2 (J Murray)	(J Suter dedicated about 50% of his time to this initiative in 4 1-week trips, so perhaps this number should be reduced to 2?)  in February-March 2005
14A	1	1-week trip to Park (Dec-04) to meet with communities along the western and northern boundaries to present the project
14B	2	September 2004: DGIS-sponsored conference on livelihoods and conservation, Lewa Downs – Kenya, where J Suter presented a paper on this initiative  March 2005: University of Turin where S Koffa presented a paper inspired by this initiative
20	£17,000	For a 4x4 vehicle and spare parts, computer equipment (1 laptop, portable printer, accessories, 2 used desktop computers), GPS handset, generator and battery. This is the total cost, pre-depreciation. Actual values will be lower when materials are handed over due to depreciation.

23	1750-	50% of Dr Samuel Koffa's time for 2 months
	4770-	15% of J Suter's time for 6 months
	4200-	20% of A Vohiri's time for 6 months
	2000-	Richard Sambola 100% October-04 to January-05
	540-	FDA-Monrovia staff: 3 people x 30 GBP/month x 6 months (Oct-04 to Mar-05)
	7686-	Cost of project vehicle (6534 GBP) plus part of its shipping cost to Liberia (1152 GBP)
	1419.16	1.5 trips to Liberia by J Suter
	4366.52	Associated rents, heating, lighting, cleaning (Monrovia, Cambridge)
	2783.26	Associated postage, telephone, stationery (Monrovia, Cambridge)
	<b>£29,514.94</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>

**Table 2: Publications**

Type *	Detail	Publishers	Available from	Cost £
(e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	(title, author, year)	(name, city)	(e.g. contact address, website)	
Article in a public newsletter	'Piloting Communal Forests in Liberia in the Post-Conflict Period', article appearing in the EFRN Newsletter of Winter 2004/05, focusing on 'Forests and Conflict'	European Tropical Forest Research Network, Netherlands?	<a href="http://www.etfrn.org/etfrn/newsletter/news4344/index.html">http://www.etfrn.org/etfrn/newsletter/news4344/index.html</a>	Free

*All other materials produced were not publicly published.*





Annex 1 Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year: 2004/2005

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2004-Mar 2005	Actions required/planned for next period
<p><b>Goal:</b> 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"> <li>• The conservation of biological diversity,</li> <li>• The sustainable use of its components, and</li> <li>• The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Purpose</b></p> <p>To ensure forest biodiversity conservation and sustainable rural livelihoods in Liberia based on a legally grounded, working model of forest community empowerment and forest resource use</p>	<p>Forest cover &amp; wildlife populations maintained in pilot communal forest areas and Sapu Park</p> <p>Absence of non-seasonal or critical shortage of forest resources to appropriate communities</p> <p>Absence of community complaints of external expropriation of natural resources for CFs/TRs</p> <p>Requests from other forest-dwelling communities and INGOs to replicate the model, and donor interest to support this as required</p>	<p>No progress can yet be reported towards any of these four indicators although a few INGOs working in the development arena are interested in working with FFI to pilot the communal forest model.</p>	<p>Monitoring these higher-level indicators depends upon monitoring to be done by the overall Sapu Park management project (forest cover &amp; indicator species, funding to start mid-2005), by development NGOs working in the area (monitoring of food and other resource security), as well as by this project after field work begins.</p>
<p><b>Outputs</b></p> <p>1. . Regulatory framework and legal amendments for CFs adopted</p>	<p>1. . FDA promulgates regulations through a communal forest manual, resolving any incongruencies/issues between MIA and FDA policy</p>	<p>Finalisation of the manual has not happened because it is now part of a larger process of forest sector policy reform, which gives the manual and CF policy a sounder context. Final agreement will take years, however provisional agreement has been reached so the CF initiative to move forward.</p>	<p>Plans include continue to promote communities' perspectives and voices in the forest sector reform process, and to bring communities into the process much more directly than before, especially after field work begins and FFI can draw on specific individuals.</p>

<p>2. 3 to 4 communal forests/ tribal reserves in Sapo Park buffer zone established</p>	<p>2a. At least 3 CFs/TRs legally established around SNP, covering 70,000-80,000 ha</p> <p>2b. Each communal forest has a mgt. plan under implementation</p>	<p>Pilot communities have been tentatively identified after the 1-week trip in December but this needs more field verification. Otherwise these indicators are years away from being achieved.</p>	<p>The plan and urgent need it to initiate field work!!!</p>
<p>3. Model for sustainable natural resources &amp; common property-based livelihoods developed</p>	<p>3. Sustainable forest resource-based livelihood programmes underway for 3 communities with CFs, possibly incl. agro-forestry, rattan furniture, others tbd.</p>	<p>Depending upon the outcomes of the Sapo Park review of April-May, as well as the process of emptying the Park of invaders and devt. assistance consequently offered, this is likely to start in mid-2005 and will precede achieving output 2.</p>	<p>Plans are to work closely with development NGOs like Africare and Mercy Corps, as well as UNOPS, CIFOR, ICRAF and FAO who will conduct research and/or development interventions that FFI can influence in the direction of sustainability.</p>
<p>4. Capacity of FDA, MIA, Liberian NGOs and communities strengthened to create and manage CFs/TRs</p>	<p>4. Efficient, effective monitoring and management of CFs, including formalising and implementing the mechanism within FDA to support recurrent costs of CFs, i.e. allocating certain forestry fees to CFs</p>	<p>No progress towards these indicators yet.</p>	<p>Plans: lobby the financial management reform process so that a portion of forestry revenues is allocated towards communal forest management in the process of forest sector financial reform (underway).</p>
<p>5. Model developed for replication of sustainable forest livelihood integrated with biodiversity conservation, supported by written materials (guidelines, evaluations, recommendations, training materials)</p>	<p>5. Report with clear lessons learned, procedures, recommendations for future CFs</p>	<p>No progress yet.</p>	<p>Evaluation unlikely to occur in coming FY</p>

