FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ref.	TF092010	Reporting Period:	05/27/2008 to 06/30/2013
Printed On:	11/19/2013	Report Type:	Completion
		Report Status:	Approved

Assignment: TF092010

GEF MSP - LIBERIA: GRANT FOR CONSOLIDATION OF LIBERIA PROTECTED AREA NETWORK PROJECT (COPAN)

GEFIA - GEF-IBRD AS IMPLEMENTING AGENCY

Task Team Leader: 00000234869 - Oliver Braedt
Approving Manager: 00000086248 - Magdolna Lovei

Summary Information	
TF Status	**LCLS**
Recipient Country	**Liberia**
Executed By	**Recipient**
Managing Unit	**8840 - AFTN3**
Grant Start Date / End Date	**05/27/2008 to 05/31/2013**
Program Manager	**Karin Shepardson**
Original Grant Amount	**750,000.00**
Grant Amount	**747,489.86**
Outstanding Commitments	**0.00**
Cumulative Disbursements	**747,489.86 as of 06/30/2013**
Disbursed 05/27/2008 to 06/30/2013	**747,489.86**
Donor	**TF602001 - MULTIPLE DONORS**

This GRM report includes the following sections: Overview, Outcome, Components/Outputs, Execution, Program(GEFIA), Completion, Processing, Attached Documents, Disbursements, Internal Comments.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ref.	TF092010	Reporting Period:	05/27/2008 to 06/30/2013
Printed On:	11/19/2013	Report Type:	Completion
		Report Status:	Approved

OVERVIEW

Overall Assessments and Ratings

Grant Objectives:

The objective of the Project is to conserve biodiversity through the expansion, consolidation, and rationalization of national protected area (PA) systems.

Overall progress from 05/27/2008 to 06/30/2013 with regard to Achieving Grant Objectives:

Rating: Moderately Satisfactory(Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Comment:

The project has secured the creation of a Multi-use Reserve in Lake Piso, and made progress towards the creation of a new protected area in Gola.

Overall progress from 05/27/2008 to 06/30/2013 with regard to Implementation of Grant Financed Activities:

Rating: Moderately Satisfactory(Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Comment:

This project was the first FDA-executed project in the Liberia forestry sector and capacity-constraints have led to delays in field implementation, procurement and financial management. The capacity of FDA without TA remains a major concern. The 2011 elections further compounded implementation delaysActivities that were not concluded during theimplementation period were to be supported under the Expansion of the Protected Area Network project (P114580-TF097657) (EXPAN).

Grant follow-up and structure

Description and context of Grant:

The Grant funds three of five components under the overall COPAN program: Component 2, Consolidation of Protected Area Management Instruments; Component 3, Creation of New Protected Areas; and Component 5, Project Management. Components 1 (Strengthening of FDA and EPA) and 4 (Livelihood Activities around Protected Areas), were cofinanced by a IDA grant (DFSMP- P104287/TF057090) and have not been executed nor supervised under COPAN. Nonetheless, the principles behind these two components have found additional expression both in other COPAN components (the entire project proposes to strengthen FDA) and, for the livelihoods component, through twining with the DFSMP community forestry grant (CBED). Liberia contains a large part of the remaining Upper Guinean forest Biodiversity Hotspot, therefore conservation action is essential. But, since the end of the civil war, logistical, technical and management capacity are still critically insufficient and remain a difficult challenge for all projects and initiatives.

Expected follow up (if any): Follow up project or grant (non-Bank funded)

Comment on follow up:

The EXPAN grant is building on GEF COPAN grant project to consolidate the management of the protected areas in the PA system. EXPAN will focus on only one new protected area in the South-east (Grebo) and will also support the gazettement of Wonegizi in the North. EXPAN funds will also be used to consolidate activities at Lake Piso and Gola.

End Date of Last Site Visit:

Restructuring of Grant:

Given the time frame and budget of the grant, it was agreed that the following deliverables # (a) regulatory framework for the proposed Wildlife Management Law, (b) financial mechanisms and a long-term financing plan, and (c) protected areas system management strategy # would be financed under EXPAN. It was also agreed that the actual building of the headquarters for Lake Piso Mutli-use reserve would be supported under EXPAN. Finally, in view of the suite of activities necessary to gazette Gola and consolidate the ongoing activities at Lake Piso, it was agreed that Wonegizi would not received any further COPAN support and instead would be supported under EXPAN.

Activity Risk

Rating: Negligible or Low Risk

Comment:
FDA park management, financial management and procurement were weak. As the grant closed in November, 2012, this resulted in having unachieved or only partially achieved activities at grant closing. The financial sustainability of the PA operating cost was a major concern. FDA faces a large general budget shortfall and the GoL has been failing to properly capture and reallocate some revenues from the forest sector specifically for conservation. The major risks are related to the unresolved land tenure issue. The land tenure and community rights law are critical in order to establish any new protected area. There is significant risk of encroachment from Private Use Permit logging concession (which unclear allocation process is creating some turmoil in FDA and in the forest sector in general) on PA and of overlap PA on Community Forest.

Critical Issues and Pending Actions for Management Attention

There are currently no issues and actions for Management attention.

OUTCOME

Comments on outcome achieved from 05/27/2008 to 06/30/2013

Grant Outcome Indicators

Grant outcome indicators are listed below.

Authority (FDA) Conservation Department and EPA Environmental Monitoring Department (funded by WB IDA new credit on growth and by World Bank Forestry Grant) 1.1 Training of staff of FDA

Baseline Value: 4 qualified staff at HQ-none in the field

Date: 06/30/2009

Progress to Date: 35 rangers trained and active in the field; Procurement training provided to two HQ staff; Conservation department hired an admininistative assistant for COPAN in HQ.

Date: 06/30/2012

Target Value: Twenty qualified staff in place and performing in FDA (both in the field and in the capital)

Date: 11/30/2012

Support to the enactment of the wildlife utilization and management law

Baseline Value: Wildlife Law not existent

Date: 06/30/2009

Progress to Date: Proposed wildlife management law submitted for ratification to the legislature

Date: 06/30/2012

Target Value: Comprehensive law on wildlife management produced

Date: 11/30/2012

Legal establishment of proposed PA

Baseline Value: Not in place

Date: 06/30/2009

Progress to Date: Lake Piso MUR gazetted and final draft of MUR management plan are being reviewed by FDA and FFI, physical demarcation underway; Gola PA preparatory activities have started; Wonegizi PA no activity yet

Date: 06/30/2012

Target Value: Additional National PAs demarcated and under improved management as measured by WWF Score Cards for PA and METT

Date: 11/30/2012

COMPONENTS/OUTPUTS

Output and Implementation by Component

Strenghening of FDA and EPA

Implementation Rating: Moderately Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Status: Completed

Planned Output: Conservation department strengthened

Actual Output: TA and administrative assistant are hired, training provided to the conservation department.

Consolidation of protected area management instruments

Implementation Rating: Moderately Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Unsatisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Status: Under Implementation

Planned Output: Sustainable Protected Areas Network created by law

Actual Output: Wild life management law submitted for ratification, and regulation will be developed; financial mechanism and long term financing plan, as well as PAs management guideline to be developed.

Creation of new protected areas.

Implementation Rating: Moderately Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Status: Under Implementation

Planned Output: 3 new Protected Areas created

Actual Output: Lake Piso Multi Use Reserve (MUR) - officialy gazetted; Gola PA - activities have started; Wonegizi PA - no activities

Development of conservation livelihood systems

Implementation Rating: Moderately Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Status: Completed

Planned Output: SME created around 2 protected areas

Actual Output: 10 community Market analysis and development project created in Lake Piso PA, Gola PA and Wonegizi PA

Project Management

Implementation Rating: Moderately Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Status: Under Implementation

Planned Output: Unqualified Audits for the life of the project

Actual Output: Quality of WA and procurement requests have slightly improved

Comment on planned and actual Output

The ICM with more details was finalized in March 2013.

Comment on component implementation progress

EXECUTION

Bank project related to the grant

Project ID / Name: P105830 - LR-Establisht of Protected Areas (FY08)

Project Status: Lending

Global Focal Area: Biodiversity

Product Line: GM - GEF Medium Sized Program

Implementing agency and contact details

Agency: Forest Development Authority

Contact: Mr Theo Freeman

Address: FDA Sinkor

Phone: 231 467329 **Email:**

Website: fDA

Implementation performance ratings from 05/27/2008 to 06/30/2013 with regard to:

Project Management: Moderately Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Brief Comment:

None

Financial Management: Moderately Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Brief Comment:

None

Counterpart Funding: Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Brief Comment:

None

Procurement: Moderately Satisfactory (Previously Rated Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Brief Comment:

None

Monitoring and Evaluation: Moderately Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Unsatisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Brief Comment:

The MTR is over a year overdue and project management is not providing a monthly work plan/budget update as agreed. The grant does not have a M&E staff. This situation slows down grant supervision and does not guaranty a full transparency.

Additional Comments on Implementation Performance:

Implementation presented many challenges for FDA, specially given that this is the first project managed directly by them and that there is no direct TA provided under the project. The project extension contributed towards achieving the PDO.

PROGRAM

Program Specific Ratings

1. Please rate public involvement - Moderately Satisfactory
2. Please rate government commitment - Moderately Unsatisfactory
3. Please rate safeguard performance - Satisfactory
4. Please rate arrangements for sustainability - Not Rated

Program Specific Questions

1 .Please comment on additional resources leveraged

The level of co-financing achieved for the Project was less than envisioned but nonetheless provided support for important enabling and complementary activities. FDA provided substantial support through the provision of staff who worked on project activities, and a Project Coordinator who worked full time on the Project after the Mid-Term Review. Co-financing in cash from the EC/BirdLife International Across the River Project provided support to activities around Gola proposed protected area. Not only was the support substantial, but it was directly complementary (e.g. through training rangers, equipping them, paying for the biodiverseity and socio-economic baselines for the gazettement package, etc) and sequenced perfectly with COPAN project activities. Support from the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, though not strictly co-financing given that it too is a GEF-funded program, provided support to local NGOs to bolster efforts by the FDA to build community constituencies and undertake biodiversity baselines in each of the proposed protected areas. The Government of Italy CHYAO co-financing supported alternative livelihoods around the proposed protected areas, which provided local communities an incentive to work with FDA as they prepared to gazette each park. This co-financing was central to the success COPAN had at building community relations, which were themselves central to success and continued sustainability of each of the proposed protected areas.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ref.	TF092010	Reporting Period:	05/27/2008 to 06/30/2013
Printed On:	11/19/2013	Report Type:	Completion
		Report Status:	Approved

COMPLETION

Overall Assessments and Lessons Learned

Main lessons learned:

COPAN provides two sets of lessons that are important for future project planning and execution in this sector in Liberia and in other low-income countries.

Sequencing investments. Arguably the biggest result from COPAN is improved relations with local communities, and as a result, reduced threats on natural capital. However, because alternative livelihood activities were supported by co-financing, COPAN suffered from some sequencing challenges as these activities tended to begin and end before park management activities got going at the same sites. It is important that rather than individual investments, projects should be sequences to optimize sustainable landscape-level investments.

Scaling activities to capacity. COPAN suffered from having an overly ambitious design. It is important that project preparation be used to fully assess the capacity of executing partners, both in technical and back-office (e.g. general management, procurement, FM) terms. Often individual technical capacity is stymied by institutional dysfunction or inability to follow Bank policies. A full assessment of such challenges would promote project planning that was realistic and would allow for success. Moreover, project investments should be made to alleviate dysfunction where possible to create the enabling conditions for prolonging the life of project investments. The need for resources (both in human capital and funds for operation) to operate a successful project in an fragile state environment should not be underestimated. The later also ensuring sufficient supervision costs from the Banks side as above average efforts are required to ensure implementation support.

Scaling activities to business-as-usual. One of the successes of COPAN was a scale of support that is potentially sustainable over the long term. COPAN invested in capital projects with an eye to the future # it did not build infrastructures with a high maintenance cost or recruit a large project management unit. Support to rangers was provided at the government rate and a number of rangers recruited that could be carried long term by the client. Similarly, COPAN provided funds for capital investments # in radios, equipment and planning instruments # that will not require a large outlay of funds going forward, and rather will promote efficiencies in park management. This mix of support to capital investment that reduced the long-term cost of management and support to ongoing operational costs at the government-approved rate are important lessons for other projects.

Building incentives into the project. Because of the frequent changes in project management with the recipient, and the use of external consultants often sitting far from the recipient, COPAN suffered from a lack of ownership from FDA senior management for the first several years of the Project. Instead of ad hoc changes as a result of failure, it would have been interesting to test how using external consultants to mentor FDA would have worked, especially if built-in transition to full FDA management was planned from the beginning (a transition that was tied to verifiable project targets). This could have made the best of two challenges: the need to often provide external support to accelerate activities at the beginning of a project and build the necessary back-office capacity, and the need to build ownership of project activities as part of business-as-usual among staff and senior management of an executing agency.

Overall outcome (and its Sustainability): Rated Likely

Comment:

The Project is rated as Moderately Satisfactory. Though it could only fully gazette one of the three parks as planned, the Project did succeed in conserving biodiversity through a mix of official gazettement at Lake Piso and enhanced national forest management in Gola and Wonegizi that resulted in the reduction of threats # particularly from bushmeat hunting # to biodiversity. In addition, the community relations developed and the process for establishing grievance redress systems started under the project as part of the numerous consultations in the other 2 protected areas is significant and fundamental to a successful future gazettement and related activities. The fact that there is the GEF funded EXPAN project that is able to continue activities that have started under COPAN is very beneficial.

Bank Performance: Rated Moderately Satisfactory

Comment:

Actions taken by the Bank were Moderately Satisfactory. Project design was overly ambitious given the fragile state of the forestry sector and the technical and human resource capacity of FDA to work on more than one park at a time. Initially implementation support was hampered by the absence of Liberia-based staff working on the Project, but was nonetheless provided regularly. Upon the hiring of country-based staff to work on the Project, Bank supervision provided ongoing implementation support that helped accelerate project implementation. Training in procurement was provided early on, and again when it became clear that the training had not been enough. Three FDA procurement staff participate in the World Bank Procurement Procedures course at GIMPA, Ghana. Critical risks # from safeguard related risks such as the need for a grievance redress mechanism, to failures in project management arrangements # were appropriately flagged and addressed in a timely manner through relevant channels, even if resolution was not always immediately forthcoming. The task team made routine visits (when security permitted) to the Project#s field sites and successfully followed each visit with detailed aide-memoires that flagged actions for follow-up. The team was also ready to engage the relevant expertise when problems arose that required such expertise. The team effectively raised issues affecting the project to management#s attention and management responded actively and speedily to issues raised, such as by extending the Project to allow FDA to meet project objectives.

Additional Assessment

Development / strengthening of institutions: Rated Substantial

Comment:

Building incentives into the project. Because of the frequent changes in project management with the recipient, and the use of external consultants often sitting far from the recipient, COPAN suffered from a lack of ownership from FDA senior management for the first several years of the Project. Instead of ad hoc changes as a result of failure, it would have been interesting to test how using external consultants to mentor FDA would have worked, especially if built-in transition to full FDA management was planned from the beginning (a transition that was tied to verifiable project targets). This could have made the best of two challenges: the need to often provide external support to accelerate activities at the beginning of a project and build the necessary back-office capacity, and the need to build ownership of project activities as part of business-as-usual among staff and senior management of an executing agency.

Mobilization of other resources: Rated Modest

Comment:

Given the delays experienced in COPAN, a follow-up GEF project # the Expansion of the Protected Area Network (EXPAN) project #was initiated to consolidate results from COPAN and expand them. The COPAN approach was in fact designed to be the first of a series of phased investments from the GEF in Liberia#s protected area system. Given the absence of a system before COPAN, its initial investments and results, however limited, have established precursory enabling conditions to secure other investments and continue work. For example, its results have allowed other stakeholders, notably Conservation International and BirdLife International to build on some of the achievements to secure investments for other parks, notably East Nimba Nature Reserve.

Knowledge exchange : Rated Substantial

Comment:

Sequencing investments. Arguably the biggest result from COPAN is improved relations with local communities, and as a result, reduced threats on natural capital. However, because alternative livelihood activities were supported by co-financing, COPAN suffered from some sequencing challenges as these activities tended to begin and end before park management activities got going at the same sites. It is important that rather than individual investments, projects should be sequences to optimize sustainable landscape-level investments.

Client's policy / program implementation : Rated Modest

Comment:

The project fully supported the clients program, bu thte client did not have sufficient capacity nor funding to fully benefit from the program.

Efficiency : Rated Moderately Satisfactory

Comment:

A rough assessment of cost-effectiveness is possible on the basis of comparing PA management cost per unit area for the Lake Piso and the two proposed protected areas at Gola and Wonegizi with other countries. Considering the total project cost of US$750,000 and the total hectares in which management was enhanced under the project (all three areas total 176,462 ha), the project provided a degree of park protection and management for five years at a cost of about US$0.85/ha/year. This was broadly consistent, given inflation and the cost of living in Liberia compared with a mean budget of PA budgets from developing countries during the 1990s, which was US$1.57/ha/yr (James et al, 1999; this is the most recent assessment that has been made). By comparison, GEF investments at Sapo resulted in expenditures of $2.4/ha/year, which turned out to be difficult to sustain. As such, the Project was cost-effective and its low expenditures have set it up for success in the long term.

Replicability: Rated Likely

Comment:

Given the slow but steady nature of progress in the project despite an overly ambitious project design, and the focus on building the capacity of the FDA and its ranger corps to implement activities in a structured way with cooperation from communities, project activities were scaled and identified appropriately to the conditions and needs in Liberia. As a result, they have been replicated by a follow-up Bank/GEF Project (Expanding the Protected Area Network, EXPAN), as well as by the Across the River project. However, the project design should have better incorporated the lack of capacity at FDA and therefore budgeted better for project management and also should have been less ambitious in its objectives.

Main recommendations to stakeholders:

Scaling activities to capacity. COPAN suffered from having an overly ambitious design. It is important that project preparation be used to fully assess the capacity of executing partners, both in technical and back-office (e.g. general management, procurement, FM) terms. Often individual technical capacity is stymied by institutional dysfunction or inability to follow Bank policies. A full assessment of such challenges would promote project planning that was realistic and would allow for success. Moreover, project investments should be made to alleviate dysfunction where possible to create the enabling conditions for prolonging the life of project investments. The need for resources (both in human capital and funds for operation) to operate a successful project in an fragile state environment should not be underestimated. The later also ensuring sufficient supervision costs from the Banks side as above average efforts are required to ensure implementation support.

Main recommendations to Bank Management:

Building incentives into the project. Because of the frequent changes in project management with the recipient, and the use of external consultants often sitting far from the recipient, COPAN suffered from a lack of ownership from FDA senior management for the first several years of the Project. Instead of ad hoc changes as a result of failure, it would have been interesting to test how using external consultants to mentor FDA would have worked, especially if built-in transition to full FDA management was planned from the beginning (a transition that was tied to verifiable project targets). This could have made the best of two challenges: the need to often provide external support to accelerate activities at the beginning of a project and build the necessary back-office capacity, and the need to build ownership of project activities as part of business-as-usual among staff and senior management of an executing agency.

PROCESSING

Manager's comments on this GRM report:

Date:11/19/2013 User ID:WB86248 Name:Ms Magdolna Lovei Operation performed:Approved by Manager

This was an important part of the larger support to a very challenging sector under fragile institutional context. While not all objectives were achieved, the project played an important role in supporting conservation and biodiversity protection.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ref.	TF092010	Reporting Period:	05/27/2008 to 06/30/2013
Printed On:	11/19/2013	Report Type:	Completion
		Report Status:	Approved

GRM report history - Requested on 09/09/2013,due on 09/30/2013

Action	Name	Status	Date
Created	Beula Selvadurai	Draft	10/31/2013
Changed	Beula Selvadurai	Draft	11/04/2013
Changed	Beula Selvadurai	Draft	11/04/2013
Changed	Beula Selvadurai	Draft	11/04/2013
Changed	Beula Selvadurai	Draft	11/04/2013
Changed	Beula Selvadurai	Draft	11/04/2013
Changed	Beula Selvadurai	Draft	11/04/2013
Changed	Beula Selvadurai	Draft	11/04/2013
Changed	Oliver Braedt	Draft	11/12/2013
Changed	Oliver Braedt	Draft	11/12/2013
Changed	Oliver Braedt	Draft	11/12/2013
Changed	Oliver Braedt	Draft	11/12/2013
Changed	Oliver Braedt	Draft	11/12/2013
Changed	Oliver Braedt	Draft	11/12/2013
Mail sent to Reviewer	Oliver Braedt	Draft	11/12/2013
Submitted for Approval	Oliver Braedt	Submitted	11/19/2013
Approved by Manager	Magdolna Lovei	Approved	11/19/2013

DOCUMENTS

List of documents attached to this GRM

1) ICM P105830

DISBURSEMENTS

Disbursements Summary in USD

Date From	Date To	Planned Cumulative	Planned Period	Actual Cumulative	Actual Period
01/01/2008	06/30/2008	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
07/01/2008	12/31/2008	0.00	0.00	100,000.00	100,000.00
01/01/2009	06/30/2009	0.00	0.00	100,000.00	0.00
07/01/2009	12/31/2009	0.00	0.00	134,523.23	34,523.23
01/01/2010	06/30/2010	0.00	0.00	160,999.61	26,476.38
07/01/2010	12/31/2010	0.00	0.00	220,283.78	59,284.17
01/01/2011	06/30/2011	0.00	0.00	314,871.70	94,587.92
07/01/2011	12/31/2011	0.00	0.00	491,409.81	176,538.11
01/01/2012	06/30/2012	0.00	0.00	559,296.62	67,886.81
07/01/2012	12/31/2012	0.00	0.00	714,340.91	155,044.29

01/01/2013	06/30/2013	0.00	0.00	747,489.86	33,148.95

INTERNAL COMMENTS

Date:11/19/2013 User ID:WB86248 Name:Ms Magdolna Lovei Operation performed:Approved by Manager
This was an important part of the larger support to a very challenging sector under fragile institutional context. While not all objectives were achieved, the project played an important role in supporting conservation and biodiversity protection.

Date:11/19/2013 User ID:WB234869 Name:Mr Oliver Braedt Operation performed:Mail Sent to PM
Dear Magda,
Please find this ICM attached. For some reason this has to be submitted again, although it has already been submitted several times.
Kind regards, Oliver.

Date:11/12/2013 User ID:WB234869 Name:Mr Oliver Braedt Operation performed:
Dear Siv,
Please find attached the ICM from March 2013 and the final GRM for you rreview and approval.
Kind regards, Oliver.