

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Society for the Conservation of Nature of Liberia (SCNL)

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): Reconstruction of Gbaboni Research Station at Sapo National Park.

Implementation Partners for This Project: Forestry Development Authority (FDA) and the local community around the Sapo Park.

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): October 1, 2005 – September 30, 2007

Date of Report: October 2007

II. OPENING REMARKS

Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this report.

This report covers status of the CEPF Small Grant Final Project completion (closure). The purpose of the project was to reconstruct a research station (Gbaboni) at Sapo National Park located in Sinoe County, southeastern Liberia. The aim is to provide structures to accommodate scientific studies and produce results that enhance public understanding of Liberia's biodiversity and its sustainable use. The report also highlights achievements made, lessons learned, disappointments and failures encountered during the project implementation which made it impossible to complete as scheduled. SCNL regrets its inability to bring the project to a successful conclusion.

III. NARRATIVE QUESTIONS

1. What was the initial objective of this project?

The overall goal: to establish infrastructure in Sapo NP to facilitate research and enhance knowledge of Liberia's biodiversity.

Objective: To Reconstruct Gbaboni Research Station at Sapo National Park and improve transportation routes to facilitate scientific research.

2. Did the objectives of your project change during implementation? If so, please explain why and how. No, there was no change in the project objective.

3. How was your project successful in achieving the expected objectives?

Six (6) of the nine (9) identified activities for the achievement of the project objective were completed.

4. Did your team experience any disappointments or failures during implementation? If so, please explain and comment on how the team addressed these disappointments and/or failures.

Yes, the team experienced many disappointments and met with failures in some instances.

a) Disappointments: It was unfortunate that the local community people around the site for construction of the structures, refused to permit the exercise to be carried out although they had previously accepted the project site and thereby played a major role in the initial stages of implementation. Their resistance is based on the argument that the area we selected is their farming land and not an extension of Sapo Park. Despite the intervention of the county authority and the FDA, the local people maintained their decision.

b) Failures: There were failures. These can be attributed to 1) lack of the competent construction contractors in the community, 2) lack of construction in the community which had to be purchased from Monrovia and transported some 480 miles to the site and 3) The bad and prolonged weather (rain season) condition which rendered the roads inaccessible.

c) Attempt to address the problems: In an effort to resolve the major problems that affected the project implementation, the team communicated its concerns with all stakeholders and even met with the elders, youth of the community and county authorities to reach a consensus. However, our efforts failed. The team also tried to locate an alternative site but, most other areas are very much inaccessible for such operation.

5. Describe any positive or negative lessons learned from this project that would be useful to share with other organizations interested in implementing a similar project.

Lessons learned:

Positive lessons learned:

During project implementation in rural and impoverished communities, the best options for achieving tangible results are dialogue and consensus building among partners. The team also learned that after a long civil war, many communities, especially around the Sapo Park expect relief hand-outs rather than doing physical work to earn a living.

Negative lessons learned:

The people of the local community in which the project was implemented, sometimes harbored the notions that NGOs, whether local or international, have large funds which they intentionally hold back for other motives. This is why their wage demands for services rendered are often high.

- 6. Describe any follow-up activities related to this project.

There are no follow-up activities since the project was not completed as planned.

- 7. Please provide any additional information to assist CEPF in understanding any other aspects of your completed project. N/A

IV. ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
N/A	N/A	N/A	

***Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:**

- A** *Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)*
- B** *Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF project)*
- C** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)*
- D** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

V. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The project is a unique undertaking in the reconstruction process of Liberia, a country devastated by a prolonged civil war. The selected site contains a portion of the remaining block of the Upper Guinea Forest region. It is rich in fauna and flora species, many of which are endemic and restricted to Liberia.

A successful conclusion of the project would have provided the necessary facility to improve understanding of Liberia's biodiversity through research. Furthermore, the presence of people in and out of the park could help to deter alluvial miners and hunters from entering the Park.

Although the project had to be closed before its completion, we would like to recommend that SCNL remains an implementing partner for future CEPF projects.

VI. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned and results. One way we do this is by making programmatic project documents available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and by marketing these in our newsletter and other communications.

These documents are accessed frequently by other CEPF grantees, potential partners, and the wider conservation community.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Joseph K. Fully

Organization name: Society for the Conservation of Nature of Liberia (SCNL)

Mailing address: Monrovia Zoo, Lakpazee

P.O. Box 2628

Monrovia, Liberia/ West Africa

Tel: 231-6-512506/ 231-6-572377

Fax: N/A

E-mail: scnlib2001@yahoo.com

jsphfully@yahoo.com