



REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Improve sustainability of mangrove forests and coastal mangrove areas in Liberia through protection, planning and livelihood creation – as a building block towards Liberia’s marine and coastal protected areas			
Country(ies):	Liberia	GEF Project ID: ¹	5712
GEF Agency(ies):	Conservation International	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Other Executing Partner(s):	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Liberia; Conservation International (CI) - Liberia	Submission Date:	03/11/2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	36
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	86,759
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 		

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
(select) BD-1	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.	Output 1. New protected areas (number) and coverage (hectares) of unprotected ecosystems. Output 3. Sustainable financing plans (number).	GEF TF	256,972	2,850,000
(select) BD-2	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.	Output 2. National and sub-national land-use plans (number) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation.	GEF TF	707,022	800,000
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
Total project costs				963,994	3,650,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

<p>Component 2: Reducing pressures on an additional 15% of priority mangrove areas through integrated land-use planning, improving local community livelihoods and increasing stakeholders' capacity and awareness</p>	<p>TA</p>	<p>Outcome 2.1.: Priority Mangrove forest land-use planning integrated and mainstreamed in the wider landscape and subjected to 5-year M&E program for adaptive management</p> <p>Outcome 2.2.: No further deforestation within the 15% of priority mangroves and surrounding buffer areas through addressing drivers of deforestation and improving people's livelihoods</p> <p>Outcome 2.3.: Capacity and awareness of key government agencies</p>	<p>Output 2.1.1.: Multi-stakeholder integrated land-use planning and decision support toolkit (with key information gathered) for priority mangrove forests and immediate buffer areas in the wider landscape completed and applied to the priority mangrove areas</p> <p>Output 2.1.2.: Five-year monitoring and evaluation program for the mangrove forests developed and being implemented by the EPA</p> <p>Output 2.1.3.: Plans for demonstration sites developed for sustainable management and restoration by local communities within 4 priority mangrove areas and implemented</p> <p>Output 2.2.1.: Conservation agreements signed and being implemented with at least 10 communities providing local economic development (alternative livelihoods) and community involvement in mangrove protected areas management (governance) strengthened in and around key proposed protected areas</p> <p>Output 2.3.1.: Capacity building programs, based on needs assessment, designed</p>	<p>GEF TF</p>	<p>674,907</p>	<p>800,000</p>
--	-----------	--	--	---------------	----------------	----------------

		and local communities on mangrove forest conservation and sustainable use substantially improved	and delivered to at least 50 government officials and 1,000 members in 4 local communities				
	(select)			(select)			
	(select)			(select)			
	(select)			(select)			
	(select)			(select)			
	(select)			(select)			
	(select)			(select)			
Subtotal						915,822	3,650,000
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				GEF TF		48,172	
Total project costs						963,994	3,650,000

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	Conservation International	Cash	1,000,000
National Government	Forestry Development Authority	In-kind	1,350,000
National Government	Environmental Protection Agency	In-kind	1,000,000
GEF Agency	Conservation International	In-kind	300,000
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
Total Co-financing			3,650,000

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
CI	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Liberia	963,994	86,759	1,050,753
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
Total Grant Resources				963,994	86,759	1,050,753

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	126,000	0	126,000
National/Local Consultants	0	0	0

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

- A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.
- A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.
- A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:
- A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:
- A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:
- A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks: The following risks were added:

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

Risks	Rating (Low, Medium, High)	Risk Mitigation Measures
A resurgence of the Ebola virus in Liberia	Medium	Whilst the Ebola epidemic has subsided and all but disappeared in the West African region, there remains a risk that Ebola could reappear in Liberia. CI will work with all stakeholders to ensure the safety of those affected by this project. The Project Management Unit will ensure that strict hygiene procedures are maintained in the field and that there is continued awareness on Ebola and its impact among stakeholders.
Conflict in Liberia	Low	It has been over 14 years since civil conflict ended in Liberia. Whilst the risk of conflict remains low, upcoming national elections in 2017 may result in some unrest in local communities. CI will ensure that actions taken in the project do not exacerbate potentially volatile situations in local communities. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Process Framework for Restriction of Access to Natural Resources in this document are important tools that will help mitigate against the risk of conflict in this project.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives. The following GEF projects and coordination were added:

GEF Projects Other Projects/Initiatives	Linkages and Coordination
UNDP/GEF project: Enhancing Resilience of vulnerable coastal areas to climate change risks in Liberia—June 2010-June 2014-ongoing, USD 3.3 million	This project seeks to develop coastal defense mechanisms. Current investments are specifically focused on the Monrovia and Buchanan areas where risks are highest. The proposed Project will compliment these investments, working specifically with coastal and mangrove communities on local land-use plans and livelihood solutions. Putting in place mangrove protected areas will also help to address current coastal erosion issues and support efforts to enhance resilience of vulnerable coastal areas.
UNDP/GEF project: Strengthening Liberia’s capability to provide climate information and services to enhance climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change—October 2013-2017, USD 6.7 million	This project aims to strengthen Liberia’s capability to provide climate and hydrological information and services that enable climate resilient sustainable development. This proposed Project will collaborate with the UNDP/GEF project to ensure the data collected for the early warning system is also included as part of local land-use plans and other development activities. CI maintains regular communication with UNDP on both projects.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation

A Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) was prepared during the PPG phase. The purpose of the SEP is to encourage buy-in and support for the project through effective participation and productive dialogue. The plan will help the project in implementing effective communication channels and working relationships. The SEP was presented to wide group of stakeholders including government representatives, private companies, NGOs and community representatives during a

workshop at the conclusion of the Rapid Mangrove Survey. Participants confirmed, and where necessary, refined project outcomes and targets, and also identified key stakeholders that needed to be part of the project and the methodology for engagement. A full version of the SEP is presented in Appendix VI of the ProDoc while a Summary of the engagement methodology is presented below:

Stakeholders	Engagement Methods/Mean	Engagement Activities
Local communities in project sites	Through face-to-face community meetings, individual interviews and workshops	Range of activities may include: participatory appraisals of community needs using standard PRA methods and tools; capacity building and awareness raising; feasibility studies for Conservation Agreements; data collection for research purposes; Consultations to attain Free, Prior and Informed Consent; Involvement in Strategic landscape level planning meetings and localized land use planning meetings
National Government Ministries and Agencies	Emails, face-to-face meetings, workshops	Project Management Unit meetings Project Steering Committee meetings Project Inception workshop Protected Area gazettement workshops Strategic landscape level planning meetings Share midterm and final project evaluation Participation in high level advocacy meetings for Montserrado
NGOs and civil society organizations	Emails, face-to-face meetings, workshops	Project Inception workshop Share midterm and final project evaluation Protected Area gazettement workshops Strategic landscape level planning meetings Protected Area gazettement workshops
Private Sector	Emails, face-to-face meetings, workshops	Project Inception workshop Share midterm and final project evaluation Strategic landscape level planning meetings Protected Area gazettement workshops
Bilateral/Multilateral Entities	Emails, face-to-face meetings, workshops	Project Inception workshop Share midterm and final project evaluation Strategic landscape level planning meetings Protected Area gazettement workshops
Local Government	Emails, face-to-face meetings, workshops	Project Inception workshop Share midterm and final project evaluation Strategic landscape level planning meetings Protected Area gazettement workshops
Private land owners in coastal and riverine areas	Emails, face-to-face meetings, workshops	Strategic landscape level planning meetings Protected Area gazettement workshops

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF):

The protection of mangrove ecosystems under this project will reduce the vulnerability of people by providing protection and shelter against extreme weather events, such as storm winds and floods and reduce the impact of coastal erosion that is currently threatening Liberia's coastline. Protecting mangroves will help safeguard traditional economic activities such as fishing and gathering of crustaceans, which is generally done by women. Storage of carbon in mangroves in Liberia will also help mitigate against the future impacts of climate change in a country that is highly vulnerable to climate change impacts in coastal areas.

The project will introduce the Conservation Agreement (CA) methodology with at least 10 communities living in and around key mangrove areas. These agreements will improve the livelihoods of an estimated 10,000 people and will be equitably distributed between men and women. Specific details on the benefits that communities will receive under the Conservation Agreements will be determined during the negotiation and design of the agreements; however, we anticipate that investments in local livelihoods and socioeconomic development will potentially enhance food security, improve access to education and health services and provide direct income through conservation jobs.

An estimated 10,000 people (equitably distributed between men and women) will also benefit from improved land use planning under this project. This project will enhance rural development and participation in the governance of natural resources through participatory land use planning in 3 project sites. By engaging resource users and all other relevant stakeholders in the planning processes of this project we ensure that they have a say in how resources are extracted sustainably and how benefits are shared. Through this process, communities will be empowered to negotiate future land and resource uses and help reduce power asymmetries that exist between communities and other stakeholders

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The project looked at three options. The first option was a top-down approach in which the Government of Liberia establishes a series of Category 1 Protected Areas for mangroves at each of the priority sites without any consultation or participation by local people. Studies throughout the world have shown that this approach generally meets with limited success owing to the lack of buy-in from local people and the reliance on enforcement and punitive measures such as the imposition of fines and imprisonment to achieve conservation objectives. This approach is unlikely to meet with any success in Liberia owing to the limited capacity of the relevant government agencies to implement such an approach. This approach is also contrary to the participatory approach that the Government of Liberia has adopted for management of natural resources in the country.

The second option focuses solely on community-based management of mangroves. This approach has its limitations as often community management approaches initiated by an NGO tend to lose momentum when the NGO withdraws support. Despite the fact that important resources might have been invested in technical assistance and training and efforts made to define phase-out strategies, the overall result is generally that few of the innovations continue after the project finishes. It is important that state owned institutions are empowered to support these innovations in community management through formal protection mechanisms that include protected area management. Further, private land management have yet to be proven in Liberia, would be hard to monitor, and generally do not guarantee conservation outcomes.

The third option is one that includes elements of formal protection as well community-based protection. Support for the conservation measures that are implemented under this approach is generally much higher and success is much more likely. By adopting this approach, there is confidence that Liberia's mangroves will be better protected, thus decreasing deforestation, through a combination

of improved enforcement, reduced pressures, and the sustainable land management.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

Type of M&E	Reporting Frequency	Responsible Parties	Indicative Budget from GEF (USD)
a. Inception workshop and Report	Within three months of signing of CI Grant Agreement for GEF Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Team • Executing Agency • 	\$2800
b. Inception workshop Report	Within one month of inception workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Team • 	\$400
c. Project Results Monitoring Plan (Objective, Outcomes and Outputs)	Annually (data on indicators will be gathered according to monitoring plan schedule shown on Appendix IV)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Team • 	\$31,000
d. GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools	i) Project development phase; ii) prior to project mid-term evaluation; and iii) project completion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Team • Executing Agency • CI-GEF PA 	\$31,000
e. Project Steering Committee Meetings	Annually	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Team • Executing Agency • 	\$9000
f. CI-GEF Project Agency Field Supervision Missions	Approximately annual visits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CI-GEF PA 	\$500
g. Quarterly Progress Reporting	Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Team • Executing Agency 	\$600
h. Annual Project Implementation Report (PIR)	Annually for year ending June 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Team • Executing Agency • CI-GEF PA 	\$600
i. Project Completion Report	Upon project operational closure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Team • Executing Agency 	\$1000
j. Independent External Mid-term Review	CI Evaluation Office Project Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximate mid-point of project implementation period 	\$18,000

Type of M&E	Reporting Frequency	Responsible Parties	Indicative Budget from GEF (USD)
	CI-GEF PA		
<i>k. Independent Terminal Evaluation</i>	CI Evaluation Office Project Team CI-GEF PA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation field mission within three months prior to project completion. 	\$18,000
<i>l. Lessons Learned and Knowledge Generation</i>	Project Team Executing Agency CI-GEF PA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least annually 	\$200
<i>m. Financial Statements Audit</i>	Executing Agency CI-GEF PA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually 	\$21,000


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Anyaa Vohiri	Executive Director and CEO	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY - LIBERIA	02/14/2014

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Miguel Morales, Conservation International		01/22/2016	Orissa Samaro	202 510 4667	osamaroo@conservation.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Objective:	To strengthen the conservation and sustainable use of globally important mangrove forests through effective participatory land-use planning and establishment of coastal protected areas in at least 35% of Liberia’s mangroves.
Indicator(s):	<p>a. Area (ha) and percentage (%) of mangrove forests in Liberia incorporated in areas designated for formal protection</p> <p>b. Area (ha) and percentage (%) of mangrove forests in Liberia safeguarded through community based Conservation Agreements or other legal mechanisms</p> <p>c. Number of Conservation Agreements implemented with coastal communities in Liberia</p>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
Component 1: Enabling conditions for establishment of coastal protected areas in 20% of priority mangrove forests			
<p>Outcome 1.1.: 15% of priority mangrove areas have been identified, delineated, and management plans to safeguard them completed</p> <p><i>Indicator 1.1.: Area (ha and % of total) of mangrove forest incorporated into protect areas</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lake Piso Multiple Use Reserve under limited protection • No current map delineating the extent of mangrove forest distribution in Liberia and identifying the priority areas exist. • No participatory management plans for mangrove areas exist • No financial plan for conservation of priority mangrove forests exist • Low levels of awareness and support for new coastal protected areas within appropriate government agencies, ministries and legislatures 	<p>15% of mangrove priority areas delineated in a participatory process with management plans for two proposed national protected areas submitted to government for endorsement</p>	<p>Output 1.1.1.: A multi-stakeholder participatory process has been established to identify and delineate priority coastal protected areas in Liberia.</p> <p><i>Indicator 1.1.1.:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Report on distribution and delineation of mangrove forests in Liberia with priority coastal protected areas identified for incorporation into formal protected areas and endorsed by the Government of Liberia</i> <p>Output 1.1.2.: Participatory management plans for two proposed national protected areas developed and on-the-ground management activities initiated</p> <p><i>Indicator 1.1.2.:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Gazettement packages prepared for establishment of two coastal protected areas in Liberia and submitted to Cabinet for endorsement</i> • <i>Multi-stakeholder management forums established for each proposed protected area</i> <p>Output 1.1.3.: Financial plan, including establishment and management costs in short, medium and long terms, for the inclusion of priority</p>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
			<p>mangrove forests into the Protected Areas Network of Liberia, completed.</p> <p><i>Indicator 1.1.3.:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Financial plans prepared for two coastal protected areas in Liberia and endorsed by the Government of Liberia</i> <p>Output 1.1.4.: Advocacy to create awareness and support for the creation of new coastal protected areas within the appropriate government agencies, ministries and legislature completed.</p> <p><i>Indicator 1.1.4.:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Number of key government staff (gender disaggregated) that participated in project workshops and training sessions</i>
<p>1.2 5% of priority mangrove forests is safeguarded through community based Conservation Agreements and other legal mechanisms</p> <p><i>Indicator 1.2.: Area (ha and % of total) of mangrove forest under community conservation or other legal mechanisms</i></p>	<p>No mangrove forests in Liberia are currently under community conservation</p>	<p>5% of priority mangrove forests under community conservation or other legal mechanisms</p>	<p>Output 1.2.1.: A multi-stakeholder and community process is established to identify and protect priority mangrove areas</p> <p><i>Indicator 1.2.1.: Number of workshops and meetings held with local communities to discuss</i></p>
<p>Component 2: Reducing pressures on an additional 15% of priority mangrove areas through integrated land-use planning, improving local community livelihoods and increasing stakeholders' capacity and awareness</p>			
<p>Outcome 2.1.: Priority Mangrove forest land-use planning integrated and mainstreamed in the</p>	<p>No integrated land use practiced in the Liberian coastal zone at present</p>	<p>15% of additional priority mangroves with integrated land use plans and M&E</p>	<p>Output 2.1.1.: Multi-stakeholder integrated land-use planning and decision support <i>toolkit</i> (with key information gathered) for priority mangrove forests and immediate buffer areas in the wider landscape completed and applied to the priority mangrove areas.</p>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
<p>wider landscape and subjected to 5-year M&E program for adaptive management</p> <p><i>Indicator 2.1.:</i></p> <p><i>Area (ha) of priority mangroves covered by the M&E program</i></p>		<p>program</p>	<p><i>Indicator 2.1.1.:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Tool kit is completed</i> • <i>Number of ha where tool kit has been applied successfully</i> <p>Output 2.1.2.: Five-year monitoring and evaluation program for the mangrove forests developed and being implemented by the EPA.</p> <p><i>Indicator 2.1.2.:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>M&E program developed and endorsed by the EPA</i> • <i>Records of monitoring activities and results of assessments undertaken</i> <p>Output 2.1.3.: Plans for demonstration sites developed for sustainable management and restoration by local communities within 4 priority mangrove areas and implemented.</p> <p><i>Indicator 2.1.3.:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Number of plans completed</i> • <i>Reduction in the rate of loss of mangrove forest area at priority sites.</i>
<p>Outcome 2.2.: No further deforestation within the 15% of priority mangroves and surrounding buffer areas through addressing drivers of deforestation and improving people's livelihoods</p> <p><i>Indicator 2.2.: Number of ha deforested within the buffer areas</i></p>	<p>No protection exists for mangrove forests in buffer areas surrounding priority sites at present. Levels of deforestation and mangrove harvesting at many sites is very high at present, especially in the Monserado and Marshall areas.</p>	<p>At least 50 government officials and 1,000 people in 4 local communities receive training on the key threats to and benefits provided by mangrove forests in Liberia</p>	<p>Output 2.2.1.: Conservation agreements signed and being implemented with at least 10 communities providing local economic development (alternative livelihoods) and community involvement in mangrove protected areas management (governance) strengthened in and around key proposed protected areas</p> <p><i>Indicator 2.2.1.:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Number of communities with Conservation Agreements</i> • <i>Note: additional indicators of CA will be developed for each Agreement and will be monitored throughout the life of the project</i>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
<i>surrounding priority sites</i>			
<p>Outcome 2.3.: Capacity and awareness of key government agencies and local communities on mangrove forest conservation and sustainable use substantially improved</p> <p><i>Indicator 2.3.:</i></p> <p><i>Number of government officials and local stakeholders aware of threats and benefits of mangroves</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness of threats and benefits of mangroves amongst government officials in Liberia is currently very poor. • Awareness of threats and benefits of mangroves amongst people in local communities at the four priority sites is variable (moderately high at Lake Piso but poor at the other priority sites). 	<p>At least 50 government officials and 1,000 people in 4 local communities have received training on the key threats to and benefits provided by mangrove forests in Liberia</p>	<p>Output 2.3.1.: Capacity building programs, based on needs assessment, designed and delivered to at least 50 government officials and 1,000 members in 4 local communities</p> <p><i>Indicator 2.3.1.:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Needs Assessment completed and report available</i> • <i>Capacity building program designed</i> • <i>Number of participants by type of stakeholders (gender disaggregated)</i>

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁵

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Stakeholder consultations, safeguard plan development, Prodoc development	91,000	64,684	91,000
Total	91,000	64,684	91,000

⁵ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)