

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	
Acronyms.....	
1. Introduction	
1.1 Context.....	
1.2 Goals	
1.3 Objectives.....	
1.4 Role of GEF/Implementing Agency.....	
2. Summary of the NCSA Process	
2.1 Timeframe.....	
2.2 Methods/Preparation.....	
2.3 Project Teams.....	
2.4 Stakeholders.....	
2.5 Stakeholders' Involvement Methods/Participation.....	
3. Summary of Key Findings/Conclusions NCSA Steps.....	
3.1 Cross-cutting Analysis.....	
3.2 Identified Capacity Needs.....	
3.3 Linkages and Synergies.....	
3.4 Action Plan.....	
4. Implementation Plan.....	
5. Monitoring & Evaluation Strategies.....	
6. Proposed Next Step & Follow-up.....	
7. Bibliography	
Annexes	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Liberia is Party to three RIO Conventions: The Convention on Biological Diversity (UNCBD), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification/Land Degradation (UNCCD). Since the ratification of these conventions, the country has been instituted some measures effectively implement them amidst human, institutional and structural inadequacies.

The thematic reports confirm a series of limitations/constraints responsible for these inadequacies, among them: training gaps in the sector; those who obtained relevant qualifications under these conventions obtained them between ten to twenty-five years ago, and thus are unable to cope with modern scientific methods and techniques; lack of harmonization of sectoral laws and policies and their implementation; inadequate planning skills and resources; incomplete structures at all levels, especially in the Environmental Protection Agency, lack of and/or damaged infrastructures and budgetary constraints. These have created gaps in the implementation of the conventions as well as in the overall management of the environment and natural resources.

The assessment and stocktaking exercises also revealed a total of 69 capacity constraints/issues within the three thematic areas of biodiversity, climate change and land degradation. Of these, 50 are within the Convention on Biological Diversity; 16 within the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, and 3 under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Similarly, the synergistic and crosscutting capacity needs assessment across the three conventions revealed a total of 18 crosscutting issues identified at the two-day retreat and compiled by the consultant in the Synergy Report.

Based on the identified, confirmed, and prioritized capacity constraints/issues and associated capacity development needs at the individual, institutional, and systemic levels, a three-year medium-size project (MSP) proposal for capacity building across the three conventions has been developed. This MSP is intended to help the key environmental institution in the country; the Environmental Protection Agency in the conduct of its mandate, as well as establishing the basis for identifying other capacity needs, not included from the thematic reports, the NBSAP, and ongoing initiatives under the UNCCD and the UNFCCC. It will be submitted as a separate document.

Part One of the document explains the introductory processes, rationale and context; Part Two: A summary of Capacity Constraints; Part Three: Opportunities for synergistic and Cross-cutting Capacity-building across the three conventions; Part Four: Action Plan and Part Five: Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism.

Moreover, apart from the synergistic and cross-cutting capacity needs assessment across the three conventions which revealed a total of 18 cross-cutting constraints/issues that were confirmed and validated by a national workshop on August 22 -23, 2005, actions and strategies were identified both in the thematic reports and in the NBSAP which cut across the three conventions and are being considered for long-term project support. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change has just concluded its National Adaptation Programme of Action, which has documented some Priority Adaptation Options. The UNCCD has just begun implementation of its PDF-A for a medium-sized sustainable land management project.

It is anticipated that the implementation process of the strategy/action plan will be monitored and evaluated within the framework of the NEAP/NRDP. The monitoring and evaluation strategy is designed to ensure that there will be regular reviews, and results fed back into the proposals; thereby providing useful lessons for future capacity building planning and programming exercises.

Considering the above, it is expected that the Government of Liberia will accord this strategy the highest political commitment, and that various stakeholders will consider these initiatives for capacity development in managing the environment and natural resources judiciously.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ABS	Access and Benefit Sharing
BCH	Biosafety Clearing House
BCS	Biodiversity Coordinating Secretariat
BWI	Booker Washington Institute
CARI	Central Agriculture Research Institute
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBOs	Community-Based Organizations
CHM	Clearing House Mechanism
CI	Conservation International
CUC	Cuttington University College
DDCs	District Development Committees
EEC	European Economic Community
EFA	Environmental Foundation for Africa
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FDA	Forestry Development Authority
FFI	Fauna and Floral International
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHs	Green House Gases
GIS	Geographic Information System
GOL	Government of Liberia
ICAM	Integrated Coastal and Marine Area Management
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ISCB	Inter-Sectoral Committee on Biodiversity
ISCD	Inter-Sectoral Committee on Desertification
LEC	Liberia Electricity Corporation
LHS	Liberia Hydrological Surveys
LSRC	Legislative Sub-Committee on Rio Convention
LWSC	Liberia Water and Sewer Corporation
MDFTs	Multi-Disciplinary Facilitation Teams
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MIA	Ministry of Internal Affairs
MLME	Ministry of Lands, Mines & Energy
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture
MOT	Ministry of Transport
MPEA	Ministry of Planning & Economic Affairs
MRD	Ministry of Rural Development
NAP	National Action Programme to Combat Desertification
NAPA	National Adaptation Program of Action
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan

NCCC	National Climate Change Committee
NCCAPs	National Climate Change Action Plan and Strategy
NCSA	National Capacity Self-Assessment
NDTF	National Desertification Trust Fund
NEAP	National Environmental Action Plan
NEPC	National Environmental Policy Committee
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NRDP	National Reconstruction and Development Plan
NSC	National Steering Committee
PA	Protected Areas
PVOs	Private Voluntary Organizations
RIA	Roberts International Airport
SDI	Sustainable Development Initiative
TATs	Thematic Assessment Teams
TSU	Technical Support Unit
UL	University of Liberia
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VDCs	Village Development Committees
W.H.O	World Health Organization

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1. Rationale and Context of the NCSA

Pressures on ecosystems in Liberia are significant and are the result of a host of human, institutional and structural inadequacies. The huge gap in training and other problems across the three thematic conventions include: inadequate public awareness and education, inadequate and damaged institutions including institutional frameworks, inadequate political commitment, inadequate planning skills and resources, as well as incomplete structures at all levels of policy implementation. These shortcomings have made it difficult to implement the NBSAP and to complete many tasks relative to both the UNFCCC and the UNCCD.

These inadequacies are further compounded by high level of illiteracy, ignorance, mass rural-urban migration, population increase, all of which have significant impacts on the harmonious and consolidated implementation of these conventions and the overall management of the environment and natural resources.

The reasons are evident. From the individual consultants reports under the Three Thematic Areas, key constraints and limitations evolve around the management functions of planning, decision-making, supervision, coordination, monitoring and evaluation at national, provincial, and local levels as well as breakdown of key institutions as a result of the civil crisis.

Much attention has been accorded these cross-cutting issues in the key environmental legislations, the institutional arrangements for natural resources management, administrative and management reporting procedures, sustainable development strategic frameworks, and natural resources investment programmes and projects design. Implementation, however, continues to remain a major problem.

In spite of the above, the reports of the stock-taking and inventory exercises provided the background documentation for a broad-based consultation on the priority capacity needs across the Three RIO Conventions around the country; thus providing important input for realistic actions in this Action Plan. The NCSA therefore provides an excellent opportunity for Liberia to develop a targeted and coordinated approach to environmental management through the preparation of workable Action Programs intended to address existing gaps across the three conventions consistent with the environmental and sectoral laws.

1.2 Goal of the NCSA

The primary goal of the NCSA is to determine national priorities for capacity development to better address global environmental issues. It is primarily concerned with a country's capacity – the abilities of individuals, groups, organizations and institutions to address the priority environmental issues as part of efforts to achieve sustainable development.

1.3 Objectives:

The main objectives for preparing an NCSA Action Plan are to:

- Provide a concise, well-researched summary of capacity development goals and objectives, strategies and priority actions that will lead to measurable improvements in the management of global and national environmental issues;
- Ensure follow-up to the NCSA, by specifying implementation frameworks and strategies for the action plan, including monitoring and evaluation; and,
- Mobilize support for environmental capacity development from domestic and international sources.

1.4 Role of the GEF/Implementing Agency

To carry out the above goals and objectives the GEF has assisted countries in Capacity Development. It supports capacity building actions needed to enhance the ability of individuals, institutions, and systems to make and implement decisions, and to perform functions in an efficient, effective, and sustainable manner.

At individual level, capacity building supports access to knowledge and the development of skills to impact behavior and change in attitudes; making people learn by demonstration, participation, ownership and processes associated with increase in performance through changes in management, motivation, morale, and levels of accountability and responsibility.

At the institutional level, capacity support focuses on the overall performance and functioning capabilities as well as the ability of the organization to adapt to change.

The systemic level support takes into consideration the creation of “enabling environment” in the overall policy, and regulatory frameworks within which

institutions and individuals operate.

In the case of the Liberian NCSA Process, the United Nations Environment Program I(UNEP) Is the Implementing Agency, with logistical support from the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) . UNEP manages the funds and ensures compliance with GEF procedures. It is assisted in this task by the Environmental Protection Agency, which executes the project and monitors the day-to-day activities conducted by the project team.

2.0 SUMMARY OF THE NCSA

2.1 Timeframe

The timeframe for the implementation of the National Capacity Self-Assessment Project was one year. Due to the civil crisis, it has lasted more than two years.

2.2 Methodology/Preparation Process

Liberia acceded to, and/or ratified the three RIO Conventions between 1998 and 2002. Project Secretariat was immediately established after each accession or ratification to lead the process of preparation and the eventual implementation of various strategies and actions developed under each project both at national and local levels.

Thematic Assessment Teams were constituted from various sectoral institutions to conduct the actual assessment of capacity needs. The teams were headed by a national consultant and comprised resource persons. Results from the assessments were compiled into a report, which was presented at national and regional workshops around the country. These workshops were helpful in reviewing and validating the reports by incorporating grass-root views and concerns.

Based on the validated reports on capacity assessment within the thematic areas of the three Rio Conventions, a national consultant was recruited to carry out the second stage of the NCSA process of conducting capacity assessment/synergies across the conventions in consultation with the Focal Points. The draft report of this assessment was finalized into "Assessment of Synergies" with the incorporation of comments from workshops and a combined group of conventional experts review. The information compiled in the Synergy Report is now being formulated into Actions for support and implementation.

The process of formulating the National Capacity Assessment Teams began on 8th May 2004. At the national level, the process was guided by the first meeting held to formulate the Coordinating Committee. A consultative mechanism was then devised to guide regional and local consultations.

2.3 Project Teams

A total of three consultants, one under each of the RIO Conventions, and four Resource Persons under each thematic area were recruited. These were charged with the responsibility to collect and process the data from sectoral and relevant institutions. A list of the teams can be found in the annex to this report.

2.4 Stakeholders:

Stakeholders were drawn from a number of government ministries and agencies, private and academic institutions, non-governmental organizations, and civil society groups. At the National Level Consultation and Priority-Setting Workshop, a total of 100 persons participated; while 50 persons were invited to each regional meeting. More than 60 participants, however, attended the meetings. A comprehensive list and contact addresses of institutions represented at each level of the process is found in the annex of this report.

2.5 Stakeholders' Involvement/Participation Process

The NCSA was conducted within the framework of the established national consultative process that included participation at sectoral, regional and national levels.

Sectoral Level

Consultation at the sectoral level was limited to core stakeholders involved with the implementation of various projects relevant to the RIO Conventions. The focal point of each convention spearheaded the thematic assessment drive in collaboration with the national consultants and resource persons. The draft reports of these participatory stocktaking exercises provided the background information for broader consultations at county and district levels.

Regional Level

Four Regional Workshops were held across the country during the process. The First Regional Workshop was held from the 8-9 November 2004 in Tubmanburg, Bomi County. Four counties (Montserrado, Grand Cape Mount, Gbarpolu and Bomi) were represented, with 60 participants from various environmental related institutions (Forestry, Agriculture, Education, Local Government, and Civil Society), NGOs, UNEP Post Conflict Assessment Unit, UNMIL, and NCSA Project Secretariat.

The Second Regional Workshop was held from 11-13 November 2004 in Buchanan, Grand Bassa County. 60 Participants from Grand Bassa, Rivercess and Margibi Counties attended the workshop.

The Third Regional Workshop was held in Zwedru, Grand Gedeh County from November 23-25, 2004. Sixty (60) participants from Grand Gedeh, River Gee, and Maryland attended the workshop. Due to bad road condition, many participants did not come from Grand Kru and Sinoe Counties.

The Fourth and final Regional Workshop was held in Gbarnga, Bong County from December 8-10, 2004. Sixty (60) participants representing Lofa, Bong and Nimba Counties were in attendance.

National Level

The NCSA Process began in May 2004 with the appointment of a project coordinator and administrative staff. This was followed by the commissioning of thematic teams and the establishment of a national coordinating committee in June 2004. The project, which was officially launched on July 1, 2004, brought together representatives of various interest groups, stakeholder, institutions and organizations. The consultants and resource teams began their work by developing questionnaires to engage stakeholders and to conduct interviews. Data obtained were compiled in preparation for the first national workshop.

The first national workshop was held October 19-20, 2004. The workshop reviewed thematic reports and Liberia's obligation under the RIO Conventions in order to identify crosscutting capacity issues/constraints, and build consensus on priority needs across the thematic areas.

PLENARY: The plenary was devoted to presentation of the various documents and background to the NCSA process, which highlighted the four specific objectives, and the seven basic steps of the process. Participants were also drilled through the Issues Prioritization Matrix to illustrate the ranking process using three sets of criteria, namely: - Scale of the problem, Level of Concern, and Ability to Adequately Address the Problem. This was followed by a demonstration of a Final Priority Ranking.

Participants were then taken through the next stages of the exercise dealing with the categorization of the capacity constraints for each issue into the three capacity building levels of individual, institutional and systemic. For this exercise, the use of the Capacity Constraints Matrix was demonstrated. Participants were further divided into three thematic working groups (Biodiversity, Climate Change and Land Degradation) and reviewed their respective reports within the framework demonstrated to them.

The background presentation included an overview of the steps taken during the consultations leading to the elaboration of the three conventional strategies and action plans. The presentations were made by the national consultants, who worked with the Thematic Assessment Teams and Focal Points.

3. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS FROM EACH NCSA STEP

The summary of the capacity issues/constraints raised by the thematic assessments revealed that 69 of the 101 capacity issues had been categorized as cross-cutting, 50 of which are within the CBD, 3 within the UNFCCC, and 16 within the UNCCD. A closer scrutiny of the thematic assessments especially revealed that few of the thematic issues are cross-cutting in character among the various conventions such as those relating to damaged infrastructures, research bodies and programs, law enforcement, planning, assessment and technology transfer.

The following depicts constraints specific to the three RIO Conventions at the individual, institutional and systemic levels:

3.1 Capacity Constraints in Biodiversity

The stocktaking, inventory and thematic workshops revealed that most institutions responsible for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use lack the necessary capacity to effectively carry out their work. They lack adequate trained personnel, financial resources, technology, equipments, and facilities. There's urgent need to build and strengthen institutional capacity, especially those that were damaged by the war; to conduct training of personnel, develop capacity in planning and negotiation skills; enhance the capacity to access information and to identify and seize other opportunities. In addition, the below constraints were also identified:

3.1.1 Capacity Constraints at the Individual Level

A series of capacity issues and training needs were identified in the stocktaking exercise. These capacity constraints at the individual level include:

- Low and inadequate levels of education and training; especially, in analytical, scientific research, and technical skills, and personnel.
- Unclear job requirements and misplacement of available human resources;
- Inadequate level of delegation of responsibility resulting to under-utilization of available skills and expertise which impacts negatively on production;
- Poor staff incentive structure resulting in low level of team spirit and productivity, as well as inadequate networking;

- Low level of enforcement of performance standards and merit system resulting to poor staff performance.

3.1.2 Capacity Constraints at Institutional Level

Almost all institutions responsible for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use lack the necessary capacity to effectively carry out their work. These inadequacies include: lack of expertise in core disciplines, inadequate financial resources, equipment and necessary supplies. The key capacity constraints can be itemized as:

- Damaged infrastructures previously used for training, scientific research, and assessment of biodiversity;
- Inadequate infrastructure and the requisite equipment and supplies to adequately address pressing biodiversity problems;
- Inadequate staffing level and poor organizational structure resulting in low institutional productive capacity;
- Inadequate financial resources resulting in inadequate maintenance, operation, and efficient use of equipment/facility;
- Lack of clearly articulated strategic plan with concise focus on specific biodiversity issues.

The foregoing problems have constrained the capacities of institutions to fulfill the important institutional functions of:

- Biodiversity assessment and monitoring in the different ecosystems;
- Conduct of taxonomic inventory;
- Risk assessment and management of biotechnology;
- Development of regulatory systems and enhancement of negotiation skills for ABS; and
- Access to information for effective biodiversity conservation.

3.1.3 Capacity Constraints at System Level

The key capacity constraints of systemic nature in the management and sustainable use of biodiversity in Liberia are inadequate policies and legal frameworks, low level of involvement of civil society in biodiversity management and, inappropriate and inadequate natural resources management systems.

Recent policy and legal reforms leading to the enactment of the Environmental Protection and Management Law have greatly remedied the gap in the legal framework relative to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. However, given that biodiversity conservation is synonymous with natural resources management, the existence of inappropriate natural resources management legislation has important implication on the former.

consultations involving local communities and other important stakeholders (NGOs and CBOs) at the various levels have resulted in raising the awareness of Liberians on issues of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. Notwithstanding the apparent achievements in this area, there is need to reinforce and consolidate awareness creation activities at all levels of the Liberian society to bring about the much needed attitudinal change.

3.2 Capacity Constraints in Climate Change

A number of capacity constraints critical to effective climate change management were identified in the stocktaking exercise. These constraints are individually detailed below at individual, institutional and system levels.

3.2.1 Capacity constraints at Individual Level

- Inadequate trained human resources to effectively manage the climate change sector;
- Lack of awareness on mitigation and adaptation options, as well as other relevant issues on climate change;
- Absence of training opportunities in the core disciplines of climate change;
- Lack of research programs on climate change issues;
- Lack of education and training programmes on climate change;
- Lack of specialized skills or expertise in scientific and technical institutions concerned with climate change issues;

3.2.2 Capacity Constraints at Institutional Level

- The lack of a comprehensive climate change action plan and integrated implementation strategy that takes into account the capacity building needs of the various institutions participating in climate change activities, particularly in research and training;
- Lack of efficient climate change monitoring;
- Need to Rehabilitate climate change institutions with needed scientific technology to implement UNFCCC in Liberia.

3.2.3 Capacity Constraints at the System Level

- Lack of explicit policy and regulatory measures that adequately take into account climate change issues as sustainable development priorities;
- Inadequate national programmes aimed at reducing pressure on resources and enhance adaptive capacity;
- Lack of adequate public awareness and education mechanism to provide opportunities for meaningful public participation;
- Lack of financial resources to provide critical equipment required to facilitate data collection.

- Lack of skilled human resources as well as the necessary infrastructure for effective climate change management.

3.3 Capacity Constraints in Desertification/Land Degradation

A critical review of the capacity issues identified in the thematic assessment exercise revealed the following constraints under the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification/Land Degradation. These constraints are defined at the three capacity building levels as follows:

3.3.1 Capacity Constraints at Individual Level

The key individual level capacity constraints for combating desertification/land degradation are identical to those in biodiversity management and sustainable use. They include:

- Inadequate trained human resources in core disciplines relative to land development;
- Lack of alternative sources of livelihood for rural dwellers to support conservation initiatives;
- Inadequate/inappropriate farming practices or technologies;
- Poor forest/land management practices;
- Inadequate public awareness and education;
- Over-exploitation and/or poor harvesting of biological resources;

3.3.2 Capacity Constraints at Institutional Level

All the institutions, especially at national and local levels, identified for involvement in the implementation of the UNCCD, lack adequate human resources, appropriate scientific and technical skills, and financial resources to implement the strategies of the NAP and the general requirement of the convention. These capacity constraints as in the case of the CBD can be specified as follows:

- Lack of institutional capacities for combating land degradation;
- Inadequate assessment and monitoring initiatives;
- Lack of data on biological and other natural resources;
- Inadequate financial resources to operate and maintain existing infrastructure/equipment in a functional state and effectively carry out important management functions such as regular programme planning, monitoring and evaluation;
- Lack of effective mechanism for information processing and sharing;
- Poor knowledge of indigenous/traditional conservation techniques/practices;
- Inadequate staff to management existing protected areas;

- Inadequate staffing level and poor organizational structure resulting in low outreach programmes for essential knowledge and technology transfer; and
- Poor incentive structure resulting in low staff morale and motivation;
- Inadequate opportunities for networking;

3.3.3 Capacity Constraints at Systemic Level

The capacity constraints at systemic level in combating desertification/land degradation are essentially similar to those related to the management and sustainable use of biodiversity. These constraints are mainly associated with inadequate policy and legal framework, bad governance, poorly structured economic framework, low and inadequate critical mass; and, ineffective national processes and relationships in sustainable development.

4.0 CROSS-CUTTING ANALYSIS

A series of cross-cutting activities were identified at each stage of the NCSA Process. Following a further careful analysis of these cross-sectoral issues, the below nineteen were selected as those with high and persistent impacts that cut across the three conventions.

- Damaged and looted infrastructures previously used for training in various conventional disciplines;
- Inadequate education, public awareness and sensitization;
- Limited skills in inventory, assessment, and monitoring;
- Low level of community and private sector involvement in resource management;
- Lack of access to information for planning purposes;
- Poor database for planning and monitoring;
- Limited skills in taxonomy;
- Poor enforcement of legislations;
- Lack of, or inadequate technology transfer;
- Lack of integrated land use planning;
- Lack of, or inadequate environmental information systems;
- Low levels of understanding of the ecosystems approach to resource management;
- Lack of negotiation skills;
- Lack of conflict resolution techniques;
- Poor coordination, and lack of harmonization of sectoral laws/policies;
- Lack of incentives and policy reforms;
- Lack of, or inadequate research and training programs;
- Inadequate financial mechanisms;
- Low partnerships; and
- Poor networking.

4.1 IDENTIFIED CAPACITY NEEDS

The University of Liberia Forest and Arboretum

In the early 1960s the college of Agriculture and Forestry of the University of Liberia established a 1000-acre land area in Fendell, outside Monrovia a research and demonstration forest of valuable indigenous and exotic tree species as well as a training facility for students of the college. The entire plantation was harvested and used for charcoal and firewood during the civil war.

Gene Banks

In Liberia the Central Agriculture Research Institute (CARI) and the Small Holder Rice Seed Project (SHRSP) have been engaged over many years in managing germplasm collections of cereal crops, mainly rice (lowland and upland cultivations) and corn, grains, legume crops, root crops (cassava, eddoes, sweet potatoes) and clones and all types of citrus. These germplasms were evaluated on an ongoing basis and distributed to local farmers to multiply in their respective habitats and returned a certain quantity back to the project to ensure continuity and further screening. Rural farmers were also trained and encouraged over the years to established and manage village seed banks of mainly rice varieties. The two institutions were also destroyed.

Aquaculture

Aqua-cultural technology was initiated in Liberia in the early 1950s at the Central Agricultural Research Institute (CARI) through assistance provided by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). Later, through the World Bank, an international donor supported projects such as the Bong County Development Project (BCADP), the Lofa County Development Project (LCADP) and the Grand Gedeh County Integrated Rural Development Project of Nimba and Grand Gedeh Counties also established aquaculture components. In addition, to these facilities, a hatchery was set up at Klay, Bomi County for the production and distribution of fingerlings of Talapia and Claria species.

Farmers, NGOs and extension personnel were trained and retrained by the projects in aquaculture technology for many years until 1990 when all activities came to a halt as a result of the civil war. Presently, aquaculture technicians are in short supply. Most facilities have been destroyed and need rehabilitation.

Land Management Issues

At present there is very little, if any, capacity in terms of qualified manpower as well as the requisite infrastructure to adequately address issues relative to the implementation of the Convention to Combat Desertification in Liberia. The major constraint of the Liberian Hydrological Service has been the destruction of its laboratories, the removal of all of its current flow gauges and rain gauges and the absence of requisite personnel who fled the country as a result of the war.

The Liberia Domestic Airport Authority, the Division of Meteorology at the Roberts International Airport and the Firestone Plantations Company gather weather information that is utilized by the relevant agencies. The major constraints transcending all of the above institutions have been the prolonged civil war that resulted to the total destruction and collapse of all relevant infrastructures, the brain drain as a result of flight (from war) of trained personnel from those institutions and Government's dismal financial position to reinstitute viable programs to correct the situation.

The longevity of the war has deprived most of these personnel of the modern state-of-the-art techniques and information on land management issues. The need for the training/retraining of requisite personnel in land management administration with up-to-date technology is a prerequisite to an effective and systematic environmental management program.

Coming out of the above, five dimensions of capacity constraints have been identified as the major areas of capacity support to Liberia. They are:

I. Infrastructure, Organization/Management

As stated in the thematic reports and cross-cutting analysis of issues under the various conventions, most infrastructures in place prior to the civil conflict were destroyed, looted or damaged. These include the Forestry Training Institute in Tubmanburg, the Central Agriculture Research Institute in Suacoco; the herbarium at the University of Liberia in Fendell, the Maritime Training Institute in Marshall, and the Road Maintenance & Development Institute in Grand Bassa. The rehabilitation and strengthening of these centers will greatly improve the capacity of sectoral institutions in the implementation of the conventions.

Moreover, strengthening of the organizational and management structures of these institutions will ensure effective performance and the utilization and retention of skilled people. In other words, capacity development must improve the organizational structures, processes and management systems, in particular, the personnel management systems, which make the best use of skilled human resources, and which ensure their retention and continued motivation.

ii. Training and education:

Inadequate trained human resources in core disciplines cut across the thematic areas. It is important to note that the various institutions mentioned above were instrumental in training corps of officers in the various sectors to develop requisite skills and capacities in various disciplines, thereby providing continuity in management. With these infrastructures damaged, there are serious gaps in both training and effective performance of any functions and roles with regard to specific activities. Training in the short, medium and long term, as well as in-service training for long term personnel to bring them on par with modern technology and scientific programs relative to environmental and natural resources management will enhance the implementation of the conventions.

Furthermore, support to the newly established College of Environmental Science Programme at the University of Liberia and the revision of the curricula to include relevant courses which address gaps under the various conventions will immensely strengthen the implementation of the conventional programs.

iii. Policy Network and Linkages among organizations:

The harmonization of sectoral laws and policies is crucial to the implementation of the conventions. The development of regulations, standards, and guidelines would be crucial to effective monitoring and evaluation of public programs and activities under the various conventions. It will also be in line with the National Environmental Policy of Liberia, which embraces cross-dimensional initiatives in environmental management and sustainable development programs.

Furthermore, some of these institutions had linkage with the other local and international institutions such as the West African Rice Development Association (WARDA), where research and training were conducted, as well as the implementation of other relevant programs. After collapse of the Tubman Zoo in Totota, the Steiner Zoo was established in Lapkazee in Monrovia. That facility was also vandalized, and thus no longer functional.

iv. Technology Transfer and Equipment

Implementation of the RIO Conventions can be successful where modern state of the art technologies and the requisite equipments are available for biodiversity assessment and monitoring as well as climate change data collection and processing. Critical to these are the establishment of a multipurpose laboratory at the Environmental Protection Agency, a gene bank at the Central Agriculture Research Institute and meteorological monitoring equipments for climate change programs.

v. Sustainability of Institutions/Resources

The thematic assessment reports highlight limited skills in assessment, inventory and monitoring; low level of understanding of ecosystem approach in resource management; lack of negotiation skills; the lack of techniques for conflict resolution; low level of enforcement of performance standards and merit system resulting to poor staff performance as impediments to the sustainable management of the environment and natural resources of the country.

As a consequence of the above, control of institutional resources becomes difficult and problematic due to lack of as mechanism to ensure the retention of trained personnel. Building capacity in the above areas will help ensure sustainable management in the overall performance of the conventions.

4.2 Linkages and Synergies

Issues	Institution	Activities	Linkages
Infrastructure Rehabilitation/Strengthening	1. Forestry Training Institute	Provide training and efficient monitoring & management of forest /land resources	Forest biodiversity conservation, adaptive measures for mitigation of climate change, and land management
	2. CARI	Adaptive agricultural research geared towards sustainable agricultural efficiency	Conservation of agricultural biodiversity, soil conservation and adaptive measures to mitigate and monitor climate change
	3. University of Liberia	Trains all categories of personnel under the various conventions	
	4. Maritime Training Institute		
	5. Road Maintenance training Center		
Training and education	University of Liberia, Forestry Training Institute, Maritime Training Institute,	Provide training in the core disciplines at medium and long term levels; negotiation skills and conflict resolution techniques	Address training needs across the thematic areas for effective implementation of the RIO Conventions
Policy Network & Linkages among Organizations	Sectoral Institutions	Revision of existing environmental law to address climate change and land degradation issues; harmonization of sectoral laws with the EPA Legislations	Environmental legislations that address all RIO Convention issues and provide an effective mechanism for monitoring and evaluation
Technology Transfer and Equipment	Sectoral Institutions	Revitalization of research programs, the laboratory, and meteorological stations	Collection and analysis of relevant data relating to the RIO Conventions Re-establish network and collaborative ventures with research institutions

4.3 Action Plan

Project Title: Strengthening Secretal Institutions in Environmental Management

Duration: 2007 - 2009 Three (3) years

Start Date: 2007

Lead Agency: Environmental Protection Agency

Collaborating Agencies: Ministry of Lands, Mines & Energy; Ministry of Agriculture; Ministry of Transport; Ministry of Health & Social Welfare; Forestry Development Authority; Bureau of Maritime Affairs; Liberia Water & Sewer Corporation and Liberia Electricity Corporation

Goal and Objectives

The overall goal of the project is to enhance national ability to manage the environment on a sustainable basis. Its primary objectives are to:

- Contribute to the effective implementation of the three (3) Rio Conventions;
- Build/develop the requisite human resources capacity in all relevant fields and sectors for the effective implementation and monitoring of the conventions;
- Rehabilitate damaged institutions; strengthen and/or create national institutional capacities to facilitate the effective implementation and monitoring of the conventions;
- Review/revise appropriate portions of legal and regulatory legislation on the environment in order to include issues of the RIO Conventions.

Implementation Approach/Activities

The project will help to enhance the institutional capacity of key government institutions and NGOs by rehabilitating their facilities and providing them with the basic resource requirements. These resource requirements will include research equipment, computer and IT equipment, office supplies, and other key resources.

A series of short-term training courses will be organized within the country for different target groups. The key areas in which specialized training will be provided include, among others: biodiversity assessment and monitoring, integrated resource planning, ecosystem approach to resource management, negotiation skills, conflict resolution, evaluation methods, policy development and analysis, and design of incentive measures including other disciplines which will be identified under the

RIO Conventions. A few long-term training programs would be pursued. Scholarships will be provided to train a few specialists abroad in selected areas such as taxonomy and environmental economics.

The project will also support selective policy, legal and regulatory reforms. Such reforms would include the review of the mandates of technical agencies concerned with a view to make them responsive to the RIO Conventions.

Project Components

In line with the specific objectives of the project and the adverse nature of the underlying cross-cutting capacity constraints and their associated capacity building needs, the project will have the following components:

Rehabilitation of infrastructures and provision of equipment to strengthen key institutions;

Training: - long and short-term training, seminars, workshops, refresher courses and networking;

Conduct reviews, studies and investigations into the performance of existing overall policy framework and processes;

Appropriately equip the technical, educational, and research institutions and agencies; including public and private organizations, NGOs and CBOs involved in the implementation of the conventions at all levels of the development process.

PROPOSED OUTPUTS AND ACTIVITIES

Outputs	List of Proposed Activities	Responsibility
1.0 Sectoral Institutions Capacity Development		
1.1 Rehabilitation and strengthening of damaged infrastructures	1.1.1 Assessment of damaged infrastructures; 1.1.2 Provision of equipment to relevant institutions	EPA, MLME, MOA, FDA, BMA EPA, Donor
1.2 Human Resources Development	1.2.1 Assessment of training needs; 1.2.2 Organizing training workshops, refresher courses, and short term training; 1.2.3 organizing seminars and conferences; 1.2.3 Sourcing funding for international training/fellowship	EPA, MLME, MOA, FDA, BMA EPA, Donor
1.3 Legal/policy review, study and revision	1.3.1 Consultancy to review legal instruments; 1.3.2 Revision and adoption of laws; 1.3.3 Printing, distribution and enforcement	EPA, Donor STAKEHOLDERS
1.4 Technology Transfer/Equipment	1.4.1 Consultancy to train researchers; 1.4.2 Revitalization of research programs, including laboratory facilities; 1.4.3 Rehabilitate arboretum, herbarium, gene bank, and aquaculture programs ; 1.4.4 Networking	EPA, MLME, MOA, FDA, BMA EPA, Donor

5. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

5.1 Operational Mechanism for Monitoring and Evaluation

The monitoring and evaluation of this national capacity building strategy/action plan, by its very scope and nature, will be the responsibility of the established national environmental monitoring and observation mechanisms of the government. They include: government agencies, NGOs, private sector and the decentralized local community structures. It will be monitored within the framework of the NEAP/NRDP. The indicative budgets and the proposed schedules of implementation developed for the project proposal will constitute the framework for monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the strategy /action plan.

4.2 Monitoring Progress

The strategy/action plan specific implementation process will be monitored through a three-step assessment of the execution of the budgets against the schedules of implementation. These steps include:

- Measuring the progress of implementation of the budgets against the proposed time schedules;
- Analysis of any variance in budget execution against the planned time schedules, both in terms of actual expenditures versus the budgeted amounts, and times of making the expenditures versus the planned schedules; and
- Determination of any remedial actions where necessary.

4.3 Evaluation of the Impact

Evaluation of the implementation of the strategy/action plan will basically aim at ascertaining the degree of success to which the specific objectives of the strategy/action plan are being realized. The realization of the specific objectives should translate into achievement of the primary objectives, which in turn are expected to contribute to the overall goal of the strategy/action plan. The outcome of the evaluation process should establish the need, or otherwise, for any further corrective action in the design of the strategy/action plan.

4.4 Mechanism for Consultations of the Monitoring and Evaluation Reports

The production of quarterly reports will be instituted as an essential parallel activity to the strategy/action plan implementation. The EPA, thematic Working Groups, and the field teams, will constitute the mechanisms for consultation on the Monitoring and Evaluation results of the strategy/action plan at national and regional levels.

The monitoring and evaluation strategy of the strategy/action plan is based on the assumption that regular reviews will be conducted to ensure broad-based timely decisions on the intermittent results, which presupposes the production of regular reports on a quarterly basis. The data collected for these regular reviews will be the basis for policy decisions on the strategy /action plan.

4.5 Feedback on Monitoring and Evaluation to Programme Management

The regular reviews are designed to provide essential monitoring and evaluation information to the programme management, policy decision-makers and the general public at large. Thus, it is essential that data provided through routine data collection are accurate, and more importantly, reflective of the realities. Thus, the overall monitoring and evaluation strategy is to provide on-going feedback to the strategy/action plan management, concerned agencies, and policy and decision-makers regarding the effectiveness of implemented activities so that improvements can be made and future capacity building planning and programming exercises incorporate lessons learnt from these experiences.

5. PROPOSED NEXT STEPS AND FOLLOW-UP

5.1 Next Steps Needed to Implement the Proposed Strategies

The proposed project proposal may require fine-tuning by way of revising the indicative budgets, and/or developing implementation schedules/modalities in accordance with prospective donor requirements. Consequently, the proposed following ten (10) steps are primarily focused on the task of resource mobilization for implementation, and are described below:

- **Validation of the Action Plan:** EPA, with the technical and financial assistance of GEF, subjected this NCSA document to a national validation workshop of the same composition as the workshops on the thematic assessment reports;
- **Revision of the Indicative Budgets:** Based on the comments of the validation workshop, the EPA has revised the document appropriately;
- **Adoption of the Action plan:** EPA ensures official adoption of the document as a national strategy/action plan through executive (ministerial) and Board approval;
- **Integration of the action plan in the NEAP/NRDP:** Following the approval processes, EPA submits the cross-cutting project proposals for incorporation in the NEAP/NRDP as strategy elements of the Rio Conventions to implement the NEAP/NRDP programmatic component;
- **Funding Arrangements of the Action Plan:** The Government of Liberia (GOL) formally approaches GEF to consider participating in a tripartite funding arrangement for the project proposals. Such a tripartite funding arrangement may be in the ratio of: 0.15; 0.50, and 0.35 of the total proposals (GOL/GEF) and other external donors sources, respectively.
- **GOL Contribution towards the Project Proposals:** The GOL appropriately allocates its fifteen percent contribution for funding in its annual budgetary allocation;
- **GEF Contribution towards the Project Proposals:** GEF to also appropriately provide its fifty percent contribution according to its established rules of disbursement and conditions;
- **Other External Donor Sources:** GEF, through its partnership relations with UNDP, to assist the GOL to organize a special donor consultation to raise the other thirty-five percent of the total cost of the proposal;
- **Revision of the proposals as may be required by Funding Parties:** EPA with the technical and financial assistance of GEF and other external donor sources, revises the project proposals as may be required by other funding partners;

- **Implementation Schedules/Modalities:** GOL to put in place implementation modalities and schedules acceptable to the rest of the tripartite funding groups, and commence implementation in earnest.

Given that the successful implementation of the proposed project proposals will result in strengthening the overall capacities for both national and global environmental management, the quest for funds may prove to be difficult one, but not impossible.

5.2 The Required Follow-Up Action

The required follow-up actions clearly derived from, and are summed up in the proposed “ten (10) steps”, and have both national and international dimensions. These essentially are:

- GEF to follow-up with the GOL to draw-up definite timetable to take the “ten (10) steps” and assist it by implementing its own ascribed components on a timely basis; and
- EPA to follow-up with GOL to draw up the time-lines and take the necessary decisions timely in the implementation of the “ten next steps”.

These are the most important follow-up actions necessary for the successful implementation of the conventions.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. GEF/UNDP (200): Capacity Development Initiative: Country Capacity, Development Needs and Priorities Regional Report for Africa.
2. National Biodiversity Strategy & Action Plan.
3. UNEP (2004): Desk Study on the Environment in Liberia.
4. UNDP (2003): Human Development Report.
5. Global Environment Facility (2002): A Guide for Self-Assessment of Country Capacity Needs for Global Environmental Management, Washington D.C., USA.
6. Liberia (2004): Millennium Development Goals.
7. Fayia, Alfred Kpandel (2004): Stocktaking Reports in the Area of the Desertification /Land Degradation, NCSA, Liberia.
8. Kiadii, Patrick (2004): Stocktaking Report in the Area of the CBD, NCSA, Liberia.
9. Kpardeh, Anthony D. (2004): Stocktaking Report in the Area of the UNFCCC, NCSA, Liberia.
10. Davies, Jonathan W. (2005): Synergy Report on the Three Thematic Areas: CBD, UNFCCC & UNCCD.
11. SBA, WHO & GOL: Health Situation Analysis Study
12. Republic of the Gambia (2004): National Capacity Self-Assessment Strategy/Action Plan for Capacity Building in Protecting the Global Environment.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1.2 CONTACT AND DETAILS OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE NCSA PROCESS

Thematic Assessment Team

Members of the CBD Assessment Team

Focal Point/Team Leader - Ben Turtur Donnie
Patrick Kiadii - Environmental Protection Agency
James T. Kpadehyea - LIFE
Boima Bafaie - LIFE
Ella Y. Johnson - Civil Society
Rebecca Doo - EPA

Members of the UNFCCC Assessment Team

Focal Point/Team Leader - Benjamin Karmorh
Anthony D. Kpardeh - Ministry of Lands, Mines & Energy
Eunice Dagbe - Environmental Protection Agency
Varney Corneh - EPA/FFI
David Kingsley - Ministry of Planning & Economic Affairs
Fabien Kieh - Civil Society
Roland Dahn - Lawyer

Members of the UNCCD Assessment Team

Focal Point/Team Leader - Jerome Nyenka
Alfred K. Fayia - Ministry of Lands, Mines & Energy
Deddeh A. Mulbah - Civil Society
McAlbert Donnie - LIFE
Darius Toe - Ministry of Education

Annex 1.2.2

NCSA First National Meeting

19-20 October 2005

YMCA, Broad Street

Monrovia, Liberia

<u>Name</u>	<u>Ministry/Institution</u>
1. Jonathan Davies	Environmental Protection Agency
2. Ben T. Donnie	Environmental Protection Agency
3. Joan M. Gbakoyah	Pollution Control Association of Liberia
4. Nathaniel Ketteh	Ministry of Agriculture
5. Flomo P. Molubah	Society for the Conservation of Nature of Liberia
6. Joseph M. Ballah	University of Liberia
7. Paul Hance	A.M.E Zion University
8. James Makor	Save My Future Foundation
9. J. Jaffa Gbafor	Liberia Environmental NGOs
10. Joan Taylor	Environmental Protection Agency
11. Rodney P. Kuow	Environmental Protection Agency
12. Tommy Teah	ERADRO
13. Matthew J. Boe,II	Monrovia Breweries
14. Basil G. Vani	Firestone Plantations Company
15. Eben Moses	Center for Environmental Education & Protection
16. Mawolo Kpawor	Society Against Environmental Degradation
17. Kebbeh W. Baysah	CAFSA/University of Liberia
18. Victor N'gorbu	CAFSA/University of Liberia
19. Varney Conneh	Environmental Protection Agency
20. Henry Larway	Environ-Link
21. C. Morlee Mendscole	CAFSA/University of Liberia
22. Joseph G. Raye	Environmental Protection Agency
23. John Conteh	Environmental Protection Agency
24. James Z. Aquoi	Liberia Community Development Foundation
25. Matthew F. Konai	Liberia Electricity Corporation
26. Roger W. Luke	Environmental Protection Agency
27. Peter W. Simujla	Don Bosco Polytechnic
28. David Wiles	Environmental Protection Agency
29. J.S.D Cammue	Environmental Protection Agency
30. Peter N. Korvah	Ministry of Agriculture
31. Tarpeh Chea	Liberia Marketing Association
32. Actebeouson Nyema	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
33. Harrison Sleweon	National Transitional Legislative Assembly
34. Amanda Padmoore	Federation of Trade Union of Liberia
35. Gibson Yangain	Liberia Indigenous Forum for the Environment
36. Jeremiah Sarnor	Royal Communication Network
37. David Y. Kenkpen	Cuttington University College
38. James Gayflor	A.M.E. University
39. Raphael Uray	Grand Gedeh Community Services Association

40. Peter Kieh	Labour Union
41. Ernest Paye	Liberia Petroleum Refining Company
42. Winston Kaine	Ministry of Health and Social Welfare
43. Julia Ciapha	Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy
44. George McGee	Ministry of Rural Development
45. Sumo Kellen	Sustainable Development Promoters
46. Alexander Kingston	Society of Liberian Foresters
47. Richanrd Kollie	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
48. Matthew Kolleh	Ministry of Internal Affairs
49. Thomas King	Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs
50. Horace Sackie	Ministry of State for Presidential Affairs
51. Lesley Smith	Ministry of Finance
52. Christian Freeman	CEMENCO
53. Joseph Fahn	Ministry of Education
54. Steve Jubwe	University of Liberia
55. Dismas Cupson	Sustainable Agriculture Promoters
56. Arthur Tucker	Food and Agriculture Organization
57. James Kollie	University of Liberia
58. Johansen Voker	Environmental Protection Agency
59. Prince Dunbar	Radio Veritas
60. Raymond Kreleh	Tribute Newspaper
61. Dargbeh Toby	Ducor Broadcasting Station
62. J. Caesar Padmoore	Tidings Newspaper
63. George Chenpoyee	New National Newspaper
64. Menslega Karnga	Analyst Newspaper
65. Baltimore Verdier	Radio LIJ
66. Maxwell Johnson	Liberia Broadcasting Station
67. Peneca Sakor	Poll Watch Newspaper
68. J. Grody Dorbor	The Inquirer Newspaper

Caterers

1. Arina T. Browne
2. Gitty Saydee
3. Helena Garty
4. Tayennoh Quaye
5. Oretha Zangai
6. Hannah Benson
7. Etta Benson
8. Sarah Baryogar
9. Precious Willie
10. Ursina Saye
11. Mamie Browne
12. Majorette Gibson
13. Nyamah Weaver
14. Julia Cole
15. Hawa Johnson

16. Mary Boima

NCSA Regional Workshop

Regions 1, 2 & 3

8 November-12 December 2005

<u>Name</u>	<u>County</u>
1. Gbellay Karnley	Bomi County
2. D. B. Juwillie	Bomi County
3. Teresa Zinnah	Bomi County
4. William S. Johnson	Cape Mount County
5. William Mentee	Cape Mount County
6. Chaety Kyne	Cape Mount County
7. David Koffa	Cape Mount County
8. Eric V. Pinney	Cape Mount County
9. E. Johnny Jones	Cape Mount County
10. Josiah Davies	Gbarpolu County
11. Sylvester Wah	Gbarpolu County
12. Stephen Selewegar	Gbarpolu County
13. Steve Kroma	Gbarpolu County
14. Samuel Morris	Gbarpolu County
15. A. Nagbe Mineajue	Gbarpolu County
16. Botoe Massaquoi	Grand Cape Mount
17. Foday Kaiwu	Grand Cape Mount
18. Momoh Sambah	Grand Cape Mount
19. Hawa Mentee	Grand Cape Mount
20. Joseph L. Sneh	Bomi County
21. Seh A. Nelson	Bomi County
22. Tumu Konneh	Bomi County
23. Alipine Solo	Bomi County
24. A.B. Sando Jones	Bomi County
25. R. Medesco Lekpeyee	Grand Bassa County
26. James S. Flomo	Grand Bassa County
27. Joseph J. Tally	Grand Bassa County
28. Obediah Zangar	Grand Bassa County
29. M. Obediah Gbayeoga	Grand Bassa County
30. Deratus S. Bull	Grand Bassa County
31. Thomas Barchue	Grand Bassa County
32. H. Gbellay Marshall	Bomi County
33. Alphonso Caine	Bomi County
34. Emmanuel Wlue	Bomi County
35. Momo G. Seh	Bomi County
36. Joseph Morris	Bomi County
37. Kandy Jones	Bomi County
38. Winston Kanneh	Gbarpolu County
39. Stephen Quie	Gbarpolu County

40. A. Kube Patoh
41. Meatta Zinnah
42. Gbeyelh Synean
43. Momo G. Bass
44. J. Momolu Bass
45. Sampson Nyema
46. Francis K. Kpade
47. Joseph Morris
48. Samuel Davis
49. Morris Watson
50. Tumue Kanneh
51. D. Aloysius Kroma

- Gbarpolu County
 Gbarpolu County
 Montserrado County
 Montserrado County
 Montserrado County
 Montserrado County
 Montserrado County
 Montserrado County
 Montserrado County
 Montserrado County
 Montserrado County
 Montserrado County

2nd Regional Workshop

52. O. Bismark Diggs
53. Abel F. Giahgee
54. Angeline Luseni
55. Aloysius J. Y Bull
56. James S. Harris
57. Arthur D. Totimeh
58. Samuel Boyah
59. Rodney Massaquoi
60. Alfred Mulbah
61. Danilette N. David
62. Emmanuel Kemo
63. John Z. Buway
64. Martaley B. Cheayee
65. Samuel S. Pennoh
66. Joseph B. Kula, Sr.
67. Otis C. Zarzar
68. William Wulue Dorbor
69. Samuel Gaye
69. Joseph Kolubah
70. Joseph Morgan
71. J. Roosevelt Kouviakue
72. Charles Toe
73. James Baryougar
74. Simeon Simoke
John Anderson
75. Edmond Jones
76. A. Clement Morris
77. David L. Sumoiwuo
78. Sokowuah Subah
79. Othello H. Davies
80. D. Advertus Gueh

- Grand Bassa County
 Grand Bassa County
 Grand Bassa County
 Grand Bassa County
 Grand Bassa County
 Grand Bassa County
 Grand Bassa County
 Margibi County
 Margibi County
 Margibi County
 Margibi County
 Margibi County
 Grand Gedeh County
 Grand Gedeh County
 Grand Gedeh County
 Grand Gedeh County
 Grand Gedeh County
 Grand Gedeh County
 River Cess County
 River Cess County
 River Cess County
 River Cess County
 River Cess County
 River Cess County
 River Cess County
 River Cess County
 Margibi County
 Margibi County
 Margibi County
 Margibi County
 Margibi County
 River Cess County

81. Hamilton Wesseh	River Cess County
82. Saytue Clarke	River Cess County
3rd Regional Workshop	
83. T. Marvin Goah	Grand Gedeh County
84. Reanal J.D. Quiah	Grand Gedeh County
85. Philip G. Dorbor	Grand Gedeh County
86. J. Lawrence Yarshe	Grand Gedeh County
87. Philip K. Joekloh	Grand Gedeh County
88. David Grear	Grand Gedeh County
89. Peter Boduo	Grand Gedeh County
90. Morias Waylee	Grand Gedeh County
91. Henry B. Freeman	Grand Gedeh County
92. Allyson G. Waylee	Grand Gedeh County
93. Henry Bolue	Grand Kru County
94. Daylead Kanioh	Grand Kru County
95. Phillip Grear	Grand Kru County
96. Sam Dixon	Maryland County
97. Francis Jabba	Maryland County
100. Winston P. Nyanford	River Gee County
101. Theodore T. Walker	River Gee County
102. Charles D. Toquie	River Gee County
103. Jarpu B. Wesseh	River Gee County
104. Abraham Chadah	River Gee County
105. Lasanah Zoba	River Gee County
106. Peter Quiee	Sinoe County
107. Alexander Ako	Sinoe County

4th Regional Workshop

108. Randolph F.K. Sambolah	Lofa County
109. Emmanuel Scott	Bong County
110. Stephen T. Seleweyan	Nimba County
111. Zlenyonoh Tarlue	Bong County
112. Steve G. Kroma	Nimba County
113. Gorma-Torkpa Gweibeic	Bong County
114. Moses Fegurson	Bong County
115. Robert B. Waum	Lofa County
116. Stanley Y. Zahn	Lofa County
117. Joseph Lee Rogers	Bong County
118. Sedekie L. Kromah	Bong County
119. Emmen M. Sackor	Bong County
120. Fobay F. Dorbor	Lofa County
121. Samuel Benson	Bong County
122. Henry G. Kleeme	Bong County
123. J. Cammue Dormea	Bong County
124. S. Toe Wah	Bong County
125. Nyan Dolo	Nimba County

126. Jesse D. Wratue	Nimba County
127. Emmanuel K. Dahn	Nimba County
128. G. Patrick Vanleh	Nimba County
129. Saye Duo	Nimba County
130. Charles F. King	Bong County
131. Joko Moses Kuyon	Bong County
132. Esther Walker	Bong County
133. Jefferson Massah	Bong County
134. Peter Kpainkpa	Bong County
135. Clarence Kpana	Bong County
136. Joe P. Tokpa	Bong County
137. Thomas K. Cisco	Bong County
138. Joseph Korvah	Lofa County

**-Second National Workshop
22-23 August 2005
Held at Jesus Christ Church of Latter Days Saints
Horton Avenue
Monrovia, Liberia**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Ministry/Institution</u>
1. Ben T. Donnie	United Nations Development Programme
2. Kamil Kamaludden	United Nations Development Programme
3. Moses Massah	United Nations Environment Programme
4. Tommy Teah	ERADRO
5. S. Edward Kamara	Farmers Associated to Conserve the Environment
6. Jonathan Davies	Environmental Protection Agency
7. George O. Anderson	Global Community Link
8. George Weaymie	National Charcoal Union of Liberia
9. Joan M. Gbakoyah	Pollution Control Association of Liberia
10. Eben Moses	Center for Environmental Education and Protection
11. Victoria Cole	Forestry Development Authority
12. Joshua N. Quawah	Forestry Development Authority
13. Henry Larway	Environ-Link Liberia Ltd
14. George K. Sar	Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs
15. Ralph Woods	Concerned Environmentalists for the Enhancement of Biodiversity
16. Solomon Gofleetee	Union of Rural Farmers
17. Erastus S. Wieh	Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs
18. Jerome Nyenka	Environmental Protection Agency
19. Bracelia J. Bropeh	Center for Environmental Education and Protection
20. Victor N'gorbu	College of Agriculture and Forestry Students Association / University of Liberia
21. Oretha Kennedy	Environmental Protection Agency
22. William Mentee	Society of Liberian Foresters
23. Matther J. Boe,II	Monrovia Breweries
24. Joseph Boiwu	Food and Agriculture Organization
25. Peter G. Mulbah	Center for Environmental Education and Protection
26. James Z. Aquoi	Liberia Community Development Foundation
27. Eugene Caine	Monrovia City Corporation
28. Stephenett C. Weah	Ministry of Gender and Development
29. John Woods	Liberia Forest Initiative
30. Johansen Voker	Environmental Protection Agency
31. Joseph B. Dennis	Liberia Petroleum Refining Company
32. Abraham Washington	Ministry of Health and Social Welfare
33. Jamesetta Williams	OXFAM (GB)
34. David Wiles	Environmental Protection Agency

35. Thomas Mawolo	Society Against Environmental Degradation
36. Joseph Karr	Sustainable Development Promoters
37. Hopkins Badio	Ministry of Youth and Sports
38. Harry M. Attoh	Liberia Agriculture Company
39. James Makor	Save My Future Foundation
40. Flomo P. Molubah	Society for the Conservation of Nature of Liberia
41. Mulbah Freeman	Liberia Mining Company
42. Horace Sackie	Liberians Associated to fight Hunger
43. Joseph Thor	CEMENCO
44. Lasana Siaka	Liberia Water and Sewer Corporation

Rapporteurs

1. Varney L. Conneh
2. Leo B. Cole
3. Deddeh A. Mulbah

Facilitators

1. Boima Bafaie
2. Jonathan Davies