NEEDS ASSESSMENT FOR ENHANCING RESILIENCE TO CLIMATE CHANGE BY MAINSTREAMING ADAPTATION CONCERNS INTO AGRICULTURAL SECTOR DEVELOPMENT

BONG AND GRAND GEDEH COUNTIES, LIBERIA

(Final Report)



Prepared by: Kennedy Igbokwe, FAO Uganda Wakweya Tamiru, FAO Liberia Roland Lepol, Ministry of Agriculture

JANUARY 2013

(Financial support from UNDP-GEF)







TABLE OF CONTENTS

| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY |
|--|
| 1.0 BACKGROUND |
| 2.0 OBJECTIVES |
| 3.0 METHODOLOGY 4 |
| 4.0 THE FINDINGS |
| 4.1 Needs Assessment for Bong County 4 |
| 4.2 Needs Assessment for Grand Gedeh County 11 |
| 5.0 PROPOSED ADAPTATION OPTIONS FOR BONG AND GRAND GEDEH COUNTIES 18 |
| 6.0 GUIDELINE TOWARDS FORMULATING FFS CURRICULUM FOR CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION IN LIBERIA |
| 6.1 Why FFS approach for climate change adaptation21 |
| 6.2 The process for developing FFS curriculum for climate change adaptation |
| 6.3 Proposed FFS Sites |
| 7.0 PROPOSED PROJECT FRAMEWORK/LOGICAL FRAMEWORK |
| 8.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS |

<u>ANNEXES</u>

| Annex 1: The FFS Approach and Concept |
|--|
| Annex 2: List of people consulted in Bong County during focused group discussions |
| Annex 3: List of people consulted in Grand Gedeh County during focused group discussion 34 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Government of Liberia, with the support of the Global Environment Fund (GEF) and UNDP has launched a project on enhancing resilience to climate change by mainstreaming adaptation concerns into agriculture sector development. In this project, FAO is commissioned to support the implementation of Component 2 – *Innovative, sustainable and socially appropriate adaptive measures piloted at community level.*

In December 2012, FAO and the Ministry of Agriculture conducted a week-long needs assessment in Bong and Grand Gedeh Counties to kick start the GEF/Component 2 by defining climate risks facing the target communities to provide the basis for designing appropriate Farmer Field School (FFS) Curriculum and establishing the project baseline.

This brief report presents the outputs of the needs assessment for both Bong and Grand Gedeh Counties, covering the specific types of climate risks facing the communities as well as the extent of exposure and sensitivity of their livelihood assets to these risks along with the current coping strategies against the impacts of climate change. The report also presents the proposed climate change adaptation options for Bong and Grand Gedeh counties and the guideline towards developing and implementing a FFS methodology with the project logical framework to ensure effective monitoring and evaluation of adaptation activities and results.

DISCLAIMER

The authors' view expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the view of the Food and Agriculture Organization and the Ministry of Agriculture - Liberia

1.0 BACKGROUND

The Government of Liberia (GoL), supported through the Global Environmental Fund (GEF) and UNDP is launching a project (2011-2015) to enhance the resilience to climate change by mainstreaming adaptation concerns into agricultural sector development in Liberia (LDCF).

The project is expected to i) focus on adaptation capacity and awareness raising of key agricultural technical stakeholders on climate change and adaptation, ii) pilot community adaptation strategies in two sites in Liberia. The Minister of Agriculture (MOA) offered a non-objection to use FAO experience for Component 2 to achieve appropriate adaptative measures piloted at the community level (Outcome2). The purpose is to use Farmers' Field Schools (FFS) model, tailored for agriculture adaptation to climate change in Liberia.

The Project Steering Committee (PSC) approved on 16 October 2012 the work plan/budget for the first year of the project (last quarter 2012). The 2012 Work plan includes a 1) baseline analysis on present current climate change adaptation strategies and coping mechanisms in Bong and Grand Gedeh Counties, and 2) develop a specific tailor made FFS curriculum for demonstration sites and target communities on both project counties. Both outputs will be submitted in January 2013 to the Steering Committee.

In November 2012, the FAO and MOA team carried out a scoping mission to Bong County to identify, review and discuss with local authorities the future project districts, including the most suitable project sites and communities for implementation of FFS model.

In December 2012, FAO and MOA launched a comprehensive needs assessment mission (N-A) to determine specific technical needs on each of the selected areas, and complete the baseline for the project. The N-A mission reviewed current climate risks, and assess from the community perspectives the degree to which agriculture production system is susceptible or unable to cope with the negative impacts of climate variability and change. Further, the N-A mission defined the parameters towards developing and implementing a FFS for climate change adaptation as well as indicators for effective project monitoring and evaluation.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

The aim of the N-A mission was to kick start GEF/Component 2 by defining climate risks facing the target communities, designing appropriate FFS curriculum for Bong and Grand Gedeh Counties and establish the project baseline.

As per the TOR, the N-A mission was organized to perform the following specific tasks:

- 1. Assess target county requirements to protect Liberia's agriculture sector from negative impact of climate change and variability, focusing specifically on adaptation issues;
- 2. Determine what type of climate technology for agriculture, forestry and land use is most effective to integrate under FFS programming, for each county;
- 3. Formulate with FAO-Liberia and MOA the 2013 FFS curriculum; and
- 4. Determine potential obstacles that can hinder adaptation adoption by farmers, and identify adequate location for project demonstration sites.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

The N-A mission team was comprised of Mr. Roland J. Lepor, the National Project Coordinator, Climate Change Adaptation Project, Ministry of Agriculture; Dr. Kennedy N. Igbokwe, Project Manager and International Consultant – Climate Change Adaptation, FAO Uganda, and Mr. Wakweya Tamiru, Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, FAO Liberia. The field mission and data compilation was conducted from December 9th – 16th, 2012.

As a starting point, the assessment team reviewed the scoping mission report which was conducted earlier in November 2012. The field assessment was conducted in Bong and Grand Gedeh Counties using focused group discussion and ocular visits to potential project communities. In Bong County, the team visited Belemue village in Panta District. While in Grand Gedeh, the focused group discussion and field visits were conducted in Zleh town, Tian town, Polar and Gaye town in Gharzon District. A component-based method was employed to analyze the vulnerability of community livelihood capital assets (Natural capital, Financial capital, Physical capital, Human capital and Social capital).

Using a simple guided checklist, the information collected from the communities and local stakeholders focused primarily on four steps: (1) reviewing and confirmation of *climate risks*; (2) assessing the *exposure* of community and their livelihood capitals to climate risks; (3) assessing the *sensitivity* of community and their livelihood capitals to climate risks; and (4) assessing the current *coping strategies* to negative impacts of climate change.

During the field visit, discussions were also conducted with stakeholders in Cuttington University and the County Agriculture Coordinators in Bong and Grand Gedeh on the general emerging climate change issues and development of the farmer field school curriculum. In Grand Gedeh, meeting was also held with the County LISGIS expert. The field activities were followed by debriefing with FAO Representation staff and the Ministry of Agriculture.

4.0 THE FINDINGS

The results of the assessment are divided into *four* key parts:

The first part provides basic information on the climate context as well as the vulnerability assessments, current adaptive capacity/coping strategies of the target communities in Bong and Grand Gedeh Counties.

The second part presents a proposed adaptation options/ measures and potential obstacles that could impede community adaptation.

The third part presents parameters/guidelines towards developing a farmer field school curriculum.

The fourth part presents the proposed common project framework common to target communities in Bong and Grand Gedeh and the associated Log frame for monitoring and evaluation.

4.1 Needs Assessment for Bong County

4.1.1 The Climate Context

This section presents the target community understanding and perception about the negative impacts of climate change on the local production system.

| Table 1: Impacts of climate | e variability and change |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|

| Climate Hazards | Effects/Impacts |
|--|---|
| Erratic rainfall/irregular rainfall pattern and drought | Limits the ability of farmers to properly plan for rice production and other crops as well as causing crop damage. Especially at the time of rainfall shortage, the livelihood of the people is threatened and contributing to food insecurity and poverty. |
| Increased temperature/heat wave | Causes low rice yield/productivity due to effects of heat wave during sensitive periods of planting, germination and maturing of grains. |
| | Contributes to decreasing water levels in swamps and other shallow water sources. |
| Increased episodes of heavy rain and flooding | Destruction of rice crop/paddies and vegetables. |
| | Increase in pests and diseases, for example Caterpillar outbreak in 2009 and 2011 |
| | Increasing soil erosion and declining soil fertility. |

Table 2: Perceived impact of climate change on agricultural production during the last 5 years

| ~ | | ~ ~ _ | · · | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|------------------|--|--|---------------------|---|---------------------|---|---------------------|--|
| Crops | 2 | 007 | 20 | 008 | 2 | 009 | 20 | 010 | | 2011 |
| | Climate | Effect on | Climate | Climate Effects on | | Effect on | Climate Effects on | | Climate | Effect on |
| | hazards | Production | hazards | Production | hazards | Production | hazards | Production | hazards | Production |
| Upland Rice | No information | | No informatio | on . | High temperature | Poor germination of upland rice & low harvest | No information | | High temperature | Poor germination of upland rice & low harvest |
| Lowland/ Swamp rice | No information | | nformation High temperature Reduced High water levels leading to low yield | | | | High temperature | Reduced water levels in swamps leading to low yield | High temperature | Reduced water levels in swamps leading to low yield |
| Сосоа | Heavy Induced rainfall/ black-pod flooding disease causing low production | | nfall/ black-pod oding disease | | | | No informatio | on . | No informatio | n |
| Rubber | | | Heavy rainfall/ flooding | Induced black-thread disease on rubber cause low production | No informatio | on | No informatio | on | No informatio | on. |

4.1.2 Vulnerability Assessments

This aims to assess (from the community perspectives) the degree to which the agriculture production system is susceptible or unable to cope with the negative impacts of climate variability and change. It involved specifically assessing the exposure and sensitivity of farmers and their agricultural livelihood resources to the climate hazards as well as the adaptive capacity to cope with the negative consequences of climate variability and change.

4.1.2.1 Assessing Exposure to Climate Risks

This section presents the number and types of livelihood capital assets that are likely to experience or be present or affected by the climate hazards. These include natural assets (Table 3 - land, crops, livestock, forests and water resources), financial assets (Table 4- income generating activities), human assets (Table 5 - productive skills), physical assets (Table 6 - infrastructures and equipment) and social assets (Table 7 - membership or belongingness to community organization).

| | | District | Climate hazards | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Natural | | | Remarks | | |
| assets exposed to Climate hazards | | Erratic rainfall pattern and drought | Increased temperature/heat wave | Increased episodes of heavy rain and flooding | |
| Land Res | ources: | | | | |
| Swamps/ Wetlands | Panta District Belemue | About 350 hectares swamp lands for rice production in Panta District (i.e. all of swamp areas in the district is exposed) 250 ha (based on | About 60-75% of all swamp rice areas (i.e. 240 ha) in Panta District is reported to be affected by increased temperature. About 169 ha of | About 25% of all swamp land in Panta or 86 hectares was reported to be affected by increased rain and flooding. About 62.5 ha | The swamp rice production is cultivated by 500 farmers (400 women) in Belemue. The average swamp rice farm size is 0.50 ha per family. |
| | Village | average land size estimates and number of farmers in Belemue) | swamp land | of swamp land | |
| Uplands | | About 1,518 hectares (i.e. all of upland area in the district) | About 1,518 hectares | Upland farms are not currently affected by flooding. | The average upland farm size is 1.012 ha per family. |
| Crops: | x 1 1 | 0.501 L D 1 | 25 01 : D 1 | 1001 | |
| Rice | Lowland rice | 250 ha in Belemue | 250 ha in Belemue | 100 ha in Belemue | 40% germination failure and 60% of upland rice failure |
| Upland rice | | 1,331 ha of upland rice | 1,331 ha of upland rice | Not exposed to flooding. | attributed to increased temperature |
| Cassava | | 187 ha | 187 ha | Not exposed to flooding | 1,500 Belemue farmers cultivate cassava with average plot size of 0.12 ha. Not a major crop |
| Vegetable | es Lowland | 375 swamp vegetable farmers | 375 swamp vegetable farmers | No estimates provided | Only 25% of Belemue farmers grow vegetables in swampland |
| | Upland | 1,125 upland vegetable farmers | 1,125 upland vegetable farmers | Not exposed to flooding | |
| Plantain | | 3,000 plantain trees | 3,000 plantain trees | | |
| Livestock | : | | | | |
| Goat | | 2,250 goats | 2,250 goats | Not exposed to flooding | 50% of farmers have an average of 3 goats each. 500 goats were suspected to have died due dehydration in Feb/April 2012 |
| Chicken | | 1,890 birds | 1,890 birds | | 9% of farmers have an average of 12-15 birds. Many were reported to have died of dehydration. |
| Sheep | | 540 sheep | 540 sheep | | 12% of farmers have an average of 3 sheep |
| Duck | | 360 ducks | 360 ducks | | 8% of farmers have an average of 3 ducks |
| Pig | | 2250 pigs | 2250 pigs | | |
| Forest Re | sources: | | | | |
| Famaria Dahomey | | | Affected but size of affected area not known | | |
| Rubber | | | About 607 hectares is affected/exposed | | Farmers reported evidence of germination failure and low |

Table 3: Perceived Exposure of Natural Capital Assets to Climate hazards in Belemue Village, Panta District

| Natural Capital | | Remarks | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|
| assets exposed to | Erratic rainfall | Increased | Increased | |
| Climate hazards | pattern and drought | temperature/heat | episodes of | |
| | | wave | heavy rain and flooding | |
| | | to high temperature | | yield of latex due to heat |
| Oil Palm | | About 810 hectares is affected/exposed to high temperature | | Farmers reported oil palm tree not maturing and fruitful |
| Water Resources: | | | | |
| Springs, streams and creeks | Foe creek (in Belemeu) | Foe creek | Foe creek | The creek dries up and floods frequently. When it floods it makes crossing difficult |
| Rivers | 3 rivers in Panta District | 3 rivers in Panta District | 3 rivers in Panta District | The 3 rivers get flooded |
| Groundwater resources | 11 hand pumps | | | In Belemue, 2 machine-drilled functional hand pumps accessible to community increasingly experiencing reduced water levels since last year; another 3 hand pumps owned by Church Mission in Belemue; total of 11 hand pumps in Belemue (7 of which not functional) |

Table 4: Exposure of Financial Resources (Assets) to Climate hazards

| Financial | Resources/ | | Remarks | | | |
|-------------|------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| Assets | | Erratic rainfall pattern and drought | Increased temperature/hea t wave | | | |
| Livestock: | | | | flooding | | |
| Goat | | 2,250 goats (\$146,250) | 2,250 goats (\$146,250) | Not exposed | Selling price: US\$ 65 per goat | |
| Chicken | | 1,890 birds (\$9,450) | 1,890 birds (\$9450) | Not exposed | Selling price: US\$ 5 per bird | |
| Sheep | | 540 sheep (\$810,000) | 540 sheep (\$810,000) | Not exposed | Selling price: US\$150 per sheep | |
| Duck | | 360 ducks (\$2,880) | 360 ducks (\$2,880) | Not exposed | Selling price: US\$ 8 per duck | |
| Pig | | 2,250 pigs (\$135,000) | 2,250 pigs (\$135,000) | Not exposed Selling price: US\$ 60 per price | | |
| Crops: | | | | | | |
| Rice | Swamp rice | 250 MT (\$87,500) | 250 MT (\$87,500) | 250 MT \$87,500) | This represents the current level of production potentially | |
| Upland rice | | 665.5 MT (\$232,925) | 665.5 MT (\$232,925) | exposed to the climate hazards. The price of rice is US\$0.35 per kilogram | | |
| Vegetables | Bitterball | | Selling price: US\$11.4 per 50 kilo bag | | | |
| - | Pepper | No information/estima | stimates on the current level of production Selling price: US\$17 per 50 kilo bag | | | |
| | Okra | Selling price: US\$ 11.4 per 50 kilo bag | | | | |
| Cocoa | 1 | | | | Selling price: US\$ 2.2 per kilo | |

| Resources | | Climate hazards | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Erratic rainfall | Crratic rainfall Increased Increased | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | pattern and drought | temperature/heat | episodes of heavy | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | wave | rain and flooding | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bridges | Not applicable | Not applicable | 6 bridges are | 3 out of 6 bridges | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | exposed | damaged by flooding | | | | | | | | | |
| Roads | Not applicable | Not applicable | One (1) major | This is always affected | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | market road | when there is heavy rain | | | | | | | | | |

Table 5: Exposure of Physical Resources (Assets) to Climate hazards

Table 6: Exposure of Human Resources (Assets) to Climate hazards

| Human Reso | ources | | Remarks | | |
|--------------------|--------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Erratic rainfall pattern and drought | Increased temperature/heat | Increased episodes of heavy rain and flooding | |
| | | | wave | | |
| Rice production | Swamp | 500 swamp rice farmers | 500 swamp farmers | 500 swamp rice farmers | |
| capabilities | Upland | 1,500 upland farmers | 1,500 upland farmers | 1,500 upland farmers | |

Table 7: Exposure of Social Resources (Assets) to Climate hazards

| Membership in | | Remarks | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| organizations | Erratic rainfall | Increased | Increased | |
| | pattern and drought | temperature/heat | episodes of heavy | |
| | | wave | rain and flooding | |
| PAFACO Farmer Union | 500 members | 500 members | 500 members | Comprised of men and |
| | | | | women |
| Leekpaylay Farmer Union | 300 members | 300 members | 300 members | All women only |

4.1.2.2 Sensitivity to Climate risk

This section presents the extent to which community livelihood capital assets are currently affected by the climate hazards. These include natural assets (Table 8: land, crops, livestock, forests and water resources), financial assets (Table 9: income generating activities), human assets (Table 10: productive skills), physical assets (Table 11: infrastructures and equipment) and social assets (Table 12: membership or belongingness to community organization).

Extent to which natural resources/assets are influenced negatively by climate hazards identified in the climate context (0 = no influence, 5 = full influence) Natural **Climate hazards** Notes on sensitivity to climate **Resources/Assets Erratic rainfall** hazard impacts Increased Increased pattern and temperature/hea episodes of heavy drought t wave rain and flooding 0 1 2 3 4 5 0 1 2 4 5 0 1 2 3 4 5 3 Land Resources: Increased temperature/heat wave has Swamps/Wetlands Х Х Х moderate negative impact on the Uplands х х х swamp productivity, but with much more effect on the uplands. Crops: Erratic rainfall pattern/drought and Rice х х х increased temperature have more Cassava Х Х X negative impact on rice production. Cocoa х х х Both germination and crop failure Coffee Х X Х reached 40% and 60%, respectively. Plantain (Banana х X Х Variety)

Table 8: Community Perceived Sensitivity of Natural Resources (Assets) to Climate hazards

| Extent to which natural resources/assets are influenced negatively by climate hazards identified in the climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|-------------|-----|------|---|---|-----------|------|------|--------------|----|---|--------------|---|---|---|----|--|
| context | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (0 = no influence, 5 = full influence) Natural Climate hazards Notes on sensitivity to climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Natural Democratic | - | | • | • | 0 11 | | | | | | zaro | ls | - | | | - | | | Notes on sensitivity to climate |
| Resources/Assets | | | | ain | tall | l | | | ase | | . / L | ~ | | cre | | | | | hazard impacts |
| | - | ille oug | rn a abt | ana | | | | mp wav | erat | lure | e/ne | a | | oiso in a | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | nav 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1g | |
| Livestock: | U | - | - | | - | - | Ū | - | - | - | - | • | v | - | - | • | - | - | Increased temperature/heat wave has |
| Goat | x | | | | | | | | | | х | | х | | | | | | negative impacts on goats and |
| Chicken | | х | | | | | | | | | х | | х | | | | | | chickens. About 500 goats and scores |
| Pig | X | | | | | | | | | x | | | x | | | | | | of chicken were reported to have died |
| Duck | X | | | | | | | | x | | | | х | | | | | | in Feb/April, 2012 |
| Sheep | X | | | | | | | | | х | | | x | | | | | | |
| Forest Resources: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | No current significant impact of any of |
| Famaria | X | | | | | | | | х | | | | х | | | | | | the hazards on forest resources, except |
| Dahomey | X | | | | | | | | х | | | | | | X | | | | on the reported flooding effects on |
| Rubber | | х | | | | | | | х | | | | х | | | | | | Dahomey and the germination failure |
| Oil Palm | | х | | | | | | | х | | | | х | | | | | | and low yield of latex due to heat on |
| W (D | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | rubber. |
| Water Resources: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Communities attribute low pumping |
| Springs, streams | | | х | | | | | | х | | | | | X | | | | | rates to lowering of water tables |
| and creeks | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | caused by erratic rainfall |
| Rivers | | | X | | | | | | X | | | | | X | | | | | pattern/drought and increased temperature/heat wave. |
| Groundwater | | | | X | | | | | | Х | | | Х | | | | | | temperature/near wave. |

 Table 9: Sensitivity of Financial Capital Assets to Climate hazards

 Extent to which financial resources/assets are influenced negatively by climate hazards identified in the climate context

| | (0 = no influence, 5 = f ncial Climate hazards | | | | | | | = ft | ıll i | nflu | ience) | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|------|-------|-----|------|---|----|------|-------|------|--------|----|----|-------|-----|------|-----|----|--|
| Financial | | | | | | | С | lim | ate | haz | arc | ls | | | | | | | Notes on climate hazards |
| Resources | E | rrat | tic r | ain | fall | | In | cre | ase | d | | | Ir | icre | ase | d | | | |
| /Assets | pa | itte | rn a | and | | | te | mp | erat | ture | e/ | | eŗ | piso | des | of l | hea | vy | |
| | dı | ou | ght | | | | he | at v | wav | 'e | | | ra | ain a | and | flo | odi | ng | |
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Livestock: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Farmers claimed that increased temperature/heat |
| Goat | X | | | | | | | | | | X | | x | | | | | | wave has high negative effects on goats and |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | chicken. Estimated 500 goats died in Feb/April |
| Pig | x | | | | | | | | | x | | | х | | | | | | 2012 causing a financial loss of about US\$ |
| U | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 32,500. Scores of chicken died during similar |
| Chicken | X | | | | | | | | | | X | | X | | | | | | time (estimates to be re-verified). |
| Crops: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Farmers claimed that increased temperature/heat |
| Rice | | | | x | | | | | | X | | | | | x | | | | wave has led to as much as 60% failure in upland |
| Cassava | X | | | | | | | X | | | | | x | | | | | | rice production. In financial terms this is |
| Coffee | x | | | | | | | | | | X | | x | | | | | | translates to a loss of about US\$ 139,755. Also |
| Cocoa | x | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | x | | | | farmers claimed that flooding affects as much as |
| Plantain | x | | | | | | | | х | | | | x | | | | | | 25% of the swamp rice production areas, with |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | potential to cause a loss of about US\$ 21,875 |

Table 10: Sensitivity of Physical Capital Assets to Climate hazards

| Extent to w | hich | phy | ysica | al re | soui | rces | /asse | | | nflue 10 in | | | 0 | · | · | | | hazards identified in the climate context |
|-----------------------------------|------|-----|-------|--------------|------|-----------|---------|------|-----|----------------|----------|---------|---|-----------------|---|-----|----|--|
| Financial Resources/ Assets | | | | infa d dr | | ht | Inc | erea | sed | azar re/ | ds he | at | | ease des | | hea | ww | Notes on climate hazards |
| ASSELS | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | ,int 5 | wa 0 | • | 2 | 3 | 4 | ai 5 | - | and | | | - | |
| Bridges | x | _ | | - | | - | X | | | - | _ | - | - | x | - | - | - | Heavy rain and floods have negative |
| Roads | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | | X | | | | effects on rural infrastructures, especially the bridges where as much as 50% damage have been reported by the farmers. |

Table 11: Sensitivity of Human Capital Assets to Climate hazards

Extent to which human resources/assets are influenced negatively by climate hazards identified in the climate context (0 = no influence, 5 = full influence)

| | | | | | | | | | | (0 | | • • | | une | ., . | | *** * | | |
|--------------|---|------|-----|------|------|---|----|------|------|------|-----|-----|----|------|------|------|-------|----|--|
| Human | | | | | | | 0 | Clin | ate | ha | zar | ds | | | | | | | Notes on climate hazards |
| Resources | Ε | rra | tic | raiı | ıfal | 1 | In | cre | ase | d | | | In | cre | ase | d | | | |
| | p | atte | ern | and | l | | te | mp | erat | ture | e/ | | ep | iso | des | of l | iea | vy | |
| | d | rou | ght | ţ | | | he | at | wav | 'e | | | ra | in a | and | flo | odiı | ng | |
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Rice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Appropriate sensitivity level not clear for any of |
| production | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | the climate change hazards. However exposure to |
| capabilities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | scourge of heat and colds ailments associated |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | with frequent rain could impede capability to |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | work effectively in the field |

Table 12: Sensitivity of Social Capital Assets to Climate hazards

| Extent to w | hich | I SO | cial | l re | sou | rce | s/as | sets | | | | | | | | | | | nate hazards identified in the climate context ence) |
|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|-------|--------------------------|------|----|---|----|------|-----|------|------|----|--|
| Social | | | | | | | | | Notes on climate hazards | | | | | | | | | | |
| Resources | Er | rat | ic r | ain | fall | | In | cre | ase | d | | | In | icre | ase | d | | | |
| | pa | tte | rn a | nd | | | te | mp | erat | ture | e/ | | | | | of l | | | |
| | dr | oug | ght | - | | | he | eat v | wav | e | | | ra | in a | and | flo | odiı | ng | |
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| PAFACO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Appropriate sensitivity level not determined. |
| Farmer | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | However, the existence of farmer organizations |
| Union | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | is a positive attribute that could quickly |
| Leekpaylay | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | strengthen the institutional adaptive capacity of |
| Farmer | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | farmers to respond to the climate change risks. |
| Union | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

4.1.3 Assessing Current Community Coping Strategies to Climate Change in Belemue, Panta District

This section presents the current short-term strategies of the target communities and its effectiveness to respond to the periodic climate hazards (Table 13). According to farmers the most effective coping strategy against risk of crop failure and low productivity due to water stress is planting of drought resistant rice variety (LAC 23 upland rice).

| Climate | ommunity Coping Strate Climate change risks | Current coping | Ef | | | ess | | | Remarks |
|--|---|--|-----------|-----------|------------|---------------|-----------|---|--|
| change hazards | | strategies | co | ping 1 | g str 2 | ateg | gies 4 | 5 | |
| Erratic rainfall/ | Crop failure and low | Delayed planting | U | 1 | X | 5 | - | 5 | Does not fully remedy the |
| irregular | productivity due to water | | | | | | | | situation |
| rainfall pattern and drought | stress | Planting resistant rice variety (LAC-23 upland rice) | | | | | | х | Very effective in being resilience to climate change (about 50% farmers using it currently) |
| Increased temperature/ heat wave | Crop failure and low productivity of rice due to heat wave especially during sensitive stages of | Planting rice twice a year | | X | | | | | Damages soil structure and labor intensive |
| | planting, germination and maturation of grains | Diversification of crops | | | X | | | | Most farmers prefer this practice |
| | Crop failure and low productivity due to increased pests and diseases | Weeding, fencing and use of scare crows | | | | X | | | Common practice among farmers |
| Increased episodes of heavy rain and | Crop failure and low productivity due to flooding | None as this is not a significant problem yet | | | | | | | |
| flooding | Low crop productivity resulting from soil erosion and reduced fertility due to land degradation | Early planting in May in anticipation of rainfall; when rain comes, soil compact ability and firmness are bolstered by root- networks of crops | | | | Х | | | Late planting only increases vulnerability to soil erosion |
| | Low productivity due to increased pest and diseases | Weeding, fencing and use of scare crows | | | | х | | | Common practice among farmers |
| Climate change | Climate change risks | Current coping strategies | | | | ess (ateg | | | Remarks |
| hazards | | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Vulnerabilities: | | | | | | | | | |
| alternatives sourc livelihoods | ability due to limited ces of income and | Petty trading | | х | | | | | Not profitable or gainful |
| access to credit | ability due to limited | Credit and saving clubs and <i>susu</i> | | | х | | | | Credit clubs and <i>susu</i> have limited financial and technical capacity |
| Increased vulnera harvest losses | ability due to high post | Drying of pepper, smoking of meat, using cold shaded areas for storage of fresh vegetables | х | | | | | | |

Table 13: Community Coping Strategies to Climate Change

4.2 Needs Assessment for Grand Gedeh County

4.2.1 The Climate Context

This section presents the target community understanding and perception about the negative impacts of climate change on the local production system.

Table 14: Impacts of climate variability and change

| Climate Hazards | Effects/ Impacts |
|------------------------|--|
| Erratic | Low production (rice, vegetable, cocoa) and crop loss; and delayed cultivation |
| rainfall/irregular | Reduced soil moisture (2011) and drying up of swamps, creeks and streams |
| rainfall pattern | Shortage of sources of water for drinking, washing, etc; and hand pumps dry up (under ground water) |
| and drought | Migration of wild animal (e.g. Hippo, Christmas bird, elephant, etc) |
| Increased | Micro organisms getting deeper into the soil (fertility of surface soil reduced) and loss of soil moisture |
| temperature/heat | Occurrence of disease (human & plants), for instance cough, rashes, etc and increase in rice blast, stem |
| wave | borer affect crops |
| | Stunted growth of crops and poor germination of crops and low production; premature ripeness of |
| | vegetables |
| | Loss in livestock (mainly chicken and goat) |
| Increased episodes | Damaging of dams, houses, bridges and roads flooded to the point of no-crossing |
| of heavy rain and | Lowland farms destroyed and yield reduced |
| flooding | Human diseases (diarrhea) |
| | Soil erosion |

Table 15: Perceived impact of climate change on agricultural production during the last 5 years

| Crops | 2 | 2007 | 20 | 08 | , | 2009 | 2 | 010 | 2 | 2011 |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Climate hazards | Effect on Production | Climate hazards | Effects on Production | Climate hazards | Effect on Production | Climate hazards | Effects on Production | Climate hazards | Effect on Production |
| Upland Rice | Perceived as year | good year/normal | Perceived as go year | od year/ normal | Perceived as year | good year/normal | Drought and high temperature | Low crop yield | Drought with high temperature (worst in 5 years) | 10-15% losses in rice production |
| Lowland/ Swamp rice | Perceived as normal year Yield = 600 (1.5 MT/acre) | bundles/acre | Perceived as go year Yield = 600 bun (1.5 MT/acre) | od year/ normal ndles /acre | Perceived as normal year Yield = 600 (1.5 MT/acre | bundles/acre | Drought and high temperature | Low crop yield Likely yield loss of 10-15% | Drought with high temperature | Low crop yield. About 10-15% loss but a farmer reported yield loss of over 95%. |

Note: In 2011, there was significant period of drought and in 2012 a lot of rain was experienced. 1 bundle is equal to 2.5 kg of rice.

4.2.2 Vulnerability Assessments

This aims to assess (from the community perspectives) the degree to which the agriculture production system is susceptible or unable to cope with the negative impacts of climate variability and change. It involved specifically assessing the exposure and sensitivity of farmers and their agricultural livelihood resources to the climate hazards as well as the adaptive capacity to cope with the negative consequences of climate variability and change.

4.2.2.1 Assessing Exposure to Climate Risks

This section presents the number and types of livelihood capital assets that are likely to experience or be present or affected by the climate hazards. These include natural assets (Table 16: land, crops, livestock, forests and water resources), financial assets (Table 17: income generating activities), human assets (Table 18: productive skills), physical assets (Table 19: infrastructures and equipment) and social assets (Table 20: membership or belongingness to community organization).

Table16: Perceived Exposure of Natural Capital Assets to Climate hazards in Zleh Town, Gbarzon District

| Resources | zon District exposed to | | Climate hazards | | Remarks |
|----------------------|----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| Climate haz | zards | Erratic rainfall pattern and drought | Increased temperature/he at wave | Increased episodes of heavy rain and flooding | |
| Land Resou | | I | I | r . | |
| Swamps/ Wetlands | Gbao District | 80,000 ha are exposed | 80,000 ha are exposed | 80,000 ha are exposed | The upland farm areas in Grand Gedeh is more than double the size of the swamp farm lands |
| | Zleh Town | 700 ha are exposed | 700 ha are exposed | 700 ha are exposed | The average swamp farm size is 4.65 ha. Some farmers can incur as much as 80-85% loss due to drought |
| Uplands Zleh Town | | 160 ha | 160 ha are exposed | 160 ha are exposed | The average upland farm size is 0.60 ha per family. Approximately 267 upland farmers in Zleh town. |
| Crops: | | | | | |
| Rice | Lowland rice | 700 ha | 700 ha | 700 ha | 10-15% loss of yield for upland rice during drought in 2011 |
| | Upland rice | 160 | 160 | Not exposed to flooding | |
| Cassava | | 160 Exposed but resistant | 160 Exposed but resistant | Not exposed to flooding | All the upland farmers grow cassava. The average farm size is 0.60 ha. Every famer make cassava farm as a second option and back up for rice failure – a sort of safety net measure |
| Vegetables | | 81 ha | Not exposed | Not exposed | The average vegetable size per farmer is 0.20 ha to 0.40 ha. |
| Plantain | | 108 ha | Not exposed | Not exposed | The average farm size grown to plantain is 0.40 ha. |
| Livestock: | | - | - | - | |
| Goat (Zleh] | Γown) | 854 goats (estimates for Zleh town only) | 854 goats (estimates for Zleh town only) | Not exposed to flooding | 80% of the farmers have an average of 3-5 goats. This value was used in estimating number of goats owned by 267 upland and swamp farmers in Zleh Town. |
| Chicken (Zl | eh town) | 3,810 birds | 3,810 birds | | 95% of farmers have an average of 15 birds. About 40% were reported to have died of dehydration in 2011. |
| Sheep (Gbarzon Di | istrict) | 2,000-3,000 sheep | 2,000-3,000 sheep | | About 1,500 died in 2011 |
| Duck(Gharz | on District | 1,500 ducks | 1,500 ducks | | 50% died for lack of water in 2011 |
| Forest Reso | urces: | | | | |
| Abura | | Not applicable | Not applicable | Exposed | As much as 20% existing trees |
| Nyanqun | | Not applicable | Not applicable | Exposed | are affected |
| Upaka | | Not applicable | Not applicable | Exposed | |
| Water Resor | | 2 anal- | 2 ana also a re | 2 anal | All amales get flor de deriber it |
| Springs, s creeks | treams and | 3 creeks are exposed to cc risks | 3 creeks are exposed to cc risks | 3 creeks are exposed to cc risks | All creeks get flooded when it rains and also dries up during the dry season. As much 85% of the creeks can dry up during the dry season. |
| Rivers | | 2 rivers are exposed to climate | 2 rivers are exposed to | 2 rivers are exposed to climate | All the rivers get flooded when it rains, and about 90% are said to |

| Resources exposed to | | Climate hazards | | Remarks |
|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Climate hazards | Erratic rainfall | Increased | Increased | |
| | pattern and | temperature/he | episodes of heavy | |
| | drought | at wave | rain and flooding | |
| | change risks | climate change | change risks | overflow their banks. |
| | (Cavalla & Cestos) | risks | (Cavalla & Cestos) | |
| | | (Cavalla & | | |
| | | Cestos) | | |
| Groundwater resources | hand pumps | hand pumps | Not applicable | 90% of shallow wells are reported |
| | | | | to dry up during dry seasons |

Table 17: Exposure of Financial Capital Assets to Climate hazards

| Financial I | Resources/ | | Climate hazards | | Remarks |
|---------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|
| Assets | | Erratic rainfall pattern and drought | Increased temperature/ heat wave | Increased episodes of heavy rain and flooding | |
| Livestock: | | | | | |
| Goat (Zleh | town) | 854 goats (\$55,510) | 854 goats (\$55,510) | Not exposed | Selling price: US\$ 65 per goat |
| Chicken (Z | leh town) | 3,810 birds (\$19,050) | 3,810 birds (\$19,050) | Not exposed | Selling price: US\$ 5 per bird |
| Sheep (Gbarzon D | District) | 2,000-3,000 sheep | 2,000-3,000 sheep | Not exposed | Selling price: US\$ 150 per sheep |
| Duck (Gbarzon D | District) | 1,500 ducks | 1,500 ducks | Not exposed | Selling price: US\$ 8 per duck |
| Crops: | | | | | |
| Rice (Zleh | Swamp rice | 700MT (\$245,000) | 700 MT (\$245,000) | 700 MT (\$245,000) | This represents the current level of production |
| Town) | Upland rice | 80 MT (\$28,000) | 80 MT (\$28,000) | Not exposed to flooding | potentially exposed to the climate hazards. The price of rice is \$0.35 per kilogram |
| Vegetables | | No information/estimation/ | ates on the current level | of production | |
| Plantain | | 4 | | | |
| Charcoal se | elling | | | | |

Table 18: Exposure of Physical Capital Assets to Climate hazards

| Resources | | Climate hazards | | Remarks |
|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------|---|
| | Erratic rainfall | Increased | Increased episodes | |
| | pattern and drought | temperature/heat | of heavy rain and | |
| | | wave | flooding | |
| Irrigation facilities | Not applicable | Not applicable | Exposed | The N-A team visited one irrigation facility near Zleh town, which was damaged by flooding. |
| Bridges | Not applicable | Not applicable | 2 bridges are exposed | Two bridges damaged by flooding |
| Roads | Not applicable | Not applicable | 1 major market road | This is always affected when there is heavy rain |

| Human Res | ources | | Climate hazards | | Remarks |
|---|--------|--|--|--|--|
| | | Erratic rainfall pattern and drought | Increased temperature/he at wave | Increased episodes of heavy rain and flooding | |
| Rice production capabilities (Zleh | Swamp | 151 swamp rice farmers | 151 swamp farmers | 151 swamp rice farmers | This figures are derived by dividing 700 ha of swamp farm in Zleh Town by an average farm size of 4.65 ha per farmer |
| Town) | Upland | 267 upland farmers | 267 upland farmers | 267 upland farmers | This figures are derived by dividing 160 ha of upland farm in Zleh Town by an average farm size of 0.60 ha per farmer |
| Fishing capa | bility | Quantity of fish no | ot provided | | Large amounts of fish are caught and sold. |

Table 19: Exposure of Human Resources (Assets) to Climate hazards

Table 20: Exposure of Social Resources (Assets) to Climate hazards

| Membership in | | Climate hazards | | Remarks |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| organizations | Erratic rainfall pattern and drought | Increased temperature/heat | Increased episodes of heavy | |
| | | wave | rain and flooding | |
| AMENU Farmer group | 1,875 members | 1,875 members | 1,875 members | Women comprised 43% |
| | | | | of the membership |
| Women groups | 300 members | 300 members | 300 members | There are seven women |
| | | | | groups |

4.2.2.2 Assessing sensitivity to climate risks

This section presents the extent to which community livelihood capital assets are currently affected by the climate hazards. These include Natural assets (Table 21: land, crops, livestock, forests and water resources), financial assets (Table 22:I income generating activities), human assets (Table 23: productive skills), physical assets (Table 24: infrastructures and equipment) and social assets (Table 25: membership or belongingness to community organization).

| Extent to whi | Extent to which natural resources/assets are influenced negatively by climate hazards identified in the climate context (0 = no influence, 5 = full influence) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|----|-------------------|-----|---|------|---|----|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Natural | ural Climate hazards | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Notes on climate hazard impacts | | | | |
| Resources/As sets | pa | Erratic rainfall pattern and drought | | | | te | ncre mp wav | era | | e/he | a | ep | icre Diso Din a | des | of l | | • | | |
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Land Resources: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Flooding and erratic nature of rainfall significantly affects swamp and upland areas, |
| Swamps/ Wetlands | | | | x | | | | | | x | | | | | | | x | | respectively. Some farmers reported loss of rice plots to flooding. 100% of the swamp |
| Uplands | | | | | X | | | | | X | | | X | | | | | | areas are affected with 15-20% for the uplands |
| Crops: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Erratic rainfall pattern/ drought and increased |
| Rice | | | | | X | | | | | | X | | | | | x | | | temperature have more negative impact on |
| Cassava | х | | | | | | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | rice production. Across the board loss of 10- |
| Vegetables | | | x | | | | | | | X | | | | | X | | | | 15% yield was reported in 2011 though some |
| Plantain (Banana Variety) | X | | | | | | | x | | | | | | x | | | | | experienced over 95% loss |

Table 21: Community Perceived Sensitivity of Natural Capital Asset to Climate hazards

| Extent to whi | Extent to which natural resources/assets are influenced negatively by climate hazards identified in the climate context (0 = no influence, 5 = full influence) Natural Climate hazards Notes on climate hazard impacts | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|---------|------|------|----|---|-----|------|-------|------|------|----|------|------|-----|------|----------|---|--|
| Natural | | | | | | | Cl | ima | ite l | ıaza | ard | s | | | | | | | Notes on climate hazard impacts |
| Resources/As | Er | rati | c ra | infa | 11 | | In | icre | ase | d | | | In | icre | ase | d | | | |
| sets | - | | n an | ıd | | | te | mp | era | tur | e/he | a | | oiso | | | | | |
| | | drought | | | | | wav | 'e | | | | ra | in a | nd | flo | odiı | <u> </u> | | |
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Livestock: | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | Increased temperature/heat wave has negative |
| Goat | | | | X | | | | | | X | | | x | | | | | | impacts on goats and chickens. About 40% of |
| Chicken | | | | х | | | | | | Х | | | х | | | | | | chicken and scores of goats and sheep were |
| | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | reported to have died in 2011. |
| Sheep | | | | X | | | | | | X | | | x | | | | | | |
| Duck | | | | х | | | | | | Х | | | х | | | | | | |
| Forest | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Heavy rain and flooding were mentioned as |
| Resources: | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | having affected about 20% of the trees. |
| Abura | | X | | | | | | x | | - | | | | | X | | | | |
| Nyankon | | X | | | | | | x | | | | | | | x | | | | |
| Upaka | | X | | | | | | x | | | | | | | x | | | | |
| Water | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Communities attribute low pumping rates |
| Resources: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | and drying of wells to lowering of water |
| Springs, | | | | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | | X | | tables caused by erratic rainfall |
| streams and | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | pattern/drought and increased |
| creeks | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | temperature/heat wave |
| Rivers | | | х | | | | | | x | | | | х | | | | | | |
| Groundwater | | | | х | | | | | | X | | | х | | | | | | |

Table 22: Sensitivity of Financial Capital Assets to Climate hazards

| Extent to w | Extent to which financial resources/assets are influenced negatively by climate hazards identified in the climate context | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|------|------|-----|------|---|----|-------|------|------|-----|----|-------------|-------------------|------|------|------|----|--|--|--|--|
| | (0 = no influence, 5 = full influence) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Financial | | | | | | | C | lim | ate | haz | arc | ls | | | | | | | | | | |
| Resources / | E | rrat | ic r | ain | fall | | In | cre | ase | d | | | In | cre | ease | d | | | | | | |
| Assets | pa | atte | rn a | nd | | | te | mp | erat | ture | e/ | | ep | oiso | des | of l | hea | vy | Notes on climate hazards | | | |
| | dı | oug | ght | | | | he | eat v | wav | 'e | | | ra | rain and flooding | | | odiı | ng | | | | |
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | | | | | | | | | |
| Livestock: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Farmers claimed that increased temperature/heat | | | |
| Goat | | | | х | | | | | | х | | | х | | | | | | wave has negative effects on goats and chicken. | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Estimated 100 goats died in 2011causing a | | | |
| Chicken | | | | х | | | | | | х | | | х | | | | | | financial loss of about US\$ 6,500. About 40% of | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | chicken (1,524) died causing financial loss of | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | US\$ 7,620 | | | |
| Sheep | | | | X | | | | | | х | | | х | | | | | | About 50% of the sheep and ducks were reported | | | |
| Duck | | | | X | | | | | | х | | | х | | | | | | to have died due to dehydration. | | | |
| Crops: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Farmers claimed that increased temperature/heat | | | |
| Rice | | | | X | | | | | | | X | | | | | X | | | wave has led to as much as 10-15% failure in | | | |
| Cassava | х | | | | | | X | | | | | | x | | | | | | upland rice production. In financial terms this is | | | |
| Vegetable | | | x | | | | | | | X | | | | x | | | | | translates to a loss of about US\$ 24,500-36,750 | | | |
| Plantain | х | | | | | | | х | | | | | | х | | | | | in Zleh town. Also farmers claimed that flooding | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | caused as much as over 95% swamp rice yield | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | production decline was reported for some people. | | | |

Table 23: Sensitivity of Physical Resources (Assets) to Climate hazards

| Extent to whi | Extent to which physical resources/assets are influenced negatively by climate hazards identified in the climate context | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|----|--|-----------|------|---|--|--|--|
| Financial | | (0 = no influence, 5 = full influence) Climate hazards Notes on climate hazards | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Resources/ | Er | Erratic rainfall Increased | | | | | | | | | | | cre | | | | | |
| Assets | - | attern and temp rought heat | | | | | | - | | | e/ | | | oiso | | | | |
| | 0 | oug 1 | 1 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | eat wave rain and flooding 1 2 3 4 5 0 1 2 3 4 5 | | | | | 1110 2 | 3 | | | | |
| Irrigation facilities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bridges | X | | | | | | х | | | | | | | | x | | | Heavy rain and floods have negative effects on |
| Roads | x | | | | | | x x x x rural infrastructures, especially the bridges | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | where as much as 50% damage have been reported by the farmers. |

Table 24: Sensitivity of Human Resources (Assets) to Climate hazards

| Extent to w | Extent to which human resources/ assets are influenced negatively by climate hazards identified in the climate context | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|------|----|---|------|----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|----|------|-----|-----|------|----|--|
| | (0 = no influence, 5 = full influence) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Human | | Climate hazards Notes on climate hazards | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Resources | Er | Erratic rainfall Incre | | | | ease | d | | | In | icre | ase | d | | | | | | |
| | pa | tter | n ar | nd | | | te | mp | era | tur | e/ | | ep | oiso | des | of | hear | vy | |
| | dr | oug | ht | | | | he | eat | way | ve | | | ra | in a | and | flo | odiı | ng | |
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Rice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Appropriate sensitivity level not clear for any of |
| production | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | the climate change hazards. However exposure |
| capabilities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | to scourge of heat and colds ailments associated |
| - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | with frequent rain could impede capability to |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | work effectively in the field |
| Fishing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
| capabilities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 25: Sensitivity of Social Resources (Assets) to Climate hazards

| Extent to | Extent to which social resources/assets are influenced negatively by climate hazards identified in the climate context (0 = no influence, 5 = full influence) | | | | | | | | | | | | | ~ | | - | - | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|-------------------|------|---|---|---|---|
| Social | | Climate hazard | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Notes on climate hazards |
| Resources | pa | Erratic rainfall pattern and drought 0 1 2 3 4 | | | | Increased temperature/ heat wave | | | | | | | oiso | ase des and | of l | | • | | |
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| AMENU Farmer group | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Appropriate sensitivity level not determined. However, the existence of farmer organizations is a positive attribute that could quickly strengthen the institutional adaptive capacity of farmers to respond to the climate change risks. |
| Women groups | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

4.2.3 Assessing Current Community Coping Strategies to climate change in Zleh Town, Gharzon District

This section presents the current coping strategies that the communities are using to address the various climate risks they face, as well as the effectiveness of these strategies. As shown in the Table 26 below, the most effective coping strategy, according to farmers is increasing use of lowland farming to address the risk of crop failure due to water stress. This is followed by crop diversification and intercropping with cassava to address the impact of heat wave during sensitive stages of plant growth.

| | ommunity coping strategie | 0 | | | | | 0 | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|------|-----|---|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| Climate | Climate change risks | Current coping | Effe | | | | | | Remarks/ Notes |
| change | | strategies | copi | - 4 | | | | _ | |
| hazards | | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Erratic rainfall/ | Crop failure and low | Planting resistant | | | | Х | | | Limited awareness |
| irregular | productivity due to water | rice variety (LAC- | | | | | | | |
| rainfall pattern | stress | 23 upland rice) | | | | | | | |
| and drought | | Increased lowland | | | | | | х | Currently the most assuring |
| | | farming | | | | | | | farms (80-85% farmers are |
| | | | | | | | | | into lowland farming in Zleh, |
| | | | | | | | | | Tian and Gaye towns |
| Increased | Crop failure and low | Diversification and | | | | Х | | | Most farmers prefer rice, but |
| temperature/ | productivity of rice due to | intercropping with | | | | | | | cassava and others are |
| heat wave | heat wave especially | cassava | | | | | | | helping. For example, Tian |
| | during sensitive stages of | | | | | | | | town reported 100% |
| | planting, germination and | | | | | | | | intercropping with cassava |
| | maturation of grains | | | | | | | | · · · · |
| | Crop failure and low | IPM (Integrated | | | х | | | | Limited awareness |
| | productivity due to | Pest Management) | | | | | | | |
| | increased pests and | system | | | | | | | |
| τ | diseases | Observation, | | | | | | | NT-4 |
| Increased | Crop failure and low | reduced sand | | Х | | | | | Not really helping |
| episodes of heavy rain and | productivity due to flooding | mining and shifting | | | | | | | |
| flooding | nooding | to upland | | | | | | | |
| nooung | | production | | | | | | | |
| | Low crop productivity | Crop rotation/ | | | х | | | | Lack of extension services |
| | resulting from soil erosion | intercropping | | | л | | | | Lack of extension services |
| | and reduced fertility due to | intereropping | | | | | | | |
| | land degradation | | | | | | | | |
| | Low productivity due to | Use of IPM as | | | х | | | | Limited awareness |
| | increased pest and diseases | mentioned above | | | | | | | |
| Vulnerabilities | | | | | | | | | |
| | ability due to limited | Mining and hunting | | х | | | | | Not profitable or gainful |
| | ces of income and | | | | | | | | 1 0 |
| livelihoods | | | | | | | | | |
| Increased vulnera | ability due to limited access | Assessing credit | | х | | | | | Not helping due to high |
| to credit | | through susu | | | | | | | interest rates and short |
| | | - | | | | | | | repayment duration. Currently |
| | | | | | | | | | only 25% of farmers have |
| | | | | | | | | | access to susu |
| Increased vulner | ability due to high post | Individual rice | | Х | | | | | Availability of shaded areas |
| harvest losses | | kitchen | | | | | | | keep reducing; |

Table 26: Community coping strategies to climate change, Zleh Town

Note: Scale of zero (0) means NOT effective.

5.0 PROPOSED ADAPTATION OPTIONS FOR BONG AND GRAND GEDEH COUNTIES

This section presents potential climate change adaption options applicable for both Bong and Grand Gedeh Counties. The adaptation measures are identified for each of the current climate risks facing the target communities.

| Table 27: Proposed Common Climate Change adaptation Measures for Bong and Grand Gedeh |
|---|
| Counties and the potential obstacles for adoption |

| | and the potential obstacles for adoption | Detential al starl |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| Climate risks facing | Proposed Adaptation options and practices | Potential obstacle |
| agriculture in Bong and Grand Gedeh | | that can hinder |
| | | adaptation by |
| Counties Crop failure and low | Promote drought resistant rice variety (Lac-23). This is currently | farmers Skepticism, lack of |
| | used by 50% of farmers in Panta and Gharzon District. There is need | information and |
| productivity due to | | |
| water stress | to increase coverage to all farmers (100%) | training |
| | Lowland/ Swamp rice production: | Limited knowledge, |
| | Improve reliability of water supply in the swamp through establishment of water harvesting systems, like valley dams and | awareness and capacity to develop |
| | valley tank/ reservoirs with appropriate water control measures. | swamp farms |
| | Promote ecosystem/watershed management approach to ensure | swamp tarms |
| | that runoff from the surrounding upland areas are infiltrating | |
| | and recharging the groundwater system upon which the swamp | |
| | water for rice depends. | |
| | Train and organize farmers into watershed or catchment | |
| | development associations/committees | |
| | Upland rice production: | Limited knowledge |
| | \triangleright Reduce water stress by rainwater harvesting through small | and awareness |
| | farmer reservoir systems, mini-ponds, trenches and terracing | |
| | Maintenance of permanent soil cover through crop residue | |
| | retention to increase soil organic matter and reduce water stress | |
| Crop failure and low | Reduce floods by developing water control and drainage | Limited knowledge |
| productivity due to | systems | and awareness |
| flooding | Reduce floods by promoting ecosystem/watershed management | |
| nooung | approach to ensure that runoff from the surrounding upland | |
| | areas are reduced by infiltrating and recharging the groundwater | |
| | systems. | |
| | > Train and organize farmers into watershed or catchment | |
| | development associations/committees | |
| Low crop productivity | Lowland/ Swamp rice production: | Limited knowledge, |
| resulting from soil | > System of Rice Intensification (SRI) introduced in the two sites | training and awareness |
| erosion and reduced | via farmer validation methodologies including the use of | 0 |
| fertility due to land | legumes in rice cycle to help maintain fertility and reduce labor | |
| degradation | time needed for weeding (mucuna). | |
| | Incorporation of stover into small animal husbandry systems as | |
| | opposed to burning, after animal use can be returned to the land | |
| | and enriched for improving soil cover and fertility. | |
| | | |
| | Upland production: | |
| | > Use of legumes in crop cycle, especially with maize to help | |
| | maintain fertility and reduce labor time needed for weeding | |
| | (mucuna) | |
| | Support national program in identification and management of | |
| | rice seed varieties, starting with the women of the pilot | |
| | communities as the prelude to a national seed project | |
| | Experiment with alternatives to slash and burn (for example, introducing conservation agriculture to reduce need for rotation; | |
| | introducing conservation agriculture to reduce need for rotation; | |
| | elimination of burning; mulching; incorporating national leguminous trees; intercropping; use of small ruminants; review | |
| | seed selection and broadcasting practices and alternatives | |
| | experimented with | |
| | Introduce communal seed beds for maintenance of all varieties | |
| | of key crops used on individual plots | |
| | Promote soil and water conservation systems (gully plugs/ | |
| | gabions, contour bunds, silt traps, check dams, mulching, buffer | |
| | strips, etc) | |
| | Promote integrated soil fertility management through such | |
| 1 | such such som forting management unbugh such | |

| Climate risks facing agriculture in Bong and Grand Gedeh Counties | Proposed Adaptation options and practices | Potential obstacle that can hinder adaptation by farmers |
|--|---|--|
| | practices such as: green manure legumes, N-fixing agro-forestry trees, composting and animal manure application. Promote Sloping Agriculture Technology (SALT) including agro-forestry | |
| Low productivity due to increased pest and diseases | Promote crop varieties resistant to pests and diseases Train farmers on integrated pest management (IPM) | Limited knowledge |
| Addressing current vuln | erabilities: | |
| Increased vulnerability due to limited alternative sources of income and livelihoods | Support the FFS on diversification of livelihoods opportunities, this may include the following activities, among others: Integrated rice-fish culture/production system Bee keeping for honey production Poultry production Food processing/value addition | Solvency of farmers Competition from other activities such as mining |
| Increased vulnerability due to limited access to credit | Strengthening of savings/credit clubs (90% of farmers into savings and credit clubs), and strengthening CBOs and Co-ops. This will help in strengthening community management of their resource assets and livelihood diversification | Interest rates and payment periods Solvency of farmers Competition from other activities such as mining |
| Increased vulnerability due to high post- harvest losses | Improve local post harvest/storage systems Enhanced access to markets Development of processing facilities | Infrastructure |

6.0 GUIDELINE TOWARDS FORMULATING FFS CURRICULUM FOR CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION IN LIBERIA $^{\rm 1}$

The proposed FFS curriculum is designed to initiate discussion among FAO Liberia, the Ministry of Agriculture and Cuttington University towards developing an appropriate and tailored curriculum for Liberian farmers, and in particular for the implementation of GEF climate change adaptation project in Bong and Grand Gedeh Counties.

Following the development of FFS Approach by FAO in 1980s for rice-based farming systems in South East Asia and its successful adaptation for other crops across the world, there is now renewed and urgent interest for it to be used in farming communities affected by climate change. As a farmer training and learning methodology, it has a huge potential to empower communities to increase knowledge and skills for problem solving so that they can take self-initiatives in making adaptations decisions on climate change and climate variability. Since 2007, a number of experiences have been documented, particularly, in Asia where FFS have been tried for climate change adaptation. In the Philippines, the Local Government of Dumangas has implemented a Climate Field School project as an innovative disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation strategy, where capacity of farmers were built to monitor changing weather and climate pattern and accordingly adjust their farming

¹ Sources consulted:

^{1.} FAO Uganda (2010). Facilitators' Guide for Running a Farmer Field School

^{2.} FAO Kenya (2002). Training Guide on the Farmers Field School Methodology: Approach and Procedures

FAO Renya (2002). Training Guide on the Families Fried School Training Climate Forecast to Farmers Through Climate Field School: Indonesian Experience

^{4.} Narteh L.T, C.M Soumare, S. Makhfousse, Batello and P. Kenmore (2010). Farmer Field Schools for Climate adaptation to enhance farmer's resilience.

practices. In Indonesia, the Climate Field School approach was implemented and found efficient and effective for communicating the information needed for adaptation to climate change. In Uganda, the Farmer Field School approach is being used currently to implement the country Global Climate Change Alliance project.

The curriculum being proposed for discussion in the context of Liberia draws inspiration from the experiences in the Philippines and Indonesia. The general content of the FFS process and curriculum development as presented here is consistent with the published FAO FFS Training guides and procedures in use in Uganda, Kenya and elsewhere. This brief outline, therefore, is meant to be only a discussion guide in developing a curriculum that would be suitable and appropriate for Liberia. A brief description of FFS Approach and concept is provided in Annex 3.

6.1 Why FFS approach for climate change adaptation

Successful farming activities under conditions of increasing climate variability are dependent on climate information. The changing rainfall pattern and planting dates in Liberia will continue to occur, with decreasing or increasing moisture depending on the extent of climate variability. Even times of adequate rainfall, Liberia has occasionally experienced periods of dry weather which interrupted plant growth and reduced productivity. These factors are major contributors to the vulnerability rural poor farmers. Therefore, new approaches, like, Climate Smart Agriculture are required to ensure and improve productivity in the face of changing climate and variability.

Assessments show that the capability of farmers to use climate forecast or even indigenous knowledge to anticipate weather events for planning is very limited. More so, the few available agricultural extension workers lack the ability to use or translate climate information for supporting farming activities. Yet their role as the main mediator for transferring new knowledge or technology to farmers is crucial. With the overall capacity and systematic mechanism at national and local levels for collecting and analyzing weather information for agricultural activities being very limited, transferring knowledge of climate to farmers may require time. Learning by doing through FFS may be one of the few effective options for transferring knowledge or climate information to Liberian farmers.

Thus the proposed FFS curriculum for climate change adaptation must be designed towards: (1) increasing farmer's knowledge on climate and ability to anticipate extreme climate events for their farming activities; (2) assisting farmers in observing climatic parameters and its use for supporting farming activities, and (3) assisting farmers how to translate the climate (forecast) information for supporting farming activities, in particular, planting decision and cropping strategy.

6.2 The process for developing FFS curriculum for climate change adaptation

The process of developing FFS curriculum for climate change adaptation can be divided into two phases.

The first phase known as pre-experiment phase or the *Phase of socialization* can be conducted over a minimum period of 12 weeks (i.e. 12 meetings in 4 months or one season). Though, ideally eight months or two planning seasons (24 meetings – i.e. 12 meetings in dry season and 12 meeting meetings in wet season) is highly recommended especially for long-term projects. This phase aims to increase farmer's knowledge on climate and use of climate (forecast) information for designing cropping strategy.

The second phase known as the experimentation phase is the *phase of institutionalization*. This is a phase for implementation of further activities in the form of actions done by farmers as FFS participants. This phase is carried out after the socialization or pre-experiment phase for two or more planting seasons, depending on the duration of the project. The phase aims to build farmers capacity on how to put into practice the knowledge they have acquired.

Important note: Before the beginning any of these phases, the agricultural extension workers and FFS facilitators from the target counties and districts must be selected for intensive training covering all key aspects of basic climatology (weather and climate information for decision making) including special topics. This intensive training can be designed for 4 weeks. Based on the knowledge obtained, the agricultural extension workers and FFS facilitators along with their trainers, farmers and other stakeholders will together develop the FFS curriculum.

Table 28 presents an example of FFS curriculum biased towards climate change adaptation. This example can be modified or tailored to meet the local needs in Liberia.

| Period | : FFS Curriculum Guide for Climate Change Adaptation |
|----------------------|--|
| | Topic and Contents |
| PHASE 1: | |
| Pre- experim | ent phase/ Phase of Socialization (12 weeks): Before the first rainy season starts |
| rie experim | ent phase, I have of Socialization (12 weeks). Defore the mist fully season starts |
| Objective: To | o increase farmer's knowledge on climate and use of climate (forecast) information for designing |
| cropping strate | egy. |
| Weeks 1 & 2 | Farmer field school methodology |
| | ✓ Concepts and principles of farmer field schools |
| | ✓ Steps in establishing a farmer field school |
| | ✓ Organization and management |
| Week 3 | Knowing about Elements of Weather and Climate |
| | \checkmark To introduce elements of weather and climate |
| | \checkmark To build ability to differentiate between weather and climate |
| Week 4 | Process of Rain Formation |
| | \checkmark To study the process of rainfall formation |
| | \checkmark To develop better understanding on the importance of forest in retaining water |
| Week 5 | Developing Understanding on Terminologies Used in Seasonal climate Forecast |
| | ✓ To develop capacity to understand the meaning of NORMAL, BELOW NORMAL, |
| | and ABOVE NORMAL classification of weather events |
| | \checkmark To develop capacity to translate the seasonal climate forecast used by Meteorology |
| | Department to local condition considering the trend in rainfall data measured by the |
| | farmers |
| Week 6 | Develop Understanding on Probability Concept (Forecast Contains Error) |
| | \checkmark To develop better understanding of probability concept and skill of forecast in climate |
| | forecasting and its relation to decision making |
| Week 7 | Introduction To Measuring Tools for Weather/Climate: Weather measurement, equipment and |
| | ways of calibrating data |
| | ✓ To introduce instruments used for measuring weather/climate elements |
| | \checkmark To learn factors affecting the accuracy of data measured by non-standard instrument |
| | \checkmark To learn how to calibrate data which is not measured using standard method. |
| Week 8 | How to Use Climate Forecast Information for Setting Up Planting Strategies |
| | \checkmark To develop better understanding on how climate extreme events will affect the crop |
| | (e.g. relationship between cropping rotation and planting time on level of damaged |
| | crops, etc,) |
| | \checkmark To develop better capacity in using seasonal climate forecast in setting up cropping |
| | strategies (to avoid or minimize effect of drought, heat wave and floods) |
| Week 9 | Learning about Water Balance Concept and Its Use to asses irrigation water requirement and |
| | flood risk |
| | \checkmark To develop better understanding the meaning of rainfall deficit from |
| | evapotranspiration |
| | \checkmark To develop better capacity on how to estimate irrigation water requirement and simple |

water balance

| | \checkmark To assess risk of flood from water balance analysis | |
|------------------|--|--|
| Week 10 | Learning community-based adaptation planning | |
| | \checkmark To develop better understanding on how to conduct climate risks and vulnerability | |
| | assessments | |
| | ✓ To develop community-based CC adaptation plan at farm and catchment/ watershed | |
| | level | |
| Week 11 | Participatory Technology Development | |
| | \checkmark To develop analytical skills to investigate into cause-effect relationship of problems in | |
| | farming practices and design, implement and monitor local response for addressing | |
| | them | |
| | \checkmark To learn how to learn | |
| Week 12 | Assessing the Economic Value of Climate Forecast information/climate change adaptation | |
| | \checkmark To develop better capacity to quantify the economic benefit of using climate forecast | |
| | information and climate change adaptation | |
| Exposure/field v | visit to a functioning weather station, research institutions, farmers, etc, to observe application of | |
| | | |

techniques covered

PHASE 2:

Implementation/ Experimental phase or Institutionalization Phase (12-20 weeks) while study crops are growing (planting to harvesting, processing)

Objective: To build farmers capacity on how to practice climate knowledge/climate adaptation in their farming activities.

| activities. | |
|-------------------|---|
| Weeks 12-13 | Agro-ecosystem analysis |
| | ✓ Principles and concepts |
| | ✓ Developing monitoring indicators |
| Weeks 14-15 | Soil properties and functions |
| | ✓ Physical |
| | ✓ Chemical |
| | ✓ Biological |
| Weeks 16-17 | Local indicators of soil quality |
| | ✓ Terms to describe soil processes and characteristics |
| Weeks 18-19 | Land use planning (at watershed/ catchment level) |
| | ✓ Land suitability classification |
| Weeks 20-24 | Agroforestry/ Tree planting for fuel wood |
| | ✓ Role in environment management |
| | \checkmark Shrubs and trees for soil fertility improvement |
| | Tree nursery establishment and management |
| | Technologies (woodlots, improved fallows, etc.) |
| | ✓ Fruit tree establishment and management |
| Weeks 25-26 | Crop husbandry/ sustainable agriculture adaptation options |
| | ✓ Pest and disease management |
| | ✓ Agronomic practices |
| | ✓ Agro-biodiversity |
| Weeks 27-32 | Conservation agriculture principles and concepts/ Soil and land management adaptation |
| | options |
| | ✓ Tillage systems |
| | ✓ Cover crops |
| ✓ Weed management | |
| | ✓ Soil and water conservation |
| | ✓ Farm machinery & power/ Animal traction |
| | Water management adaptation options |
| | ✓ Water-conserving technologies |
| | ✓ Rainwater harvesting and capture |
| | Livestock adaptation options |

| | ✓ Production adjustments ✓ Breeding strategies |
|-------------|---|
| Weeks 33-34 | 6 6 |
| weeks 55-54 | Support the FFS on diversification of livelihoods opportunities, this may include the following |
| | activities, among others: |
| | Integrated rice-fish culture/ production system |
| | Bee keeping for honey production |
| | > Poultry production |
| | Food processing/ Value addition |
| | |

Exposure/field visit to a functioning farmer field school, research station, individual farmers, etc., to see successful practices

| Post-experiment | phase: After experimentation, and includes period after graduation | | |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| Weeks 34-35 | Adoption and adaptation of conservation agriculture | | |
| | ✓ Challenges to adoption/adaptation in farming systems | | |
| | ✓ Cost benefit analysis | | |
| Weeks 36-37 | Networking and advocacy | | |
| | ✓ Importance of networking | | |
| Weeks 38-39 | Farmer field school sustainability and up-scaling | | |
| | ✓ Revolving fund | | |
| Weeks 40-41 | Market research | | |
| | ✓ Group marketing | | |
| Weeks 42-43 | Graduation | | |
| | \checkmark Review of what has been learned | | |
| | ✓ Challenges, learning process and way forward | | |
| | ✓ Graduation preparations | | |
| | sit to a 2 nd generation farmer field school to see success of adoption, adaptation, | | |
| networking and su | ustainability | | |
| | | | |

6.3 Proposed FFS Sites

The following are the proposed sites for establishing FFS for climate change adaptation:

Bong County: (1) Foequelleh; (2) Belemue; (3) Garmu; and (4) Siaquelleh

Grand Gedeh: (1) Tian town; (2) Zleh town; (3) Gaye town; (4) Pouh Town

7.0 PROPOSED PROJECT FRAMEWORK/LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This section presents proposed project logical framework (Table 29).

| | Objectives | Objective Indicators | Means of Verification | Assumptions |
|---------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Goal | To Enhance Resilience of rural communities and Agriculture Production System in Bong and Grand Gedeh Counties to cope with Climate Change | % increase in sustained agricultural productivity and income generation- productivity per unit land, productivity per unit water, productivity per animal/ livestock. % increase in value of livelihood capital assets % reduction in production risks, and vulnerability of community and ecosystem to CC risk | Annual Reports by the Ministry of Agriculture and County Agriculture Offices | |
| Purpose/ Outcome | To improve Adaptive capacity of communities and the agricultural production system through farmer field schools approach | % increase in local food security Proportion of communities who are knowledgeable on climate change adaptation Proportion of communities who have adopted and applying climate adaptation practices Degree/ extent the agriculture productions are rehabilitated or restored | Annual Monitoring & Evaluation reports of the County Agriculture Offices | Overall political and economic environment favorable to implementatio n of proposed climate change adaptation interventions |
| | Output | Output indicators | | |
| Output 1 | Baseline analysis of current climate change undertaken at two demonstration sites and community adaptation strategies and plans in place | Baseline reports developed and shared to concerned stakeholders Community adaptation strategies and plans developed | MOA Reports and Project annual reports, County Agriculture annual reports | Existing linkages and partnerships among various participating stakeholders remains favorable |
| Activity | | Activity indicators | | |
| Activity 1.1 | Conduct baseline survey per pilot community | Type and number of survey conducted | Project reports Baseline reports | |
| Activity 1.2 | Document prevailing natural resources use strategies in pilot communities | Type and number of documentation with emphasis on gender | Project reports | |

Table 29: The Project Logical Framework

| Objectives | | Objective Indicators | Means of Verification | Assumptions |
|--------------|--|---|--|--|
| Activity 1.3 | Develop analytical report on formal and informal institutional arrangements | Types and number of reports | Project reports | |
| Activity 1.4 | Conduct vulnerability study and relevant report shared | Agricultural measures introduced to respond to climate-sensitive diseases (type and level) | Project reports Study report | |
| Activity 1.5 | Review all current FFS curriculum | Type and number of FFS curriculum reviewed | Project reports | |
| Activity 1.6 | Select and train eight FFS facilitator for 14 days | Number of FFS facilitators selected per specialty | Training reports | |
| | | Number of FFS facilitators trained in FFS methodology and concept | Project reports | |
| Activity 1.7 | Edit the FFS Facilitators' guidelines | Type of facilitator's guidelines edited | Project reports | |
| Output | | Output Indicators | | |
| Output 2 | Local community based adaptation strategies and plans implemented. At least four adaptation options and locally adapted innovations enhancing resilience to | Number and types of climate change adaptation strategies/ plans implemented Number of climate change innovation techniques tested and | M&E Reports Evidence of adaptation testing and demonstration | Farmers acceptance of proposed technologies and practices/ active |
| | climate change tested in demonstration sites | adapted to the local condition. | | participation |
| Activity | | Activity indicators | | |
| Activity 2.1 | Identify and document local coping mechanisms | Type and number of coping mechanisms identified | Project report | |
| Activity 2.2 | Test and adapt innovations to local circumstances | Type and number of innovations tested and adapted by local farmers, CBOs disaggregated by gender | Project report | |
| Activity 2.3 | Implement key adaptive measures from the local adaptation strategies and action plans | Type and number of appropriate adaptation strategies and action plans implemented | Project report | |
| Activity 2.4 | Project staff and extension services provide help/ facilitate farmers adoption of local adaptation strategies and plans | Type of technical/ extension services provided to farmers | Project reports, project documents | |
| Activity 2.5 | identify location specifically suitable adaptation measures | Number of suitable / appropriate adaption measures identified | | |
| Activity 2.6 | Identify climate information needs of the farmers and convey to relevant stakeholders the needed climate and weather | Types of climate change information needs identified and shared with relevant stakeholders | | |

| Objectives | | Objectives Objective Indicators | | Assumptions |
|--------------|--|---|---|-------------|
| | information | | | |
| Output | | Output indicators | | |
| Output 3 | County agriculture plans in Bong and Grand Gedeh account for potential climate risks and incorporate building of climate change resilience as a key component | Evidence of climate change mainstreaming in the Country agriculture plans/ strategy | Country agriculture sector plans and policy documents | |
| Activity 3.1 | Integrate extension officers in project activities; negotiate time allocation in work plans provide budgetary support | Number of work hours extension workers dedicate to the project implementation at field levels (in pilot counties) and logistical support functional | Project monitoring reports Project reports | |
| Activity 3.2 | Mainstream climate information and lessons learned on climate risk management and adaptation in county – level planning processes | Type and no of county planning documents and processes mainstreaming climate info and lessons learned CRM&A | Project reports | |
| Activity 3.3 | Organize site visits for relevant county representative and other interested communities | No and type of site visits as well as type of county representatives attending / site visit report | Project reports | |
| Activity 3.4 | Support the establishment of climate change adaptation interventions | Types and no of adaptation interventions and number of groups and individual farmers benefiting | Project M&E reports | |
| Activity 3.5 | Establish sub county network out of meeting convened with all established FFS within the same sub county | Type and no of sub county networks established Number of community members in the network | Project M&E reports | |
| Activity 3.6 | Develop sustainability strategies (savings mechanism and market linkages and financing opportunities) | Type and no of saving mechanisms developed as well as market linkages and financing mechanisms established | Project M&E Report | |
| Output | | Output indicators | | |
| Output 4 | Agricultural policies and donor investments are guided by adaptation learning at demonstration sites and integrate a land use and livelihood strategy that helps local farmers build critically needed climate change resilience | Evidence of project learning integrated into Liberia Agricultural policies and donor investments | | |

| Objectives | | Objective Indicators | Means of Verification | Assumptions |
|---------------|--|--|--|-------------|
| Activity | | Activity Indicators | | |
| Activity 4.1 | Conduct specific policy makers round table events and make tangible policy contribution | No of roundtable policy events conducted and of participants | Project reports | |
| Activity 4.2 | Discuss the key findings from the demonstration sites | No of meetings organized to discuss findings | Project reports | |
| Activity 4.3 | Promote community management of resources and livelihood diversification | Types of resource and livelihood diversification introduced | Project reports | |
| Activity 4.4 | Strengthen farmers' organizations and marketing opportunities for farmers sustaining incentives to produce above subsistence levels through offering of enabling environment | Number of farmer organizations strengthened | Project reports | |
| Activity 4.5 | Meeting with all the facilitators to review implementation process and identify requirement for implementation adjustments | No of reviews conducted | Project reports | |
| Activity 4.6 | Evaluate the process, share experiences and discuss lessons learned in each session | No of evaluations conducted | Evaluation report Project report | |
| Activity 4.7 | Meet with non participants in the targeted areas and from other villages to share experiences and display study and commercial plots | No of experience sharing visit conducted No of villages participated | Project reports | |
| Activity 4.8 | Visit other FFS groups within the same sub counties and from other sub county networks | No of visits to other FFS groups No of people participated | Project reports | |
| Activity 4.9 | Organize graduation day for all participants | No of graduation organized No of people participated | Project reports | |
| Activity 4.10 | Identify implementing agencies to carry out further establishment of FFS | No of implementing agencies identified | Project reports | |
| Activity 4.11 | Promote FFS concept within local community and central government, national and international NGOs, UN Agencies, Donors among others | No of key stakeholders aware of FFS concept | Project reports | |

8.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section highlights some key messages from the N-A mission that may require further attention and consideration in developing the final package of Climate Change Adaptation strategies for implementation:

- <u>Climate risks</u>: The key climate hazards facing communities of Bong and Grand Gedeh Counties are: (1) erratic rainfall/irregular rainfall pattern and drought; (2) increased temperature/heat wave and (3) increased episodes of heavy rain and flooding. The major risk that farmers face from these hazards is the crop failure and low productivity due to combinations of: (a) water stress; (c) heat wave during sensitive stages of rice growth; (c) flooding; d) erosion and reduced soil fertility and (e) increased pest and diseases.
- 2. Exposure to climate change: The livelihood assets mostly affected by the climate hazards are the lowland/swamp and upland rice areas as well as livestock (such as goat, sheep, pig) and poultry. In Pant District of Bong County, as much as 350 ha and 1,518 ha of lowland/swamp and uplands areas, respectively, belonging to over 1,500 farmers experienced water stress brought by the erratic rainfall pattern and increased temperature, with the swamp area being vulnerable to flooding during intense rainfall. While in Grand Gedeh County, over 80,000 ha of lowland/swamp areas are at the risk of constant flooding every season. Equally, goats, sheep and pig as well as poultry have been affected by increased temperature/heat wave.
- 3. <u>Sensitivity to climate change</u>: Overall, rice is the most sensitive crop to climate change followed by cocoa. Goats, sheep and poultry are equally sensitive to climate change and have been impacted by the increased temperature/heat wave. In Bong County, both the germination and crop failures to water stress are 40% and 60%, respectively. In Grand Gedeh, some farmers have incurred as much as 80-85% loss of lowland rice crop due to flooding. For upland rice, some farmers have reported a loss as much as 10-15% due to water stress. The least sensitive crop is cassava, which farmers grow as a food security crop, incase rice fails.
- 4. <u>Current coping strategies</u>: The overall effectiveness of the current coping strategies used by farmers is low. Most farmers expressed preference for drought resistant rice variety (LAC 23 for uplands) as an effective adaptation strategy for reducing the effect of water stress on rice. The potential barriers to farmers coping strategies or application of other adaptation measures is lack of capacity and limited knowledge.
- 5. Water control and management: Drought/water stress and floods are two most direct impacts of climate variability and change facing farmers in Bong and Grand Gedeh Counties. Seasonal floods affect as much as 25% to 100% of lowland rice areas in both Counties, thereby making water management and control systems an important adaptation strategy for the farmers. The drought and floods problems must be dealt with in an integrated way. This means water management interventions for the lowland (swamps) and upland farm areas must be planned as one integrated ecosystem. Mitigating floods requires retarding the rate of run-off from the surrounding uplands or watersheds through conservation practices to increase infiltration of storm rainfall and surface detention of flood-runoff. The watershed or catchment approach is one of the most efficient ways to jointly deal with both drought and floods problems facing the farmers.

The practical implication is that the proposed FFS groups in Bong and Grand Gedeh County must be organized on watershed/catchment basis in order to effectively deal with drought and flood issues affecting the lowland and upland rice cultivation. However, other livelihood strategies and group development initiatives can still be done as per FFS basis.

- 6. <u>Climate information and advisory support to farmers:</u> First of all, the available meteorological data are insufficient and unconsolidated in both Counties as well as in the Country. There is no operational agro-meteorological information system which can provide farmers with advice and warning during the cropping seasons. Farmers would like to know when the next rain would come and end for the planting season. And when it does come, they would like to know whether it would be enough or too much. If not enough, what can be done to address the short fall or the consequence of the short fall, and if too much, what can be done to take care of the excess water to minimize production loses. These are farmers concerns that must be factored in any future climate information and advisory services to support adaptation. Responding effectively to these concerns should require: (1) tools and resources available at County level, for example the rain gauges and E-station at CARI, must become operational. County MOA staff and farmers must use properly the rain gauge already distributed and for which they received training. This will be an indispensable tool for GEF project implementation of FFS. (2) collecting and analyzing weather information regularly, which could mean as much as providing weather summary; (3) collecting location specific and crop specific information containing description of prevailing weather, soil and crop condition and suggestions for taking appropriate measures to reduce production loses, and (4) using climate advisory as an early warning function to alert farmers on the implication of various weather events (such as extreme temperature, erratic rainfall, heavy rains, floods, etc).
- 7. <u>Gender and climate change impact:</u> Testimonies from the communities indicate that women are more vulnerable to the impacts of climate change because of the economic role they play and the numerous household tasks they perform. Therefore, women should be prioritized for any livelihood diversification opportunities being promoted by the project.

Annex 1: The FFS Approach and Concept

Broad Objectives

To bring farmers together to carry out collective and collaborative inquiry with the purpose of initiating community action in solving community problems

Specific Objectives

- 1. To empower farmers with knowledge and skills to make them experts in their own fields.
- 2. To sharpen the farmer's ability to make critical and informed decisions that render their farming profitable and sustainable.
- 3. To sensitize farmers in new ways of thinking and problem solving.
- 4. Help farmers learn how to organize themselves and their communities.

FFS also contribute to the following objective;

- 1. Shorten the time it takes to get research results from the stations to adoption in farmers' field by involving farmers' experimentation early in the technology development process.
- 2. Enhance the capacity of extension staff, working in collaboration with researchers, to serve as facilitators of farmers' experiential learning. Rather than prescribing blanket recommendation that cover a wide geographic area but may not be relevant to all farms within it, the methods train extensionist and researchers to work with farmers in testing, assessing and adapting a variety of options within their specific local conditions.
- 3. Increase the expertise of farmers to make informed decisions on what works best for them, based on their own observations of experimental plots in their Field schools and to explain their reasoning. No matter how good the researchers and extensions, recommendations must be tailored and adapted to local conditions, for which local expertise and involvement is required that only farmers themselves can supply.
- 4. Establish coherent farmer groups that facilitate the work of research and extension workers, providing the demand of a demand driven system.

Principles of Farmer Field Schools

In the field school, emphasis is laid on growing crops or raising livestock with the least disruption on the agro-ecosystem.

The training methodology is based on learning by doing, through discovery, comparison and a nonhierarchical relationship among the learners and trainers and is carried out almost entirely in the field.

The four major principles within the FFS process are:

- a) Grow a healthy crop
- b) Observe fields regularly
- c) Conserve natural enemies of crop pests
- d) Farmers understand ecology and become experts in their own field

Characteristics of the Farmer Field School Approach

Farmers as Experts: Farmers '*learn-by-doing*' i.e. they carry out for themselves the various activities related to the particular farming/forestry practice they want to study and learn about. This could be related to annual crops, or livestock/fodder production. The key thing is that farmers conduct their own field studies. Their training is based on comparison studies (of different treatments) and field studies that they, not the extension/research staff conduct. In so doing they become experts on the particular practice they are investigating.

The Field is the Learning Place: All learning is based in the field. The rice field, banana plantation, cassava field, or grazing area is where farmers learn. Working in small subgroups they collect data in the field, analyze the data, make action decisions based on the analyses of the data, and present their decisions to the other farmers in the field school for discussion, questioning and refinement.

Extension Workers as Facilitators Not Teachers: The role of the extension worker is very much that of a facilitator rather than a conventional teacher. Once the farmers know what it is they have to do, and what it is that they can observe in the field, the extension worker takes a back seat role, only offering help and guidance when asked to do so.

Presentations during group meetings are the work of the farmers not the extension worker, with the members of each working group assuming responsibility for presenting their findings in turn to their fellow farmers. The extension worker may take part in the subsequent discussion sessions but as a contributor, rather than leaders, in arriving at an agreed consensus on what action needs to be taken at that time.

Scientists/Subject Matter Specialists Work With Rather than Lecture Farmers: The role of scientists and subject matter specialists is to provide backstopping support to the members of the FFS and in so doing to learn to work in a consultative capacity with farmers. Instead of lecturing farmers their role is that of colleagues and advisers who can be consulted for advice on solving specific problems, and who can serve as a source of new ideas and/or information on locally unknown technologies.

The Curriculum is integrated: The curriculum is integrated. Crop husbandry, animal husbandry, horticulture, land husbandry are considered together with ecology, economics, sociology and education to form a holistic approach. Problems confronted in the field are the integrating principle.

Training Follows the Seasonal Cycle: Training is related to the seasonal cycle of the practice being investigated. For annual crops this would extend from land preparation to harvesting. For fodder production would include the dry season to evaluate the quantity and quality at a time of year when livestock feeds are commonly in short supply. For tree production, and conservation measures such as hedgerows and grass strips, training would need to continue over several years for farmers to see for themselves the full range of costs and benefits.

Regular Group Meetings: Farmers meet at agreed regular intervals. For annual crops such meetings may be every 1 or 2 weeks during the cropping season. For other farm/forestry management practices the time between each meeting would depend on what specific activities need to be done, or be related to critical periods of the year when there are key issues to observe and discuss in the field.

Learning Materials are Learner Generated: Farmers generate their own learning materials, from drawings of what they observe, to the field trials themselves. These materials are always consistent with local conditions, are less expensive to develop, are controlled by the learners and can thus be discussed by the learners with others. Learners know the meaning of the materials because they have created the materials. Even illiterate farmers can prepare and fuse simple diagrams to illustrate the points they want to make.

Group Dynamics/Team Building: Training includes communication skills building, problem solving, leadership and discussion methods. Farmers require these skills. Successful activities at the community level require that farmers can apply effective leadership skills and have the ability to communicate their findings to others.

FFS are conducted for the purpose of creating a learning environment in which farmers can master and apply specific land management skills. The emphasis is on empowering farmers to implement their own decisions in their own fields.

Annex 2: List of people consulted in Bong County during focused group discussions

| No. | Name | Title |
|-----|------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | T. Calvin Kollie | СВО |
| 2 | Isaac Yarkpawolo | Farmer |
| 3 | James Nyella | Local Co-op |
| 4 | Lorpu Sulonteh | Women Group |
| 5 | Samuel Tokpah | Elder |
| 6 | Moses Flomo | |
| 7 | Zubon Foster | Field Monitor |
| 8 | Papa Makor | M&E |
| 9 | John Kerkulah | CBO(Bellemue) |
| 10 | David Mulbah | Forquellah Farmer union |
| 11 | Nyama Dolo | Gbarnga siaquelleh |
| 12 | Tim Labella | СВО |
| 13 | John Nyekpea | Youth |
| 14 | James Flomo | Local Environmental (NGO) |
| 15 | Beatrice Saygbeh | Agriculture Student Union |

A. Gbarnga, Bong County December 10, 2012

B. Belemue, Bong County December 10, 2012

| No. | Name | Title |
|-----|----------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | J. Naagbor Payeline | PANFACO |
| 2 | Anthony G. Woah | |
| 3 | Isaac Yarpawolo | |
| 4 | Jacob Koyo | Farmer |
| 5 | Augustine Nuwelee | ςς |
| 6 | Jonathan Woah | ςς |
| 7 | Arison Woah | ςς |
| 8 | Isaac Woah | ςς |
| 9 | Morris Kpoequaryah | PANFACO |
| 10 | Lawrence Garteh | دد |
| 11 | Mary Woah | Farmer/Women Group |
| 12 | Mary Woah | Farmer |
| 13 | Thou Mulbah | PANFACO |
| 14 | William George | ςς |
| 15 | Emmanuel Kollie | Farmer |
| 16 | Kolubao Mulbah | دد |
| 17 | Johnson Paye | Pastor |
| 18 | Yorgboe Woah | Farmer |
| 19 | Nyanpu Woah | دد |
| 20 | Thou Vulu | دد |
| 21 | Emmanuel P. Kpolorpolunyan | دد |
| 22 | Halary George | دد |
| 23 | Ezekiel Dolo | دد |
| 24 | Joseph Dolo | " |
| 25 | Peter Kpanah | ζζ |
| 26 | Genesis P. Kollie | " |
| 27 | Wason Togbah | " |

Annex 3: List of people consulted in Grand Gedeh County during focused group discussion

| No. | Name | Title | Agency/Organization | Phone no. |
|-----|----------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 1 | Roland J. Lepol | Coordinator | CCAAP/MOA | 0886568654 |
| 2 | Kennedy N. Igbokwe | Project Manager | FAO | +256 777 700 890 |
| 3 | Wakweya Tamiru | M&E Coordinator | FAO | 0776737564 |
| 4 | A Jalarwo Karr | DAO | MOA | 0886 738645 |
| 5 | Rev. D W M Tarty sr. | General Chaplain | AMENU | 0777450969 |
| 6 | K Johnson Beyorplu | | Community Office | 0880963938 |
| 7 | Josiah Y. Tarlue | Co-Chairman | AMENU | 0880758757 |
| 8 | T. Augustus Quarty | Board Member | AMENU | 0880718649 |
| 9 | Emmett Quiah | Land Agent | | 0880570722 |
| 10 | Barlea Quedan | Intern | FAO | 0886646117 |
| 11 | Harry Dode | Driver | | |
| 12 | Maxwell Juwor | CAC | MOA | 0886533913 |
| 13 | John B. Yarkpa | Field Tech. | UNFAO | 0776737562 |
| 14 | David Kyne | TC | | |
| 15 | T. Dehday Beh | Project Manager | AEDE | 0886699708 |
| 16 | Philip B. Gauyon | Chairman | AMENU | 0880526446 |
| 17 | Rita N. kahn | Woman Leader | | 0880557933 |

A. Zleh Town, Gbarzon District, Grand Gedeh County (Stakeholder consultation

B. Famers Consultation Gaye Town, Gbarzon District, Grand Gedeh County

| No. | Name | Title |
|-----|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Jator S. Gaye | Farm manager |
| 2 | Sarah Carr | Farmer |
| 3 | Vero Carr | Farmer |
| 4 | Dorithy Peters | Women Co-op |
| 5 | Beatrice Karthy | " |
| 6 | Rita Gaye | ςς |
| 7 | Cecelia Sayee | ςς |
| 8 | Annie Jaryee | " |
| 9 | Cathrine Paye | ςς |
| 10 | Betty Worjolo | Famer and Women co-op |
| 11 | Esther Zaway | Farmer |
| 12 | Samuel Zaway | Women farmer |
| 13 | Faultor Quarly | Farmer |
| 14 | Princess Pouh | Women Co-op |
| 15 | Lucy chayee | ςς |
| 16 | Esther Zeh | " |
| 17 | Edith Johnson | ςς |
| 18 | Oretha Bakou | ςς |
| 19 | Rasetha Gaye | " |
| 20 | Marie Koublouh | " |
| 21 | Metty Zeh | ςς |
| 22 | Josiah Pouh | Farmer |
| 23 | Charles Zaway | " |
| 24 | Beatrice Zleh | ςς |
| 25 | Rebecca Gaye | Women group |
| 26 | Zean Sayee | Farmer |
| 27 | Jimmy Zeh | " |

| No. | Name | Title |
|-----|------------------|-------------|
| 28 | Andrew Gaye | Farmer |
| 29 | Chayo Zimmy | " |
| 30 | Oretha Zaway | " |
| 31 | Rebecca Gaylah | Women Co-op |
| 32 | Jerry Gedeah | Farmer |
| 33 | Sedeke Saysay | " |
| 34 | Dickson R. Cholo | " |
| 35 | Harrison Zaway | " |
| 36 | Paye S. Gaye | " |
| 37 | Harry Dobo | " |
| 38 | Ellen Jayee | Women group |

C. Famers Consultation Attendance Tian Town, Grand Gedeh County

| No. | Name | Host Community/Refugee/Organizatin |
|-----|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1 | Kennedy Igbokwe | FAO Uganda |
| 2 | T. Dehday Beh | Liberia/AEDE |
| 3 | Maxwell G.M Junior | Liberia/CAC |
| 4 | Wakweya Tamiru | FAO Liberia |
| 5 | T. Augustus Quaity | AMENU |
| 6 | Josiah Y. Tarlue | AMENU |
| 7 | Fahi Zeade' | Ivorian |
| 8 | Bio Gastor | Ivorian |
| 9 | Bloa sjahidjike Bevoit | Ivorian |
| 10 | Tasle koue' Ferdinayol | Ivorian |
| 11 | Bloa Bevoit | Ivorian |
| 12 | Nioule'Gabriel | Ivorian |
| 13 | Pouo Richard | Ivorian |
| 14 | Zian Soe | Liberian |
| 15 | Mark Barjibo | Liberian |
| 16 | James Greah | Liberian |
| 17 | Anthony B. Parjibo | Liberian |
| 18 | Martha Gee | Liberian |
| 19 | Anthony Dickaye | Liberian |
| 20 | Mamadee Toure | Liberian |
| 21 | Toe Beh | Liberian |
| 22 | John Zarway | Liberian |
| 23 | William jolo | Liberian |
| 24 | Cooper Beh | Liberian |
| 25 | David Gaye | Liberian |
| 26 | Cecelia Nyangbe | Liberian |
| 27 | Betty Barijibo | Liberian |
| 28 | Esther Targblor | Liberian |
| 29 | Betty shartu | Liberian |
| 30 | Tode' Guei Boris | Ivorian |
| 31 | Gnande Evariste | Ivorian |
| 32 | Bahiro Simeon | Ivorian |
| 33 | Ze' Pierre | Ivorian |
| 34 | Pehe' Michel | Ivorian |
| 35 | Diai Sidonie | Ivorian |
| 36 | John B. Yarkpa | FAO Liberia |