



Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species

Second Annual Report on:

***Institutional strengthening and capacity building
for Guyana's Protected Areas System***

Project Doc no: 162/11/016

Submitted by Kerstin Swahn, Fauna & Flora International

1. Darwin Project Information

Project Ref. Number	162/11/016
Project Title	<i>Institutional strengthening and capacity building for Guyana's Protected Areas System</i>
Country(ies)	<i>Guyana, South America</i>
UK Contractor	<i>Fauna & Flora International</i>
Partner Organisation(s)	<i>Guyana Environmental Protected Agency</i>
Darwin Grant Value	<i>£177,300</i>
Start/End dates	<i>Originally 1 April 2002 – 31 March 2005 but due to delays in grant disbursement 1 Oct 2002 – 31 Aug 2005</i>
Reporting period	<i>1 April 2003 – 31 March 2004 Annual Report 2</i>
Project website	<i>n/a</i>
Author(s), date	<i>Kerstin Swahn, 27 April, 2004</i>

2. Project Background

- Briefly describe the location and circumstances of the project and the problem that the project aims to address.

The project aims to enhance the capacity of Guyana's embryonic protected areas system at two levels: central administration and at the site (local level) at Shell Beach. Guyana's Environmental Protection Agency has identified the priority areas for biodiversity conservation but lacks the resources, staff skills and management capability to develop and manage protected areas. The project has been providing support at the central level with in-country training in a range of protected areas planning, administration and management activities; public awareness and environmental education and future activities will cover continued technical protected areas planning issues, and the establishment of trust funds. Site level components include community consultation and outreach, environmental education, alternative livelihood generation including basic enterprise skills, sustainable use of natural resources, and basic ranger training. The focus on Shell Beach will provide a case study for protected areas (PA) management and will consolidate central level training and strengthen the capabilities of the Guyana Marine Turtle Conservation Society (GMTCS), the NGO and lead agency with the official mandate to oversee the development of Shell Beach as a protected area. The involvement of the internationally acclaimed Iwokrama project will allow for the transfer of relevant expertise. The project is being realised through workshops, training sessions and public consultations and awareness raising. Technical and educational materials, developed where appropriate through participatory methods, will be produced for training sessions and wider dissemination, while videos will be produced for future training and presentation.

3. Project Purpose and Outputs

- State the purpose and outputs of the project. Please include your project logical framework as an appendix and report achievements and progress against it (or, if applicable, against the latest version of the logframe).

Please refer to the Logical Framework in Appendix 1. The principal purpose of the project is to improve conservation of biodiversity in-situ in Guyana by institutionally strengthening the protected areas system, both centrally and at the site level (Shell Beach). The capacity of both the EPA and other local partners (GMTCS) will be increased. The project aims to draw on and develop models of best practice for the focal area, Shell Beach, which can be then applied in-country.

The objectives are stated and reported against below:

1. To institutionally strengthen central PA administration. This objective has commenced through initial training needs assessments and a series of workshops on 1) institutional models for protected areas management and roles & responsibilities of agencies 2) project proposal preparation, and 3) project administration and management 4) how to carry out community consultations 5) first of three technical protected areas planning workshops 6) awareness and educational workshop with the production of a national awareness strategy.
 2. To enhance PAs network. This is being addressed through the cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder nature of the workshops, in particular that of the first workshop where lead agencies (EPA and GMTCS) plus various Amerindian representative groups (e.g. the Amerindian Peoples Association), Ministry of Amerindian Affairs, Regional District Captains, Iwokrama project representatives, National Forestry Commission, and other in-country international organisations (CI) etc. met to develop ideas on a national protected areas system. The workshops and training cover a range of interested stakeholders covering older and younger professionals alike, especially EPA and GMTCS staff who are dealing with protected areas projects, and/or with issues specifically pertaining to Shell Beach.
 3. To agree on training programmes, methodologies and principles for EPA and GMTCS, rangers, outreach and communities. Training needs and basic programmes of action are developed as required by the joint implementing and lead agencies. Agendas for the training workshops have been developed through close and intense communication and add-on consultation activities have been identified to strengthen the overall initiative. Continual review and adaptive management, focussing on pragmatic solutions, are made in order to ensure the overall strengthening and capacity building goals are met through the project.
 4. To increase financial benefit to communities from biodiversity. The deliverable on identifying potential sustainable livelihoods derived from biodiversity will be undertaken in the fall of this year. However, the upcoming technical 2 workshop on protected areas planning will raise this issue and ways to encourage active participation and support for this process from the local communities at Shell Beach.
 5. To produce of environmental education and awareness materials. A photographic trip was made to Guyana by FFI photographer and all images have been made available to our in-country partners who are producing public awareness materials. Awareness materials are being designed and produced according to the National Awareness strategy formulated at a workshop Nov 2002.
- Have the outputs or proposed operational plan been modified over the last year, for what reason, and have these changes been approved by the Darwin Secretariat? (Please note that any intended modifications should be discussed with the Secretariat directly rather than making suggestions in this report).

Two items have been delayed such as the biodiversity and social assessments, which were to take place in by March 31 2004. Due to delays in receiving approval

from DEFRA Darwin Secretariat, these workshops could not be implemented on time. However, the biodiversity training has already taken place and the social one is due in May/early June this year. All changes have been approved by the Secretariat and/or noted.

4. Progress

- Please provide a brief history of the project to the beginning of this reporting period. (1 para)

This project has benefited from a range of workshops and training activities that have added skills and knowledge to the EPA and the local lead agency GMTCS. The workshops and training elements have benefited from continued positive feedback from participants of their style and content. All elements addressed in workshops have been consistently applied to the Shell Beach protected areas process where concrete outputs and operational plans have been made. The project has thus far focussed mainly on general protected areas issues and developing basic structure for its application, and the remainder of the project now focuses on expanding those elements to get concrete on-the-ground results with the local support of the Shell Beach communities.

- Summarise progress over the last year against the agreed baseline timetable for the period and the logical framework (complete Annex 1). Explain differences including any slippage or additional outputs and activities.

Completion of series of workshops and training sessions:

- *Project proposal preparation (April). ON TIME.*
- *Project Management /administration and Team Dynamics workshop (April) ON TIME.*
- *Community Consultation and Outreach Workshop and on-site application (May) ON TIME.*
- *Annual Review of project with project partners (July) ON TIME.*
- *Protected Areas Technical Workshop on Management (end Sept/early Oct) ON TIME.*
- *Public Education and Awareness Strategy workshop and materials (early November 2003) ON TIME.*
- *Community consultations and awareness. ON GOING. Additional consultations were identified in the Community Consultation and Outreach workshop earlier on.*
- *Photographer to photograph Shell Beach for awareness materials (May) ON TIME.*
- *Biodiversity training on assessments. DELAYED BY ONE MONTH due to delays in approval from DEFRA on funding requests to carry-over between Darwin years (to compensate for the 5 month late start in the project due to late disbursement of funds from DEFRA), and to approve funds for a Technical team. The latter issue is addressed "Difficulties"*

- *Social assessments training (Community Resource Evaluations). DELAYED BY TWO MONTHS for reasons similar to those for the biodiversity assessments.*
- Provide an account of the project's achievements during the last year. This should include concise discussion on methodologies and approaches by the project (e.g. research, training, planning, assessment, monitoring) and their consequences and impacts as well as results. Please **summarise** content on methodologies and approaches, and, if necessary, provide more detailed information in appendices (this may include cross-references to attached publications).

Workshop programmes, training sessions and on-site consultation visits are developed jointly between FFI, EPA and GMTCS based on needs specified by EPA and GMTCS and the professional assessment of their needs by FFI. All workshops are as participatory as the nature of the workshop will allow (through working groups and joint discussions) and attempt to tie in subjects as closely and relevant to the daily work/life of the participants so that it is as realistic and practical as possible. In every deliverable, without fail, there is practical application of issues reviewed and discussed to the Shell Beach context where concrete outputs are made. Reports on each workshop/training are made to meticulously document what was covered, discussed, debated, agreed, recommended etc so that participants and non-participants alike can refer back to what was agreed and discussed. In the Guyanese context, this is very important since the skills and knowledge and networking between bodies is quite limited. Moreover, where possible, lessons learned from other in-country experiences are presented or discussed and international experiences are shared by FFI staff when they are contextually relevant to the situations in Guyana. All activities, especially those relating to community liaison/consultation and awareness materials, are made with the recommendations of, and agreement by, the local community representatives and field workers.

Another achievement that has already shown impact, is the approach of our work in spreading skills/knowledge to a wider base of young professionals so that the burden of decision-making and technical input expertise does not fall on a few people (which has been the case). For example, for every workshop and training, interested people from EPA and GMTCS are urged to attend, even if it is not at their professional level or directly related to their work (but in some way is). We do this so that information and issues can be spread for consideration and hopefully to motivate more young professionals to become involved. Another example of this is to include Shell Beach wardens in the workshops so that their understanding of issues surrounding protected areas can be expanded and that they can feel more confident in voicing their opinions and recommendations over courses of action.

- Discuss any significant difficulties encountered during the year and steps taken to overcome them.

Several difficulties have been encountered specifically during the past year's activities:

- 1) *Lack of staff available for technical training: this issue has been raised in past reports and over the past year has become an a serious risk to the project due to the fact that skilled and knowledgeable people are leaving Guyana because of low employment and wages. As such, EPA and GMTCS have not been able to identify technical trainees for the biodiversity and social assessments since their staff are already committed/overburdened or non-existent. This problem was solved by Darwin agreeing to fund a 4-person technical team to train in necessary technical skills and experience who could be contracted (and hopefully thereby stay in Guyana) for future work*

opportunities in the wider protected areas process, in addition to the on-going one at Shell Beach. The team members were chosen on previous experience, basic knowledge in biological and social sciences and availability. There is a strong understanding and agreement from EPA and GMTCS that this team will be used in other initiatives to carry out biological and social assessments elsewhere in Guyana, especially related to protected areas.

2) *Slow progress in community consultations and awareness raising: EPA and GMTCS, despite good intentions and careful planning, have not been carrying out community consultations to the extent needed, stressed by the workshop and agreed by participants. As such, the project risks not getting the local support for the project as needed. This issue will be addressed in an upcoming meeting between the FFI project manager and the in-country partners as all are concerned. In the interim, until EPA and GMTCS can fulfill their designated roles as primary informers of the project to local people, the In-country project officer will make trips to the communities and liaise with the community representatives to update them on the process and make sure awareness materials are delivered and questions can be asked. Moreover, the meeting with in-country partners will be used to ascertain exactly why trips have not been made to the extent needed and how to resolve that. One option already that has been approved by the Darwin Secretariat, is to fund a full-time project assistant to the EPA project coordinator, who will take more active role in achieving EPAs responsibilities. This person would be trained by the Coordinator, and work together with the FFI project officer, so that not only is he/she an added human resources to the project, but that they acquire useful skills and knowledge about the protected areas process.*

- Has the design of the project been enhanced over the last year, e.g. refining methods, indicators for measuring achievements, exit strategy?

The project has become much more focussed to address needs and solutions based on actual scenarios, and tailored to focus on the greatest needs that fall under the remit of the Darwin project. For example, much more focus has been placed on the Shell Beach area process than originally intended by the project proposal. This was done because of the real need to train local staff, step by step, who were having difficulty applying principles on their own. The project has become increasingly focussed on supporting and/or delivering on-the-ground activities rather than just focussing on theory.

- Present a timetable (workplan) for the next reporting period.

OUTPUT	DATES
<i>Biodiversity training and assessment</i>	<i>April – June 2004</i>
<i>Social training in Community Resource Evaluations and assessments</i>	<i>May/early June, 2004</i>
<i>Mid-project evaluation</i>	<i>May, 2004</i>
<i>Community consultations</i>	<i>On-going</i>
<i>Ranger training scoping mission</i>	<i>Aug 2004</i>
<i>Technical Protected Areas planning workshop 2</i>	<i>July/early Aug, 2004</i>
<i>Ecotourism/ alternative livelihoods survey</i>	<i>Aug – Sept 2004</i>
<i>Ranger training</i>	<i>Jan – March 2005</i>
<i>Public awareness materials produced</i>	<i>On-going</i>
<i>Ranger training materials produced</i>	<i>Jan – March 2005</i>

5. Actions taken in response to previous reviews (if applicable)

- Have you responded to issues raised in the review of your last year's annual report? Have you discussed the review with your collaborators? Briefly describe what actions have been taken as a result of recommendations from last year's review.

Yes, replies/feedback was made to the project's reviewer last year. Recommendations that were followed up were improving communications with the EPA Coordinator and clarifying more clearly roles and responsibilities of project staff. A new institutional Memorandum of Understanding was written and agreed that addressed areas of unclarity. There has been significant improvement.

6. Partnerships

- Describe collaboration between UK and host country partner(s) over the last year. Are there difficulties or unforeseen problems or advantages of these relationships?

Relations with the in-country partners have improved with clarity over roles and responsibilities. No other observations are made.

- Has the project been able to collaborate with similar projects (Darwin or other) in the host country or other regions, or establish new links with / between local or international organisations involved in biodiversity conservation?

Yes, significantly so. There is an on-going WWF project that also works to establish Shell beach as a protected area, however, it is complimentary to our activities as it focuses more on technical research and the legal aspects of protected areas gazetment. This has lead to a MoU between FFI and WWF, and possibilities of collaboration on other protected areas initiatives in Guyana and perhaps in the region. Additionally, UNDP is working on a coastal management plan for Shell Beach and we are in close contact with them to ensure that operational plans are complimentary to each other, and that communities are updated on the process. Moreover, progress in the World Bank protected areas project in Guyana has chosen Shell Beach as a pilot study area, and their activities are potentially very complimentary. FFI and WWF, along with GMTCS, are attempting to directly engage World Bank representatives on the on-going work at Shell Beach to ensure that our work is not duplicated, and that activities are collaborative and complimentary.

7. Impact and Sustainability

- Discuss the profile of the project within the country and what efforts have been made during the year to promote the work. What evidence is there for increasing interest and capacity for biodiversity resulting from the project? Is there a satisfactory exit strategy for the project in place?

The project has been promoted at and through workshop/training components, reports that have been circulated for wider viewing, radio and TV programmes, through FFI's website and magazine, and by word of mouth. According to feedback from workshop/training participants and in-country partners, the Darwin project is seen as one of the few actually delivering on the ground activities for Protected Areas related work in the country. There is general excitement about the project and observations from indigenous peoples groups have been pleased at our workshop/training which has strongly emphasised participatory development and monitoring, plus strong community consultation. Moreover, an in-country donor has become increasingly interested in funding other projects with conservation value, plus promoting biodiversity awareness materials.

8. Outputs, Outcomes and Dissemination

- Explain differences in actual outputs against those agreed in the initial 'Project Implementation Timetable' and the 'Project Outputs Schedule', i.e. what outputs were not or only partly achieved? Were additional outputs achieved?

Outputs were achieved as per the revised plan, with the exception of community consultations (which are only somewhat achieved).

- Provide details of dissemination activities in the host country during the year, including information on target audiences. Will dissemination activities be continued by the host country when the project finishes, and how will this be funded and implemented?

Dissemination activities are only just starting as some of the public awareness materials are being produced according to the National Awareness Strategy for the protected areas system. Audiences include local people, children, government institutions, and the national audience at large. A range of media are employed: newspaper, internet, radio, TV, and physical activities. Dissemination will be more actively promoted during the remainder of the project and plans for its future implementation will be discussed with recommendations from the FFI team.

- Please expand and complete Table 1. **Quantify** project outputs over the last year using the coding and format from the Darwin Initiative Standard Output Measures (see website for details) and give a brief description. Please list and report on appropriate Code Nos. only. The level of detail required is specified in the Guidance notes on Output Definitions, which accompanies the List of Standard Output Measures

Table 1. Project Outputs (According to Standard Output Measures)

Code No.	Quantity	Description
6A	15 people trained on average for 5 events	Training and workshops in project management and admin, proposal writing, community consultations and outreach, educational awareness and strategy, technical protected areas management planning.
7	4	Protected areas calendars (3,000), posters (2000), brochures (3000), CD of photographic images.
17A	2	Technical biological and social teams for work during and after Darwin on related PA work
18A and C	2	2 TV news and chat shows
19A and C	2	2 each: radio and newspaper articles.
23	US \$25,000	In-country donor.

- In Table 2, provide full details of all publications and material produced over the last year that can be publicly accessed, e.g. title, name of publisher, contact details, cost. Details will be recorded on the Darwin Monitoring Website Publications Database. Mark (*) all publications and other material that you have included with this report.

N/a at this time.

9. Project Expenditure

- Please expand and complete Table 3.

Table 3: Project expenditure during the reporting period (Defra Financial Year 01 April to 31 March)

Item	Budget	Expenditure	Balance

- Highlight any recently agreed changes to the budget and explain any variation in expenditure where this is +/- 10% of the budget.

NOTE: The project year is actually 1 Oct – 31 Aug due to a 5 month late disbursement of fund by DEFRA at the project start. For this reason, the strict Darwin yr 2 of the project is only just half completed and funds half exhausted.

** Workshop costs are covered by an in-country donor as such, we requested and received approval from DEFRA to re-allocate these funds towards contracting the technical team for a period of 6 months.*

10. Monitoring, Evaluation and Lessons

- Discuss methods employed to monitor and evaluate the project this year. How can you demonstrate that the outputs and outcomes of the project actually contribute to the project purpose? i.e. what are the indicators of achievements (both qualitative and quantitative) and how are you measuring these?

For the past year, monitoring and evaluation of the project has been judged against to the project purpose and against the indicators of workshops held and training manuals, workshop reports, and community consultations and number of awareness materials produced. Monitoring and evaluation has taken place through daily communication with the FFI in-country officer, through internal FFI reporting, Darwin reporting and through regular meetings with in-country partners. Equally valuable is the feedback from the evaluation forms from participants at the workshops to know if participants have understood objectives of the workshop and if they have gained new skills/knowledge that facilitate their work with PA issues. Furthermore, the perception that in-country partners (EPA and GMTCS) and local communities and their representatives have of the Darwin Initiative is crucial and thus far we have their encouragement through second rounds of successful workshops and FFI feels confident to pursue protected areas establishment at Shell Beach with central level support.

- What lessons have you learned from this year's work, and can you build this learning into future plan
 1. *The importance to political neutrality in Amerindian land rights issues.*
 2. *The fundamental importance of community consultations and holding partners to it.*

Annex 1 Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year: 2003/2004

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2003-Mar 2004	Actions required/planned for next period
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goal: To assist countries rich in biodiversity but poor in resources with the conservation of biodiversity and implementation of the CBD. 			
Purpose <i>To strengthen Guyana's national system for protected areas at central and site level</i>	<i>Official legislation Increased levels of trained PA personnel</i>	<i>5 workshops and training sessions have been successfully completed and attended by relevant audiences.</i>	Workshop and training cannot be too frequent or participants complain about workshop fatigue.
Outputs			
<i>Institutionally strengthened central PA administration and management</i>	<i>Recognition of EPA as central coordinating unit of protected areas process.</i>	<i>Through MoUs; models for PA structure and management at workshops</i>	<i>On-going.</i>
Enhanced PA network	<i>Official recognition of Shell Beach as a PA</i>	N/a	
Agreed training programme, methodology and materials for EPA and GMTCS, rangers, outreach and communities	<i>Defined sets of roles and responsibilities for lead agencies</i>	On-going through needs analysis, and design of 5 different training and workshops. Recommendations and follow-ups included.	Continue to build on the series of training workshops.
Options for sustainable livelihoods from biodiversity identified	<i>Identification of livelihoods for local communities at Shell beach</i>	N/a	
Environmental and educational materials produced	<i>Production of at least 3 types of visual materials</i>	<i>Posters, calendars and brochures produced according to National Protected Areas Awareness Strategy and Action Plan; Set of CD's with high quality images given to EPA and GMTCS for future work.</i>	