



Darwin Initiative Annual Report



Important note:

To be completed with reference to the Reporting Guidance Notes for Project Leaders that this report will be about 10 pages in length, excluding annexes
Submission deadline 30 April 2009

Darwin Project Information

| | |
|---|--|
| Project Ref Number | 17-017 |
| Project Title | Innovative Governance Models for Marine Protected Area Management in Ecuador |
| Country(ies) | Ecuador |
| UK Contract Holder Institution | Fauna & Flora International |
| Host country Partner Institution(s) | Fundación Futuro Latinoamericano |
| Other Partner Institution(s) | |
| Darwin Grant Value | |
| Start/End dates of Project | April 2009 – March 2012 |
| Reporting period (1 Apr 200x to 31 Mar 200y) and annual report number (1,2,3..) | 1 Apr 2009 to 31 March 2010 Annual report 1 |
| Project Leader Name | Robert Bensted-Smith |
| Project website | - |
| Author(s) and main contributors, date | Robert Bensted-Smith, Vincent Gravez, Cristina Rivadeneira, Julio Bernal, Berry Mulligan 5 May 2010 |

1. Project Background

Through this project FFI and our partner, the Fundación Futuro Latinoamericano (FFLA), are helping to establish participatory governance systems at three Marine Protected Areas (MPA's) along the coast of Ecuador, and to use the experiences of these sites to inform the development of a national sub-system or network of MPA's. One site is the long established Machalilla National Park. A second is the Galera San Francisco Marine Reserve, established by Ministerial decree in October 2008. The third was intended to be at El Morro. Some productive work was carried out there but it was then decided to switch the third site to Jambelí in the Gulf of Guayaquil. This change was approved by DI. See attached map.

2. Project Partnerships

The project management has proceeded as planned, with FFI having the overall project leadership and coordination but FFLA working with a high degree of autonomy in its areas of expertise and capacity. In particular, the full-time staff based at the coast and working with the MPA stakeholders and Management Committees is a FFLA employee (Vincent Gravez). He therefore has responsibility for maintaining the relationships with the diverse actors at each site.

The communication and cooperation between FFI and FFLA within Ecuador has operated through (i) frequent email and phone communication, (ii) face-to-face meetings in Quito and (iii) collaboration on activities at the project MPA sites. This has generally worked well but we have agreed to have more regular technical meetings amongst FFI and FFLA staff based in Quito, in order to work more closely together on the development of the project components, which are increasing in scope and complexity as the project progresses. These meetings will also provide a space to review monitoring data and to agree specific dissemination actions.

Communication with FFI experts based in UK (e.g. in livelihoods, governance, communication) has hitherto been mainly through the Ecuador-based FFI staff but we envisage increasing direct communication between UK staff and FFLA in years 2 and 3.

The project has collaborated with other projects supporting these specific MPA's, especially in Machalilla where several national and international organisations have been providing technical and financial support complementary to our work. In GSF we have worked especially closely with the national NGO, Nazca Institute for Marine Research, which has from the start played a vital role, both technically and in

informing and mobilizing local stakeholders. Elsewhere in the region, we have linked up with FFI's incipient marine programme in Nicaragua and with a pioneering programme for Responsible Artisanal Fisheries at Tárcoles in Costa Rica. The partner NGO there is CoopeSoliDar. Between the three countries we applied unsuccessfully to the European Union for funding to develop a regional programme on MPA governance. We have also linked up with FFI MPA programmes in Kenya (supported by Darwin Initiative, local partner the East African Wildlife Society) and in Antigua and Barbuda (local partner the Environment Awareness Group). We feel that there could be much benefit in cross-regional exchanges but do not yet have funds for that.

Ecuador's CBD focal point is the Ministry of Environment (MoE). The project is working very closely with the Ministry and helping Ecuador to meet its CBD commitments, including the Programme of Work on Protected Areas, is the essence of the project.

3. Project progress

3.1 Progress in carrying out project activities

3.1.1 Activities under Output 1 *At two pilot sites (Galera-San Francisco and El Morro) a governance system has been designed, and at the Machalilla site the existing governance model has been adapted and strengthened in a way that enables decentralization to the lowest appropriate level with effective inter sectoral cooperation between environment, fisheries, tourism and defence agencies, and that empowers the participation of local coastal communities, and capacity has been built for its implementation*

The first four activities towards this output (1.1 to 1.4) cover different aspects of the process towards establishing a participatory governance structure, management plan and associated legal instrument.

In Parque Nacional Machalilla (PNM) these project activities got off to a prompt start, thanks to the prior involvement of FFLA and participation by both FFI and FFLA in a meeting just before project start-up of PNM and Ministry of Environment staff, collaborating government agencies and supporting NGOs. The continued commitment of the Ministry of Environment (MoE) through the Under-Secretary of Coastal and Marine Management (USCMM). In PNM the Management Committee (MC) has already existed for some years but with a weak role as a kind of optional consultative body. The project's approach is to enable the MC to assert and fulfill a much stronger, more proactive role, across all PNM areas of activity, then to institutionalise this. Major themes of the MC's work in Year 1 include negotiation of zoning, introduction of a visitor management system, and the design and implementation of an "action plan" in order to drive forward the implementation of the Park's Management Plan, which had been approved but lying unused. Elections in August of new MC officials went well, without conflict, and a change of Park Director has also gone smoothly and brought increased energy to the programme. Following an assessment that showed that the MC's thematic sub-committees or "secretariats" are quite passive, FFLA has worked with them to become more proactive. This has been particularly effective and important with regard to the fisheries secretariat, which is now becoming an important platform for discussing artisanal fishers' concerns and proposals. One consequence of this has been an initiative to protect and restore populations of the mollusc, *Spondylus*, as described under Output 2. The renewed dynamism and significance of the MC's work led 5 more organisations (3 fisheries-related, 1 tourism and 1 biology) to sign up as members. FFLA and the MC also organized in October 2009 two meetings to draw up - with the PNM Director, MoE, Navy, Under Secretary for Fisheries Resources (USFR) and Provincial Direction of Tourism - plans for implementing a 2008 inter-institutional agreement for the management and control of the marine area of PNM. This activation of the inter-institutional coordination aspect of the Park's governance will receive a big practical boost from the deployment of a radar- and radio-based surveillance system supported by the Wildaid Foundation.

At Galera San Francisco (GSF) Marine Reserve the project activities have also started well and benefited from the active commitment of the USCMM. As this is a new MPA the project approach is to work with the informally organised stakeholders (known as the pre-committee) and the authorities to fulfill their responsibility to produce a management plan, including a chapter on governance structure. This gives more opportunity to develop innovative approaches to governance and local stewardship. The MoE assigned the leadership of this process to the Nazca Institute for Marine Research, a national NGO which has been a major force in the GSF initiative hitherto. FFLA and FFI have worked closely with Nazca throughout. Progress has been made, with FFLA facilitating several meetings of the pre-committee and FFI facilitating a workshop in November 2009 to launch the management planning process, immediately after the official go-ahead from MoE for the process. As well as generating information about priorities and programmes for inclusion in the management plan, and highlighting

some governance issues, this workshop also made very clear that the local fishers big concerns were piracy (theft of outboard motors at sea) and the impacts of shrimp trawling. These are both issues that go beyond the scope of what can be achieved by local action. A number of working groups were to be set up to work on different aspects of the management plan, but at the second management plan workshop took place in April 2010 (i.e. after the period of this report), it was clear that only those in which Nazca had a leading role had generated significant products. Local energies had been directed more towards demanding action (and eventually getting) by the Navy on the worsening piracy problem. Nevertheless, momentum for the management plan has been maintained and FFLA is working closely with the pre-committee and authorities on the governance chapter.

At the third project site, El Morro, FFLA facilitated a process to complete and approve the management plan, including the governance structure. Although it produced a quick result, in terms of an approved plan and structure, it did not have the kind of innovative governance arrangements that we had been hoping for. This was because of a change in the leadership of the Municipality to one with a traditional view of the role of the MC as essentially a group to be consulted periodically and to provide support. The replacement site, Jambelí, is new for us and requires a significant start-up time to recruit a locally based staff member (FFLA) and make initial investigations. Activities there will gather pace in Q1 of Year 2.

FFLA implemented the training course in governance, participation and negotiation in three modules (Activity 1.5). There were 36 trainees (attending all modules), drawn from PNM and El Morro Management Committees, GSF pre-committee, municipalities, and local and national authorities. End-of-module evaluations were consistently positive, but it is too early to assess with confidence the application of the skills and knowledge, because the courses were conducted in March '10. Nevertheless, at least 16 of the participants have already been in subsequent negotiations and planning processes, where the skills would be highly relevant. The project's aim is to train 60 people, with a view to at least 30 of these regularly applying the knowledge in MPA governance processes.

The first exchange visit (Activity 1.6) was organised around the third module of the course, which took place near GSF. All course participants visited the GSF site and learned about that initiative from the GSF participants and other local residents.

3.1.2 Activities under Output 2 *In 2 of 3 pilot sites (Galera-San Francisco, El Morro or Machalilla) local stewardship of the marine ecosystem is strengthened through the negotiation of an agreed, adaptive resource management strategy for one species (preferably migratory or CITES listed) at each site, on the basis of available scientific and traditional knowledge.*

The activities towards this output envisaged a sequential process, starting in Q3 with establishment of a technical working group, which would identify and prioritise key resources, leading to a choice of the key resource for support through this project. In practice, however, local initiatives have moved faster and more decisively to identify the resources on which they want to take action. We see this as positive, since it means that there is a real commitment to manage the resources (even if it does prevent us encouraging the selection of at least one migratory species in the list of priorities).

At PNM the Artisanal Fishers Association of Salango lobbied for a moratorium on the catching of the Spiny Rock Scallop, *Spondylus* (*Spondylus princeps* and *S. calcifer*). If there is such a thing as a charismatic mollusk, then *Spondylus* is it! Its rough exterior conceals a lustrous shell used in rituals, jewelry and trade for 4000 years. The 1980's saw a surge in use for jewelry, handicrafts and food and its adoption as a symbol for tourism on the "Spondylus Route". Over-harvesting led to a drastic decline in catches, provoking the local dive fishers to harvest *Spondylus*, but this time, with the support take action. An earlier attempt at a unilateral ban had served little purpose, as it had no support from the Ministry and was undermined by outside divers who continued to harvest the species. This time, however, the USFR responded to the call by issuing in October 2009 a Ministerial Agreement prohibiting fishing, transportation, selling and consuming of *Spondylus* and instructing the National Fisheries Institute to assess the status of the species. The next step is to organize a workshop to start building a management strategy that will allow *Spondylus* populations to recover and sustainable use to resume. The project has committed to support this workshop, which was scheduled for early 2010. Unfortunately it has been postponed twice by the USFR, as other urgent issues arose and then the Sub-Secretary stepped down, leaving a temporary leadership vacuum. Local commitment remains firm and we are confident that the strategy workshop will soon take place. To reinforce the local and national prohibition, organisers of the workshop are studying whether *Spondylus* merits protection under CITES.

At GSF the November 2009 meeting proposed working groups for various components of the Management Plan, but these have not been very active, except where the Nazca Institute has led the way. Nevertheless, the pre-committee members have prioritised lobsters as an economically important species for which they want to apply specific measures to restore populations, as catches and sizes of

individuals have declined drastically (over 90% of lobsters caught are below the legal size limit). Nazca has been working with fishers to assess the lobster fisheries, thereby providing valuable baseline information. Here too we feel the project should respond to this priority and will benefit from the local commitment to apply new conservation measures.

Activities 2.3 (studying lessons learned from elsewhere) and 2.4-2.7 (developing and implementing the strategy) are scheduled to start in Year 2.

3.1.3 Activities under Output 3 *Capacity built at the national level in the MoE in the facilitation of the participatory process for development of the subsystem of MPAs and guidance provided for adjustments necessary to legal and institutional framework to incorporate governance models as part of the national, regional and international initiatives to meet 2012 CBD target of creating and managing national and regional MPA networks.*

MoE asked FFLA and FFI to assist the Ministry with the process for construction of the sub-system of MPA's. The first workshop was held in Q4, some months later than expected, and the second in April '10 (after the period of this report). Earlier in Year 1 FFLA was able to provide specific inputs to two critical studies, one financed by CAF (the Andean Development Corporation) and the other by IDB/GEF, both intended to make recommendations to the Ecuadorian government for the creation of the new subsystem of MPAs. As listed in the log-frame FFLA was able through various means to inset many of the ideas about participatory governance into these documents, which will be important determinants of the eventual legal framework for the subsystem.

The workshop itself involved Park directors, MoE staff and supporting NGOs, because the Ministry wanted first to have internal discussion about what a "sub-system" of MPA's might look like. One of the initial conclusions was that in reality a sub-system would have to include other kinds of marine management areas, such as Fisheries Reserves and local government protected areas, and even the artisanal-use-only zones that extend along the whole coast, in addition to the MPA's and mangrove concessions (use agreements) that fall under the jurisdiction of MoE. Therefore the MoE would have a network of MPA's and concessions that would be one component of a broader MPA sub-system. Recognizing this and the fact that many of the key issues for the network/sub-system involve multiple institutions, the MoE will broaden participation in the series of workshops from here on. At the same time FFI and FFLA have both been asked to participate in a small working group that will help the USCM to plan the remainder of the process to design the network/sub-system.

3.1.4 Activities under Output 4 *Key groups informed about project results and awareness about local stewardship of marine biodiversity raised nationally and internationally.*

The significant change in the activities towards this output was the decision, approved by DI, to postpone the main investment in international dissemination to Years 2 and 3. The rationale in the change request was:

After considering the major themes and audiences expected at the International Marine Conservation Congress, "Making Marine Science Matter", held in Washington DC in May 2009, FFI and FFLA decided not to invest in participation there but instead to concentrate on dissemination opportunities later in the project, when we have results to show and a crucially important process to inform, namely the build-up to the 2012 CBD targets on MPA networks; once the CBD programmes are available, FFI and FFLA will identify which of the preparatory SBSTTA meetings and/ or COP 10 meeting will provide greatest impact for a side event showcasing the comparative analysis of marine governance. In addition, we will present project results at one or more international conferences that are not specifically for CBD and maintain the original plans for dissemination of project results by other means.

With regard to other forms of dissemination in Year 1, there have been a variety of bulletins and other materials produced, and FFLA has pursued its stated intention to have a comprehensive video record of the processes, for both analytical and dissemination purposes.

We intend to co-finance and organise an additional national technical workshop on marine biodiversity conservation in Q3 of Year 2, together with the Ecuadorian Working Group on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity. As co-sponsors we will be able to ensure that participatory governance systems and resource management (e.g. Spondylus) will be major themes of the workshop. Note that for this reason we include it under Standard Measure 14A rather than 14B (see below).

3.2 Progress towards Project Outputs

Output 1 *At two pilot sites (Galera-San Francisco and El Morro) a governance system has been designed, and at the Machalilla site the existing governance model has been adapted and strengthened in a way that enables decentralization to the lowest appropriate level with effective inter sectoral cooperation between environment, fisheries, tourism and defence agencies, and that empowers the participation of local coastal communities, and capacity has been built for its implementation*

Progress towards this output in the case of Machalilla has been excellent and is clearly gathering momentum.

At GSF the process has moved forward, though not quite as quickly as we had intended. This is largely a result of the fact that the communities' priority was to address the two big external threats to their livelihoods: shrimp trawling and piracy, especially after two local fishers were killed at sea by pirates, bringing local fishing activities to a virtual standstill. Though belated, Navy surveillance has brought the piracy problem under control, at least at GSF, enabling the debate about surveillance and control to be brought back to the management planning process, with plans for technology, inter-institutional coordination and local participation in surveillance and security tending to follow the Machalilla model.

The shrimp trawling issue also made important progress, thanks to the USFR acting in response to the demands from GSF and elsewhere by excluding shrimp trawling from all MPA's. While there are still challenging enforcement issues to discuss, this exclusion of a destructive fishing method not only has ecological benefits for the MPA's but also motivates – even obliges – the local artisanal fishers to look at how to regulate and manage their own fishing effort, methods, zones and so on. It is not longer sufficient to point out the damage done by others.

Overall, therefore, GSF ends Year One of the project much better placed than six months ago to move forward rapidly on the management plan and participatory governance system. Nevertheless, we feel that the process will require increased support from FFLA and FFI, to make sure that the end products emerge in a timely manner.

The actions at Machalilla and in respect of piracy and shrimp trawling at GSF all suggest that the project's assumption that the government will remain committed to decentralisation and participation holds good. Our regular interactions with the USCMM confirm this commitment. However, there is still a risk here, since power is concentrated very much in the Presidency and the new governance systems will eventually need to confirm support at that level. The recently enacted Participation Law requires participation from local to national level but through elected representatives rather than organised stakeholder groups. However, it is just a minimum requirement and does not exclude other forms of participation.

The pioneering nature of the project, and its current dependence on local leadership and support, was illustrated by the case of El Morro, which progressed as an activity but, due to a change in Municipal leadership, did not go in the direction originally expected. Therefore in January 2010 a change was requested, as explained in this excerpt from the approved request:

“Changes in the Guayaquil Municipality in 2009 led to a loss of municipal leadership and momentum for the MPA, thereby reducing the value of El Morro as an experimental site for an innovative governance model complementary to Machalilla and Galera San Francisco. Without Municipality leadership, the area will revert to a centralised governance structure with a consultative management committee. At the same time, mangrove “use agreements” have come to the top of the Ministry of Environment’s agenda as an approach to management that involves and empowers local communities. A number of use agreements have been set up along the coast in recent years, some successfully and others not. There are many issues related to access rights, control and inter-community relations, which have not been analysed or approached systematically. In the specific area of Jambelí there are as many as 10 such use agreements within an archipelago of islets and the Ministry wants to support them and generate a coordinated, archipelago-wide effort. It has some funds for that purpose, and has asked for the project’s technical guidance, especially in relation to governance issues. FFI and our partner FFLA see this as a very interesting model, strikingly distinct from Machalilla and GSF and potentially involving a greater degree of local empowerment. Thus, the switch from El Morro to Jambelí can enhance the project’s results. Furthermore, by responding to the Ministry’s priorities and preferred communities, we increase the likelihood not only of full cooperation but also of uptake and use of the lessons learned through the project.”

Eventually we expect Jambelí to make a valuable contribution to the Output and Purpose of the project, because it is a quite distinct governance system, from which much can be learnt.

Output 2 *In 2 of 3 pilot sites (Galera-San Francisco, El Morro or Machalilla) local stewardship of the marine ecosystem is strengthened through the negotiation of an agreed, adaptive resource management strategy for one species (preferably migratory or CITES listed) at each site, on the basis of available scientific and traditional knowledge.*

We remain on track for this output, although migratory or CITES-listed species are not expected to be involved. The assumption that local stakeholders participate and maintain commitment continues to be valid; indeed, they have been driving the process so far. The other two assumptions have yet to be tested, as they relate to negotiation of conservation measures and raising additional co-financing for implementing the resource management plans.

Output 3 *Capacity built at the national level in the MoE in the facilitation of the participatory process for development of the subsystem of MPAs and guidance provided for adjustments necessary to legal and institutional framework to incorporate governance models as part of the national, regional and international initiatives to meet 2012 CBD target of creating and managing national and regional MPA networks.*

We remain on track for this output. The assumption that the MoE will remain open to inputs from civil society in the design of the sub-system has been reaffirmed.

Output 4 *Key groups informed about project results and awareness about local stewardship of marine biodiversity raised nationally and internationally.*

We have made a start towards this Output but substantial progress is not expected until the second half of the project, when the site projects are further advanced and the dissemination activities are increased.

3.3 Standard Measures

Table 1 Project Standard Output Measures

| Code No. | Description | Year 1 Total | Year 2 Total | Year 3 Total | Year 4 Total | Total to date | Number planned for this reporting period | Total planned from application |
|----------|---|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 6A | Number of people to receive other forms of education/training (which does not fall into categories 1-5 above) | 36 Ecuadorians (34% women) | | | | 36 Ecuadorians (34% women) | 30 | 60 |
| 6B | Number of training weeks to be provided | 21.6 | | | | 21.6 | 18 | 36 (60 people x 3 days)/5 |
| 7 | Number of (ie different types - not volume - of material produced) training materials to be produced for use by host country | 0 | | | | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 8 | Number of weeks to be spent by UK project staff on project work in the host country | 13.1 | | | | 13.1 | 14.5 | 43.7 |
| 9 | Number of species/habitat management plans (or action plans) to be produced for Governments, public authorities, or other implementing agencies in the host country | 0 | | | | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 14A | Number of conferences/seminars/workshops to be organised | 0 | | | | 0 | 0 | 2 |

| Code No. | Description | Year 1 Total | Year 2 Total | Year 3 Total | Year 4 Total | Total to date | Number planned for this reporting period | Total planned from application |
|--------------|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | to present/disseminate findings | | | | | | | |
| 14B | Number of conferences/seminars/workshops attended at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated. | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 15A | Number of national press releases in host country(ies) | 2 | | | | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| 15B | Number of local press releases in host country(ies) | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| 15C | Number of national press releases in UK | 0 | | | | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 18A | Number of national TV programmes/features in host country(ies) | 0 | | | | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 19A | Number of national radio interviews/features in host county(ies) | 0 | | | | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 19C | Number of local radio interviews/features in host country(ies) | 0 | | | | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 23 | Value of resources raised from other sources (ie in addition to Darwin funding) for project work | £87K | | | | £87K | £78K | £188K |
| New measures | NONE | | | | | | | |

Table 2 Publications

| Type (eg journals, manual, CDs) | Detail (title, author, year) | Publishers (name, city) | Available from (eg contact address, website) | Cost £ |
|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------|---|--------|
| Bulletin | Fortalecimiento de la Gobernanza en Áreas Marinas Protegidas de la Costa del Ecuador" (Costa, Ecuador), FFLA, 2009 | FFLA | http://www.ffla.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=313&Itemid=149 | 0 |
| Bulletin | Fortaleciendo la Gobernanza en Áreas Marinas Protegidas de la costa del Ecuador, FFLA, 2010 | FFLA | http://www.ffla.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=382&Itemid=34 | 0 |
| Youtube video | Voces en el Manejo #1/3, FFLA, 2009 | FFLA | http://www.youtube.com/pr ofile?user=Vocesmanejo&hl=fr#p/u/1/RPd2dw-Ks1Q | 0 |
| Youtube video | Voces en el Manejo #2/3, FFLA, 2009 | FFLA | http://www.youtube.com/pr ofile?user=Vocesmanejo&hl=fr#p/u/2/V354aWQ-JTk | 0 |
| Youtube video | Voces en el Manejo #3/3, FFLA, 2009 | FFLA | http://www.youtube.com/pr ofile?user=Vocesmanejo&hl=fr#p/u/3/b15XMVwVOI0 | 0 |
| Youtube video | Pirateria: las comunidades de la Reserva de Galera | FFLA | http://www.youtube.com/pr ofile?user=Vocesmanejo&hl=fr#p/u/0/zrimHWIC6C | 0 |

| Type (eg journals, manual, CDs) | Detail (title, author, year) | Publishers (name, city) | Available from (eg contact address, website) | Cost £ |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|--------|
| | San Francisco piden seguridad en el mar, FFLA, 2009 | | | |
| Youtube video | Ecuador: Plan de manejo de la Reserva Marina de Galera-San Francisco - Inicio del proceso, FFLA, 2010 | FFLA | http://www.youtube.com/pr ofile?user=Vocesmanejo&hl=fr#p/u/4/6TkUF6el5x0 | 0 |

3.4 Progress towards the project purpose and outcomes (sub-goal)

Purpose: Improved capacity at the national and local level to establish participatory governance structures that facilitate the negotiation of actions for the practical management and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity in Ecuador, with lessons learned at 3 pilot sites informing the development of national and regional MPA networks.

The work of the first year of the project has definitely increased understanding of what participatory MPA governance involves and how it can lead to stronger national MPA sub-system. Also significant is the realisation that such a sub-system needs to recognise and in some way incorporate marine management areas that are not under the auspices of MoE but are nevertheless part of how Ecuador governs in marine ecosystems. The participation of FFI and FFLA on the small group which will advise USCMM as it takes this process forward is an excellent opportunity to keep the connection between project outputs and this bigger purpose.

Of the purpose indicators, the first has been broken down into stages in a way that increases its usefulness as an indicator (see Monitoring Manual). The second indicator is only applicable once the specific resource management strategies get under way. It is specific to the pilot sites but useful as a complement to the first system-wide indicator and to the tabulated data of the sub-goal indicator.

Sub-Goal: Innovative and locally validated models of governance are incorporated into the new National Sub-system of MPAs, thereby helping Ecuador to meet its 2012 CBD targets on MPAs, contributing to the establishment of a regional MPA network in South America, and facilitating the negotiation of pilot agreements on the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species along the coast of Ecuador.

The Monitoring Manual tabulates all Ecuador's MPA's and mangrove concessions and provides somewhat subjective but nevertheless valuable rating of the extent to which they have a participatory governance system. Notwithstanding progress at Machalilla and GSF, it is too early to expect meaningful change on this indicator.

The second indicator proved unworkable and has been changed.

3.5 Progress towards impact on biodiversity, sustainable use or equitable sharing of biodiversity benefits

In assessing the impact of this project, we must consider it in the context of Ecuador's array of actions intended to introduce a degree of control and management to what has largely been a free-for-all (except in Galapagos) and to enable artisanal fishers to achieve sustainable, secure livelihoods. Actions include declaring zones for artisanal and industrial fisheries, including shrimp trawling, installing Vessel Monitoring Systems for large vessels, exploring new governance mechanisms such as community management agreements (in essence, concessions), increasing fisheries monitoring and reviewing the status of shrimp farms in cleared mangrove areas. We believe that our project is making a significant contribution to this effort, especially by increasing understanding and support for participatory governance as an approach to making new policies and declarations lead on to real changes in practices at sea and hence to ecosystem productivity and biodiversity.

4. Monitoring, evaluation and lessons

In order to translate the indicators of the log frame into well defined measures of progress, FFI and FFLA have prepared a Monitoring Manual. It is only available in Spanish but is attached with this report anyway. Here is a summary of observations about the indicators in the log frame and how they have been applied.

- SG1: We exclude Galapagos from this indicator, because its huge size would distort the indicator and swamp the information about the mainland MPAs, where the project is working. We have assessed the level of participation on a scale of 0-5, as characterised in the Monitoring Manual (0 means “implements regulations and enforces against violations”; 5 means “fully recognizes private and traditional rights and provides support to local management”). Although these levels do not have a quantitative relations, we have nevertheless included some “averages” in the log frame, to give a sense of overall progress. However, they are not statistically meaningful.
- SG2, 3.2 and 4.1: We found that “Percentage of interviewees at key national and regional meetings who are familiar with lessons learned in the Ecuadorian context” was a poor indicator, because variation related to the choice of meetings and interviewees could exceed the variation resulting from the work of this project. Therefore for SG2 and 4.1 we have replaced it with “Number of requests to project participants to participate in the development of MPAs and MPA networks in the region”. The replacement indicator for 3.2 is described below.
- P1: We have assessed the extent to which the plan for the national sub-system of MPA’s makes specific reference to participatory governance on a scale of 0-4, as characterised in the Monitoring Manual (0 means “It makes no reference to participatory governance” and 4 means “The design of the sub-system makes participation a fundamental element of the decision-making system”).
- P2: We are thinking of adjusting this indicator to be the same as 1.2 below, to which it is very similar.
- 1.1: The progress towards having a formally established multi-sectorial platform is marked by four stages: 0 = no platform exists; 1 = an informal platform exists in practice but has no legal base; 2 = a platform exists and has legal base but is not fully recognised by the Ministry; 3 = platform exists, is legally established and is recognised by the Ministry.
- 1.2: The Monitoring Manual describes a method of calculating a percentage figure based on which actors should be present (according to stakeholder analysis) and the level at which they are represented. In this way we try to capture whether the right stakeholders and authorities are at the table, as well as their participation.
- 1.3: The challenge is assessing the extent to which acquired knowledge is applied. For this we will use an array of information sources (we are still working on the details of this indicator). Our intention is to train about 60 people, in order to achieve the target of at least 30 truly applying their new knowledge.
- 2.4: We are measuring this in two ways. One is the amount of co-financing raised and the other is the extent to which the co-financing enables the resource management strategy to be fully implemented.
- 3.1: The Manual lists 11 general recommendations, each of which would, if taken up, generate specific recommendations for the particular legal instruments and institutions. The Manual describes the stages of uptake of any given recommendation from 0 (ignored) through levels 1 and 2 (increasing uptake of the concept) to 3 and 4 (increasing degrees of incorporation into the legal and institutional framework). For the “percentage incorporated” indicator we consider levels 3 and 4 only.
- 3.2: We have replaced the former indicator with “Number of fora at which national government authorities are exposed to project-related recommendations on legal and institutional aspects of participatory governance.” This is a more direct measure of the extent to which the project is communicating the main recommendations. Note that the presentation of these ideas may sometimes be done by FFLA or FFI but not necessarily. In fact, greater impact - and a sign of the effectiveness of the project at the local level – will come when the recommendations are expressed in their own words by the stakeholders and local authorities.
- 4.2: The indicator referred only to materials disseminated in UK and internationally. We have added to this materials disseminated in Ecuador, since this is also relevant to the Output and is readily tracked.

In terms of lessons learned from the first year of the project, we highlight three:

- The understandable preoccupation with piracy and shrimp trawling issues at GSF may have slowed progress on the management plan but it highlighted that any participatory governance system must have the practical support of national authorities to address threats that are beyond the capacity of local stakeholders. As a project, there is no trying to push ahead ignoring these issues that loom large for local people; rather, we must help to ensure that they are resolved.
- Local fishers already have strong views about their priority resources needing conservation action. By responding to these we can be more confident of commitment to the development and implementation of the resource management strategy.
- The experience at El Morro highlights that, until participatory governance systems become institutionalised and widely accepted, local initiatives continue to be vulnerable to changes in political leadership.

5. Actions taken in response to previous reviews (not applicable)

6. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere (none)

7. Sustainability

What we can say at this relatively early stage in the project is that it has strong ownership by the government, especially the USCMM, and by the stakeholders at Machalilla and GSF (not yet at Jambelí, as we are just getting started there). Indeed, the USCMM made sure that FFLA's recommendations on governance were incorporated into IDB and CAF studies for the design of the MPA sub-system, that would otherwise have been weak in this area. Sustainability is further enhanced by the empowerment and capacity building inherent in the project. In summary, conditions are in place for achieving sustainability, but it is too early to plan the details of an exit strategy, since the details will depend on progress in Year 2 and beyond.

8. Dissemination

Notwithstanding the communications activities detailed above and in Annex 1, the emphasis in Year 1 has been on supporting the processes themselves and less on dissemination. From Q1 of Year 2 onwards we intend to implement our national and international communications efforts more systematically and in particular start dissemination through FFI's channels in UK and internationally.

9. Project Expenditure

Table 3 Project expenditure during the reporting period (Defra Financial Year 1 April 2009 to 31 March 2010)

The budget presented below corresponds to the final budget after reallocation approved by the LTS. Amounts highlighted present agreed changes. In the column variance is presented the percentage of execution of specific budget line.

Expenditure in all budget lines is within the acceptable variance (10%) except the budget line "unforeseen expenses" (in red). This line has only one expense, which corresponds to the recovery of data from a hard disk due to a virus infection after one workshop. This line exceeds the amount budgeted by £86.30.

| Item | Budget | Expenditure | Variance |
|---|--------|-------------|----------|
| Rent, rates, heating, overheads etc | | | |
| Overheads | | | |
| Travel and subsistence | | | |
| International travel | | | |
| National travel (MAE personnel) | | | |
| Fieldwork travel and subsistence | | | |
| Operating costs | | | |
| Conferences, workshops and seminars | | | |
| Bank cost | | | |
| Unforeseen expenses | | | |
| Capital items/equipment (specify) | | | |
| Computers | | | |
| Projectors Data | | | |
| Camera | | | |
| Telephone | | | |
| Others (specify) | | | |
| Communications/dissemination materials | | | |
| Communication (cellular plan) | | | |
| Materials | | | |
| Salaries (specify by individual) | | | |
| FFI Americas & Caribbean Director (based in Quito) | | | |
| FFI Ecuador Country Manager (based in Quito) | | | |
| FFLA Programme Director | | | |
| FFLA Technical Coordinator | | | |
| FFLA Executive Director | | | |
| FFLA Project Assistant | | | |
| FFLA Finance and administ team (accountant, bookkeeper, office assistant) | | | |
| FFLA Institutional development team (Director and assistant) | | | |
| TOTAL | | | |

10. OPTIONAL: Outstanding achievements of your project during the reporting period (300-400 words maximum). This section may be used for publicity purposes

[We feel the project has got off to a strong start, opening an array of opportunities for the MPA sub-system, but the "newsworthy" stories will come later in Years 2 and 3.]

I agree for LTS and the Darwin Secretariat to publish the content of this section

Annex 1 Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year: 2008/09

| Project summary | Measurable Indicators | Progress and Achievements April 2008 - March 2009 | Actions required/planned for next period |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>Goal: <i>To draw on expertise relevant to biodiversity from within the United Kingdom to work with local partners in countries rich in biodiversity but constrained in resources to achieve</i></p> <p><i>The conservation of biological diversity,</i></p> <p><i>The sustainable use of its components, and</i></p> <p><i>The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources</i></p> | | | <p><i>(do not fill not applicable)</i></p> |
| <p>Sub-Goal: Innovative and locally validated models of governance are incorporated into the new National Sub-system of MPAs, thereby helping Ecuador to meet its 2012 CBD targets on MPAs, contributing to the establishment of a regional MPA network in South America, and facilitating the negotiation of pilot agreements on the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species along the coast of Ecuador.</p> | <p><u>SG1</u> Number and size of MPAs in Ecuador, and proportion of them which have a participatory governance model. <u>SG2</u> Number of requests to project participants to participate in the development of MPAs and MPA networks in the region. <u>n.b.</u> REPLACES: "SG2 Percentage of interviewees at key national and regional meetings who are familiar with lessons learned in the Ecuadorian context."</p> | <p>SG1. Baseline established (excluding Galapagos). 13 MPAs, total size 298,000 ha plus 34 mangrove "concessions" totalling 28,606 ha. For the 13 MPAs mean score on scale of 0-5 for having an approved participatory governance mechanism, is 1.5 or, if you weight by area, 1.8. However in only 3/13 is the participatory mechanism functioning effectively. The mangroves all have a highly participatory mechanism on paper (4/5). We lack data on how many are applying this in practice. SG2. One (CPPS, Chile)</p> | <p>We plan to start working in mangrove concession as our third project site, so that will throw light on that component of the marine protected area system.</p> |
| <p>Purpose Improved capacity at the national and local level to establish participatory governance structures that facilitate the negotiation of actions for the practical management and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity in Ecuador, with lessons learned at 3 pilot sites informing the development of national and regional MPA networks.</p> | <p><u>P1.</u> Proposed MPA network at the national level has specific reference to participatory governance structures. <u>P2.</u> At 2 pilot MPA sites, percentage of key actors identified that participate actively in the negotiation of resource management strategies through the local management committees to be established.</p> | <p>P1. On the scale of 0-4, the baseline in April '09 was assessed at 1 (Minor reference to participation at the conceptual level but not reflected significantly in the operational plan). In April '10 we assessed that it had increased to 2 (substantial reference to participation at the conceptual level but in the operational plan it is a consultative role, and not reflected in power relations or decision-making structures). P2. There have not yet been</p> | |

| Project summary | Measurable Indicators | Progress and Achievements April 2008 - March 2009 | Actions required/planned for next period |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | negotiations about specific resources. We are considering adopting Indicator 1.2, to replace P2, as it is very similar and captures participation across all topics. | |
| <p>Output 1. At two pilot sites (Galera-San Francisco and Jambelí (replaces El Morro) a governance system has been designed, and at the Machalilla site the existing governance model has been adapted and strengthened in a way that enables decentralization to the lowest appropriate level with effective inter sectoral cooperation between environment, fisheries, tourism and defence agencies, and that empowers the participation of local coastal communities, and capacity has been built for its implementation.</p> | <p><u>1.1</u> One participatory and multi sectoral platform designed and established through ministerial decree at two pilot sites <u>1.2</u> Percentage attendance and participation by each of the members of the three local management committees. <u>1.3.</u> At least 30 key actors applying skills and knowledge in participation, negotiation and conflict management gained through training course, technical field assistance visits and exchange visits between pilot sites.</p> | <p>1.1 Baseline at April '09 for GSF on the scale of 0-3 is level 1 i.e. a platform exists but with no legal basis, and for Jambelí is level 0 i.e. no platform exists, This is still the situation at April '10. For El Morro the baseline at April '09 was 1 and this increased in Sept '09 to 2 with the approval of the management plan including a chapter on governance structure. 1.2 The methodology in the Monitoring Manual yields meeting-by-meeting figures for PNM of 51%, 37%, 16%, 16%, 33% and 53%, the low period corresponding to elections. For GSF the figures are 49%, 49%, 56%. 1.3 36 people, most of them involved in PNM or GSF, trained in these skills through a workshop. We have end-of-module evaluations of the course, but it is too soon to measure application of knowledge. Nevertheless, we estimate that about 16 of the 36 have already applied the knowledge gained e.g. in the zoning negotiations in PNM and the Management Plan process of GSF.</p> | |
| <p>Activity 1.1 FFLA/FFI develop through participatory process draft Ministerial Decrees and relevant management plan chapter</p> | | <p>At PNM FFI/FFLA participated in a multi-actor meeting about strengthening PNM, held a few days before official project start date of 1/04/09. FFLA has continued working with Management Committee (MC) members, and facilitated in Q4 a meeting with MC and Ministry to define scope of management plan, including decision-making processes. Two more meetings planned for April. At GSF FFI and FFLA facilitated in Q3 an initial meeting with local "pre-committee" and authorities at which scope of Management Plan agreed (includes governance chapter). Second meeting planned for April. At the original site, El Morro, in Q2 FFLA facilitated the drafting of the Ministerial decree approving the Management Plan, including a less than innovative chapter on governance. However, we have shifted focus to Jambelí (agreed with DI), where in Q1 of Year 2 we will diagnose current situation and initiate these processes.</p> | |
| <p>Activity 1.2 FFLA/FFI to organize and facilitate meetings to present and negotiate proposed governance structures and proposed inter institutional MoU's</p> | | <p>At PNM FFLA/FFI facilitated and participated in two meetings in Q3 involving Environment, Fisheries and Navy and MC, to implement inter-institutional MoU for surveillance and control work. A further meeting in Q4 addressed governance structure issues. At GSF the initial meeting in Q3 about the Management Plan addressed governance issues, including question of how to deal with non-local threats to the area i.e. shrimp trawling in the Reserve (legal but harmful) and piracy (theft of</p> | |

| Project summary | Measurable Indicators | Progress and Achievements April 2008 - March 2009 | Actions required/planned for next period |
|---|---|---|--|
| | | outboard motors at sea). Subsequent action by Fisheries prohibited shrimp trawling in all MPA's. On piracy the Navy acted after situation deteriorated further and has greatly reduced the problem. Further meeting on Management Plan scheduled for April '10. | |
| Activity 1.3 FFLA to facilitate meetings of management committee to prioritize, negotiate, validate, and evaluate activities and products; practice skills learned in training. | | At PNM in Year 1 the Management Committee's leadership group or Board met 6 times, and its full assembly (some 50 members) 2 times, all facilitated by FFLA. FFLA facilitated 2 meetings of the MC's Marine Resources secretariat, one meeting of the Communication MC Secretariat and one meeting of representatives of the 6 MC Secretariats. At GSF the local pre-committee leadership group met 7 times and the full group met 4 times. In all cases these meetings were addressing issues related to the process of building the governance system, preparing the management plan, and/or improving control, and enabled FFLA/FFI to direct project support accordingly. | |
| Activity 1.4 FFLA to facilitate and support organisation of General Assembly workshops per pilot site in which management committee plans are approved and evaluated | | In PNM FFLA facilitated in Q2 a MC General Assembly meeting at which approved the Committee's workplan and also elected new officials. No equivalent yet in GSF or Jambelí. | |
| Activity 1.5 FFLA to design and implement training courses in MPA governance, participation and negotiation | | In Q4 FFLA gave the course on governance in three modules to 36 trainees, drawn from PNM and El Morro Management Committees, GSF pre-committee, municipalities, and local and national authorities. | |
| Activity 1.6 FFLA to organise exchange visits between pilot sites as support to capacity-building in governance and resource management | | In Q4, in conjunction with the course, all course participants visited GSF to learn about that initiative. | |
| Output 2. In 2 of 3 pilot sites - Galera-San Francisco, Jambelí (replaced El Morro) or Machalilla - local stewardship of the marine ecosystem is strengthened through the negotiation of an agreed, adaptive resource management strategy for one species (preferably migratory or CITES listed) at each site, on the basis of available scientific and traditional knowledge. | <u>2.1</u> Percentage of key actors identified that participate actively in the negotiation of resource management strategies. <u>2.2</u> Signed agreement document for resource management strategy at 2 sites <u>2.3</u> Information starts to be generated by participatory monitoring system for use in adaptive management strategy. <u>2.4</u> Co-financing raised and other funds leveraged for implementation of resource use strategies | 2.1 See indicator P2 above. 2.2 Baseline at April '09 was zero agreements signed. Situation at April '10 is still zero (as expected). 2.3 Baseline at April '09 was zero resource monitoring data available. Situation at April '10 is still zero, because resources are still being chosen and plans made (as expected). 2.4 No new co-financing has been raised so far. Three proposals have been written for EU: one rejected at the full proposal stage (concept was approved), one full proposal pending (passed concept stage) and one concept submitted. One proposal to DFID Civil Society Challenge Fund rejected, but resubmission in 2010 invited. One proposal to Total Foundation rejected, a small one to Disney is under consideration. | |
| Activity 2.1 Technical working group created; and to hold meeting to present and discuss local biodiversity based on scientific and traditional knowledge. | | At PNM the idea of the technical working group was pre-empted by the local initiative on Spondylus, so we will form the working group in the first workshop on Spondylus. At GSF the November 2009 meeting proposed working groups for various components of the Management Plan, but these have not been active. A much more promising avenue is to collaborate with local NGO, Nazca Institute, which | |

| Project summary | Measurable Indicators | Progress and Achievements April 2008 - March 2009 | Actions required/planned for next period |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | has been carrying out research and gathering information based on local knowledge, so we will pursue this in Q1 of Year 2. | |
| Activity 2.2 Technical working group to identify and prioritise key resources used at 2 pilot sites. | | At PNM, as explained, the local initiative on Spondylus pre-empted the intended prioritisation process but has many advantages. At GSF discussions with Nazca Institute and local fishers will decide the priority resource in Q1 of Year 2. | |
| Activity 2.3 Technical working group to study lessons learned from successfully implemented resource use strategies and experiences. | | Scheduled to start in Q1 of Year 2. | |
| Activity 2.4 Technical working group develop and pre-negotiate 2 final resource use management strategies, present proposals for final negotiation | | Scheduled to start in Q1 of Year 2. | |
| Activity 2.5 FFI/ Technical working group to develop baseline and monitoring systems for socio-economic benefits for each key resource; FFLA/trainees assist agreement. | | Scheduled to start in Q2 of Year 2. | |
| Activity 2.6 FFI/ Technical working group to develop local biological monitoring systems for 2 key resource use strategies developed, plus FFLA/trainees assist agreement. | | Scheduled to start in Q2 of Year 2. | |
| Activity 2.7 FFI, FFLA and other partners generate and present funding proposals and also liaise with government and development agencies | | Scheduled to start in Q2 of Year 2. | |
| Output 3. Capacity built at the national level in the MoE in the facilitation of the participatory process for development of the subsystem of MPAs and guidance provided for adjustments necessary to legal and institutional framework to incorporate governance models as part of the national, regional and international initiatives to meet 2012 CBD target of creating and managing national and regional MPA networks. | <u>3.1</u> Percentage of recommendations made that are incorporated in new legal and institutional framework. <u>3.2</u> Number of fora at which national government authorities are exposed to project-related recommendations on legal and institutional aspects of participatory governance. n.b. REPLACES: 3.2 Percentage of interviewees at key national and regional meetings who are familiar with lessons learned in the Ecuadorian context. | 3.1 Baseline at April '09 was 0%. The situation remained unchanged at April '10. The more detailed assessment in the Monitoring Manual shows an increase in the mean level of uptake of the recommendations (on a scale of 0-4 in which level 3 is considered to be "incorporated") from 0.3 in April '09 (8 recommendations on level zero and 3 on level one) to 1.5 in April '10 (5 recommendations on level one and 6 on level two). 3.2 Baseline number of fora in the year April '08 to March'09 was 2. Number of fora in the period April 09 to March 10 was 4. | |
| Activity 3.1 FFLA to support MoE in the design and facilitation of key national and regional meetings for participatory development of national subsystem | | FFLA organised with MoE in Q4 the first coordination workshop for the construction of the sub-system of MPA's. The second is planned for April '10. Participants in these initial meetings are mainly MPA managers, senior staff of the Subsecretariat for Coastal and Marine Management, and supporting NGO's. Subsequent meetings will have broader participation. | |
| Activity 3.2 FFI/FFLA to present at key events their recommendations on legal and institutional changes necessary for innovative governance models. | | FFLA provided detailed recommendations on two key studies, financed by CAF (Andean Development Corporation and IDB/GEF), for MoE for the creation of the new subsystem of MPAs, by means of the following documents and | |

| Project summary | Measurable Indicators | Progress and Achievements April 2008 - March 2009 | Actions required/planned for next period |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>presentations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "FFLA_Analysis and Recommendations on FN-CAF Proposal for a Strategic Plan for the Creation of a Subsystem of MPAs" • "FFLA_ Comments on the BID-GEF Legal and Institutional Analysis for the Creation of Subsystem of MPAs" • "Minutes of the Coordination Meeting between FFLA and the BID-GEF team to reach Agreement on FFLA recommendations for the Diagnostic and Strategy for the BID-GEF Project to establish a Subsystem of MPAs" • "FFLA Recommendations to the Regional BID and Ministry of Environment Steering Committee", Powerpoint Presentation. • "Plan and Budget for Country-Wide Diagnostic of Diverse Forms of Governance to be included within the 1st year Action Plan of the BID-GEF project, in the Diagnostic component" | |
| <p>Output 4. Key groups informed about project results and awareness about local stewardship of marine biodiversity raised nationally and internationally.</p> | <p>4.1 Number of requests to project participants to participate in the development of MPAs and MPA networks in the region. n.b. REPLACES: "4.1 Percentage of interviewees at key national and regional meetings who are familiar with lessons learned in the Ecuadorian context."</p> <p>4.2 Number of communicational materials with Darwin Initiative logo that have been disseminated in Ecuador, the UK and at international fora</p> | <p>4.1 See SG2 above. 4.2 The scores for the indicator for the period April '09 to March '10 are: UK: Zero Internationally: 7 – Five Youtube videos of process in PNM, GSF and El Morro. Leaflet and poster at DI meeting in Brazil Ecuador national: 2 - FFLA bulletins Local: 6 - Poster at PNM, Poster on resource (Spondylus), four presentations at site-specific workshops.</p> | |
| <p>Activity 4.1 MoE to internally disseminate governance models and merits.</p> | | <p>Scheduled to happen in Q4 of Year 3.</p> | |
| <p>Activity 4.2 Project partners to present /expose project at/through regional conferences and networks (including MoE for SA MPA network).</p> | | <p>In Q2 FFLA drew on project plans and initial experiences in its presentation on governance made to a meeting in Chile of the South Pacific Permanent Commission's Regional Network of MPAs.</p> | |
| <p>Activity 4.3 Project partners to present/expose project to various international fora and media.</p> | | <p>FFI proposed to DI a change in project plans, postponing the investment in dissemination at international fora to Years 2 and 3. This was accepted.</p> | |
| <p>Activity 4.4 Project partners to disseminate project goal, progress and results to national media.</p> | | <p>FFLA distributed bulletins about project-related events but not specifically to disseminate the project goal, progress and results.</p> | |
| <p>Activity 4.5 Project partners to organize national events to disseminate project results.</p> | | <p>Scheduled to happen in Q4 of Year 3. However we plan to co-finance and organise an additional national workshop on marine biodiversity conservation in Q3 of Year 2, at which participatory governance systems and management of a key resource (Spondylus) will be major themes.</p> | |

Annex 2 Project's full current logframe

the Logical Framework submitted with your Stage 1 application. Please highlight any changes. (Use no smaller than Arial 10 pt)

| Project summary | Measurable Indicators | Means of verification | Important Assumptions |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>Goal: Effective contribution in support of the implementation of the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention on Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species (CMS), as well as related targets set by countries rich in biodiversity but constrained in resources.</p> | | | |
| <p>Sub-Goal: Innovative and locally validated models of governance are incorporated into the new National Sub-system of MPAs, thereby helping Ecuador to meet its 2012 CBD targets on MPAs, contributing to the establishment of a regional MPA network in South America, and facilitating the negotiation of pilot agreements on the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species along the coast of Ecuador.</p> | <p><u>SG1</u> Number and size of MPAs in Ecuador, and proportion of them which have a participatory governance model. <u>SG2</u> Number of requests to project participants to participate in the development of MPAs and MPA networks in the region.</p> | <p><u>SG1</u>. Ecuador's Official Register . <u>SG2</u>. Results of interviews undertaken</p> | |
| <p>Purpose Improved capacity at the national and local level to establish participatory governance structures that facilitate the negotiation of actions for the practical management and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity in Ecuador, with lessons learned at 3 pilot sites informing the development of national and regional MPA networks.</p> | <p><u>P1</u>. Proposed MPA network at the national level has specific reference to participatory governance structures. <u>P2</u>. At 2 pilot MPA sites, percentage of key actors identified that participate actively in the negotiation of resource management strategies through the local management committees to be established. <i>We may replace this with the indicator 1.2 below.</i></p> | <p><u>P1</u>. Proposal document by MoE for National Subsystem of MPAs. <u>P2</u> Attendance lists and notes of meetings held by the local management committees at each site.</p> | <p>Ecuadorian government continues to favour local empowerment /participatory processes.</p> |
| <p>OUTPUTS 1. At two pilot sites (Galera-San Francisco and Jambelí) a governance system has been designed, and at the Machalilla site the existing governance model has been adapted and strengthened in a way that enables decentralization to the lowest appropriate level with</p> | <p><u>1.1</u> One participatory and multi sectoral platform designed and established through ministerial decree at two pilot sites <u>1.2</u> Percentage attendance and participation by each of the members of the three local management committees. <u>1.3</u>. At least 30 key actors applying</p> | <p><u>1.1</u> Ministerial decree and internal regulations for functioning of local management committees <u>1.2</u>. Minutes of meetings held. <u>1.3</u>. Training registry; manuals and reports prepared by trainers; training evaluation feedback; contact database to determine % of trainees who are formally representing</p> | <p>Stakeholders keep willingness to participate in the design of governance models. Government decentralisation is retained.</p> |

| Project summary | Measurable Indicators | Means of verification | Important Assumptions |
|---|--|---|--|
| effective inter sectoral cooperation between environment, fisheries, tourism and defence agencies, and that empowers the participation of local coastal communities, and capacity has been built for its implementation. | skills and knowledge in participation, negotiation and conflict management gained through training course, technical field assistance visits and exchange visits between pilot sites. | constituencies in platforms (fora); Field reports from field assistance visits; exchange visit reports. | |
| 2. In 2 of 3 pilot sites (Galera-San Francisco, Jambeli or Machalilla) local stewardship of the marine ecosystem is strengthened through the negotiation of an agreed, adaptive resource management strategy for one species (preferably migratory or CITES listed) at each site, on the basis of available scientific and traditional knowledge. | <u>2.1</u> Percentage of key actors identified that participate actively in the negotiation of resource management strategies. <u>2.2</u> Signed agreement document for resource management strategy at 2 sites <u>2.3</u> Information starts to be generated by participatory monitoring system for use in adaptive management strategy; <u>2.4</u> Co-financing raised and other funds leveraged for implementation of resource use strategies | <u>2.1</u> Negotiation meeting minutes <u>2.2</u> Signed Agreement documents; final resource use strategy doc; minutes of meetings. <u>2.3.</u> Monitoring protocol; field manuals <u>2.4</u> Donor agreements signed. | Willingness of communities and stakeholders to participate and reach consensus on difficult issues, such as resource management. Local stakeholders support and attend workshops /training and remain committed to the project. Funds leveraged to permit start-up of participatory monitoring system. |
| 3. Capacity built at the national level in the MoE in the facilitation of the participatory process for development of the subsystem of MPAs and guidance provided for adjustments necessary to legal and institutional framework to incorporate governance models as part of the national, regional and international initiatives to meet 2012 CBD target of creating and managing national and regional MPA networks. | <u>3.1</u> Percentage of recommendations made that are incorporated in new legal and institutional framework. <u>3.2</u> Number of fora at which national government authorities are exposed to project-related recommendations on legal and institutional aspects of participatory governance. | <u>3.1</u> Interviews notes. Baseline analysis document. <u>3.2</u> Results of interview undertaken; register of receipt of document. | MoE continues with the predisposition of receiving support from civil society to fulfil their CBD targets. |
| 4. Key groups informed about project results and awareness about local stewardship of marine biodiversity raised nationally and internationally. | <u>4.1</u> Number of requests to project participants to participate in the development of MPAs and MPA networks in the region. <u>4.2</u> Number of communicational materials with Darwin Initiative logo that have been disseminated in Ecuador , the UK and at international fora | <u>4.1</u> Results of interviews undertaken <u>4.2</u> SA MPA Network meeting minutes; materials on established marine networks (IUCN, TNC, CPPS); presentations at UK and international fora, at least 3 articles published in various media; exposure on websites. | |

| Project summary | Measurable Indicators | Means of verification | Important Assumptions |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <p>Activities (details in workplan)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 FFLA/FFI develop through participatory process draft Ministerial Decrees and relevant management plan chapter 1.2 FFLA/FFI to organize and facilitate meetings to present and negotiate proposed governance structures and proposed inter institutional MoU's 1.3 FFLA to facilitate meetings of management committee to prioritize, negotiate, validate, and evaluate activities and products; practice skills learned in training. 1.4 FFLA to facilitate and support organisation of General Assembly workshops per pilot site in which management committee plans are approved and evaluated 1.5 FFLA to design and implement training courses in MPA governance, participation and negotiation 1.6 FFLA to organise exchange visits between pilot sites as support to capacity-building in governance and resource management 2.1 Technical working group created; and to hold meeting to present and discuss local biodiversity based on scientific and traditional knowledge 2.2 Technical working group to identify and prioritises key resources uses at 2 pilot sites 2.3 Technical working group to study lessons learned from successfully implemented resource use strategies and experiences 2.4 Technical working group develop and pre-negotiate 2 final resource use management strategies, present proposals for final negotiation 2.5 FFI/ Technical working group to develop baseline and monitoring systems for socio-economic benefits for each key resource; FFLA/trainees assist agreement 2.6 FFI/ Technical working group to develop local biological monitoring systems for 2 key resource use strategies developed, plus FFLA/trainees assist agreement. 2.7 FFI, FFLA and other partners generate and present funding proposals and also liaise with government and development agencies 3.1 FFLA to support MoE in the design and facilitation of key national and regional meetings for participatory development of national subsystem 3.2 FFI/FFLA to present at key events their recommendations on legal and institutional changes necessary for innovative governance models 4.1 MoE to internally disseminate governance models and merits. 4.2 Project partners to present /expose project at/through regional conferences and networks (including MoE for SA MPA network). 4.3 Project partners to present/expose project to various international fora and media. 4.4 Project partners to disseminate project goal, progress and results to national media. 4.5 Project partners to organize organise national events to disseminate project results. | | | |
| <p>Monitoring activities:</p> <p>Indicators: P1, P2, 1.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1 and 4.2 (indicators for capacity building at national level, and national and international dissemination).</p> <p>Training and workshop participants complete questionnaires to determine value of these events, and any areas requiring follow-up.</p> <p>Workshop and training leaders are able to make any recommendations for necessary or desirable follow-up.</p> <p>Indicators are followed closely to determine at 6 monthly intervals whether progress is satisfactory, adjustment of work plan needed etc.</p> <p>Indicators: 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 (indicators for local level activities).</p> <p>Local management committees and project partners develop site-specific monitoring and evaluation protocols for effectiveness of i) biological and socio-economic monitoring, as well as ii) for governance.</p> <p>For 1.3 and 2.3 trainee group profiles used as baseline to measure against knowledge and skills gained.</p> <p>Overall:</p> <p>Project partners monitor and evaluate the progress, context, risks and assumptions of the DI project on a bi-annual basis, based on yearly DI work plans</p> <p>Project partners conduct participatory evaluation held in last trimester of project, validating results at each pilot site and with national authorities.</p> | | | |

Annex 3 Onwards – supplementary material (optional but encouraged as evidence of project achievement)

This may include outputs of the project, but need not necessarily include all project documentation. For example, the abstract of a conference would be adequate, as would be a summary of a thesis rather than the full document. If we feel that reviewing the full document would be useful, we will contact you again to ask for it to be submitted

Checklist for submission

| | Check |
|--|----------|
| Is the report less than 5MB? If so, please email to Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk putting the project number in the Subject line. | Yes |
| Is your report more than 5MB? If so, please advise Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk that the report will be send by post on CD, putting the project number in the Subject line. | No |
| Have you included means of verification? You need not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report. We will send the Monitoring Manual in a few days, when some updates have been completed. However it is in Spanish. No other major outputs to send. | see note |
| Do you have hard copies of material you want to submit with the report? If so, please make this clear in the covering email and ensure all material is marked with the project number. | No |
| Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors | Yes |
| Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully? | Yes |
| Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report. | |