



Darwin Initiative Annual Report

Important note:

To be completed with reference to the Reporting Guidance Notes for Project Leaders: it is expected that this report will be about 10 pages in length, excluding annexes



Submission Deadline: 30 April 2011

1. Darwin Project Information

Project Reference	17-017
Project Title	Innovative Governance Models for Marine Protected Area Management in Ecuador
Host Country/ies	Ecuador
UK contract holder institution	Fauna & Flora International
Host country partner institutions	Fundación Futuro Latinoamericano
Other partner institutions	
Darwin Grant Value	£207,541
Start/end dates of project	April 2009 – March 2012
Reporting period (eg Apr 2010 – Mar 2011) and number (eg Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	1 Apr 2010 to 31 March 2011 Annual report 2
Project Leader name	Robert Bensted-Smith
Project website	-
Report authors, main contributors and date	Robert Bensted-Smith, Vincent Gravez, Cristina Rivadeneira, Julio Bernal 10 May 2010

2. Project Background

Marine conservation in mainland Ecuador has hitherto been weak, with very limited coverage and ineffective management, in which coastal communities have played almost no part. Through this project FFI and our partner, the Fundación Futuro Latinoamericano (FFLA), are helping to establish participatory governance systems at three sites along the coast of Ecuador, and to use the experiences of these sites to inform the development of a national network of Marine Protected Areas (MPA's). One site is the marine part of the long established Machalilla National Park, where the project is strengthening the existing Management Committee. A second is the Galera San Francisco Marine Reserve, established by Ministerial decree in October 2008, where the project is helping to establish the platform and mechanisms for participation and support resource management measures. The third was initially intended to be at El Morro, but was switched, with DI approval, to Jambelí in the Gulf of Guayaquil. Here we are working with organisations that have agreements with the Ministry of Environment (MAE) to look after and use defined areas of mangrove, effectively concessions.

3. Project Partnerships

Project management and partnerships have continued as described in the first annual report. FFI provides strategic thinking, guidance on diverse aspects of MPA governance, planning and management, advice on policy development, links to worldwide MPA experience, and overall project management and monitoring. FFLA leads on-site activities with authorities and stakeholders, builds capacity for good governance, facilitates participation and negotiation, maintains regular contact with the coastal arm of the Ministry of Environment, and implements in-country communication. In practice there is cooperation between FFI and FFLA on all aspects of the project, and we communicate regularly through (i) frequent email and phone

communication, (ii) face-to-face meetings in Quito and (iii) collaboration on activities at the project MPA sites. We have increased the frequency of conference calls and meetings, particularly in regard to the work in Galera San Francisco Marine Reserve (GSFMR), where both institutions have been heavily involved in the final stages of the management plan process.

We have intensified our collaboration with the Nazca Institute for Marine Research, the national NGO with a leading role in the establishment of the GSFMR. Using FFI counterpart funding, we have signed an agreement with Nazca to collaborate at GSFMR, especially in the areas of zoning and monitoring.

In Jambelí we have started to cooperate with staff of the Technical University of Machala on support to mangrove concession holders. We have also started a dialogue with a USAID-funded project called Sustainable Coasts and Forests, which is working in various parts of the coast, including mangrove concessions in the adjacent province of Guayas.

The increased participation of FFI's UK-based Director of Conservation Livelihoods and Governance (CLG), Dr Helen Schneider, in the project, including a visit to Ecuador near the end of Year 2, has further invigorated that dimension of the technical collaboration with FFLA and other partners. The visit proved highly valuable in providing expert feedback and advice on project activities and also in establishing the framework for continuing collaboration throughout Year 3. The quality and rigour of the work being done by the partnership in Ecuador adds to the potential for a mutually rewarding partnership, with wider impacts.

In the first quarter of 2011 FFI used counterpart funding to take the Ecuadorian MPA project experience to three Central American countries - Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Honduras - with a view to developing projects on participatory governance of MPAs. The main participants in this exercise were FFI, FFLA, CoopeSoliDar RL (Costa Rican organisation working with fishing communities), FUNDENIC (Nicaraguan environment and development NGO) and RECOTURH (a network of community-based tourism initiatives in Honduras). This 3-week experience strengthened the FFI-FFLA partnership, enabled the experience of the Darwin Initiative project in Ecuador to feed directly into the proposed programme in Central America, and was a learning opportunity for all involved.

Ecuador's CBD focal point is the Ministry of Environment (MoE). The project continues to work very closely with the Ministry, especially the Sub-Secretariat of Coastal and Marine Management. The work on MPAs is helping Ecuador to meet its CBD commitments, especially the Programme of Work on Protected Areas, to which the development of the MPA network is a major contribution.

4. Project Progress

4.1 Progress in carrying out project activities

4.1.1 Activities under Output 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 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 instruments. The fifth and sixth activities involve training and exchange visits.

In Parque Nacional **Machalilla** (PNM) the project has continued to work to strengthen the pre-existing Management Committee and enable it to function more effectively as the principal forum through which stakeholders can participate in planning and decision-making for the Park. However, the Management Committee has hit a barrier in that the new Park director has

proven to be quite dynamic but with little interest in local participation or inter-institutional coordination.

The Management Committee has had two meetings (April and Oct 2010) at the level of its Directorate and one General Assembly (Dec 2010). The parties to the inter-institutional coordination agreement met 3 times (July 2010, Sept 2010, Jan 2011) and held one meeting with the local fishing sector to present the new radar- and radio-based surveillance system. But the low level of inter-institutional cooperation is impeding the full implementation of this system.

This is a setback for the project and confirms that, unless and until the role of the Management Committee is established in a legal instrument (a decree), it is dependent on the interest of the Park director, who is the one who calls meetings of the Committee. Having said that, the prior work of the project with different stakeholder groups may result in this setback bringing the issue to a head and demanding definition. The stakeholders are unhappy at the sidelining of the management committee and are asking the Ministry of Environment to take corrective action and to respect their constitutional rights to participate, and the elected leader of the Management Committee is threatening to resign in protest. Thus, the looming conflict may prompt intervention by the Ministry, which has hitherto tended to ignore the problem (perhaps pleased to have a Park director who is much more active than his predecessor). Our discussions with the Ministry indicate that they maintain their position of wanting to promote participation. The project is ready to facilitate negotiation and resolution of the conflict. FFI and FFLA will do what we can to transform the conflict into a source of changes that ultimately strengthen the governance system (see output section below). Meanwhile we continue to work on building the capacity of key stakeholder groups and improve the relations between Management Committee leadership and members.

At **Galera San Francisco** (GSF) Marine Reserve the project team has worked steadily with the Pre-Committee of stakeholders and local authorities to construct a nessential instriment of governance: the statute of the Management Committee. This was submitted to the Ministry of Environment for revision by the Ministry's lawyer and, after any necessary modifications, approval in a "Ministerial Agreement" (effectively a legal decree at the level of Minister). A document with some specific queries about interpretation of the Constitutional and legal provisions regarding participation has also been submitted to the Ministry's lawyer. There are complex issues involved, balancing a Constitutional commitment to participation with constraints on delegation of major decisions to non-governmental bodies. The Ministry has undertaken to complete the legal analysis and respond soon. Ideally, the Management Committee statute and the Management Plan for the Reserve should be officially approved and published as a package, the target date being June 2011, but there is a risk that the Ministry may prioritise the Plan and delay the Statute. The participatory management planning process, coordinated by Nazca, continued throughout 2010. By November 2010 the content of each component was well advanced but there was still much work to do to bring it all together into a single coherent plan. At that point the USCMM called a meeting of technical advisors, including Nazca, FFI and FFLA, to review contents, identify what remained to be done, define the plan format, and set a timetable. The one major gap was zoning, for which information had been compiled but no analysis or negotiation had taken place. The USCMM set this as a top priority and requested FFI and Nazca to take it on. We were very happy to accept, for several reasons: (i) we consider zoning, including No Take Zones, to be essential to protect biodiversity and restore productivity and have been proposing their application in Ecuador, (ii) this would be the first significant NTZs in Ecuador outside Galapagos, so a pioneering initiative with great learning potential, (iii) it fits in very well with our DI project theme of participatory monitoring and adaptive management, (iv) we could make sure that the zoning was developed together with local communities. More details of the zoning work are provided under Output 2. In terms of process, the project has facilitated a series of workshops with local communities, to discuss zoning options and to review the other, near-final components of the Plan. The final workshop to validate the whole plan is scheduled for May/June.

A spin-off of the work with GSFMR stakeholders is that several of them have now created and registered the Galera San Francisco Development Association, with the aim of promoting sustainable development and improved environmental management throughout their area, including urban and rural lands.

At the new project site of **Jambelí** we have started to work with the Union of Artisanal Fisheries Producer Organisations of the Province of El Oro (UOPPAO). This is the main regional body within which concession holders are represented. However, they are just one small group within that large Union, so the project has agreed with the Union that we will collaborate on the creation and operation of a provincial-level platform concentrating specifically on mangrove concessions. This is in line with the idea put forward in our Oct 2010 semi-annual report about working with the concessions to strengthen their collective voice and capacity.

The project organized two internal workshops, involving 13 of the 15 mangrove concession holders, then a third at which various authorities were first taken on a field visit to see the concessions in practice (as few had) then engaged in discussions on the priority issues identified by the concession holders. The authorities involved were the USCMM, Under Secretary for Fisheries Resources, Municipal governments, Parish councils and Navy, as well as professionals from the Technical University of Machala. The process has enabled the concession holders to (i) characterize what the concession means for them and their communities, (ii) identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in relation to their organisations, (iii) identify training needs, (iv) generate a map of actors involved in mangrove governance, (v) learn about the Ministry of Environment's requirements and projections, (vi) identify ways to improve management of the concessions, and (vii) exchange ideas and experiences.

With regard to training (Activity 1.5), FFLA has delivered a second, abbreviated course on governance, targeting 9 professionals from the Ministry of Environment and the Under Secretary for Fisheries Resources. The end-of-course evaluation was positive (3.33-4.89 out of 5), but affected by Ministry-related logistical problems. Participants found the content very relevant to their work (4.89/5) and requested more training on conflict management (78% of replies).

In January 2011 FFLA delivered a course on methods for evaluation of governance to 28 participants as part of a course on MPA management effectiveness, organised by the Applied Ecology Institute (ECOLAP) of the San Francisco University of Quito. In February 2011 FFLA delivered a short, introductory course on conflict prevention to fishers involved in the agreement to protect and lobster populations.

4.1.2 Activities under Output 2 *In 2 of 3 pilot sites (Galera-San Francisco, Jambelí 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.*

Activities 2.1 to 2.6 involve the technical work on prioritising, planning and setting up biological and socio-economic monitoring, while Activity 2.7 concerns raising co-financing for implementing this. In practice, we have found that the process has involved connecting into priorities that stakeholders had already identified, then helping to develop or strengthen the approach to monitoring. Progress has been mixed, as detailed below.

At **GSF** the local fishers at the southern end of the Reserve (San Francisco) had prioritized **spiny green lobster** (*Panulirus gracilis*) as the species which they wanted to start managing, in order to allow populations to recover. With support from Conservation International, the fishers negotiated an agreement whereby they would to leave some zones to recover, and would instead be paid to protect and monitor them, initially for the 2010/211 season (of six months), with the potential to renew for the 2011/12 season. Nazca undertook to work with the fishers to monitor changes in lobster populations and sought technical and financial assistance from FFI to do this. FFI was not involved in the negotiation of the agreement itself. After initial conflicts with fishers not involved (which FFLA was called upon to help resolve), the agreement took effect from the fourth quarter of 2010. The "technical working group" referred to in the logframe activities is, in effect, FFI working with Nazca and, through Nazca, the local leaders of the initiative. FFI has been reviewing with Nazca the biological and socio-economic baseline data that they and the fishers had already obtained prior to the change in management regime. We have supported the organisation and analysis of a socio-economic dataset from a December 2009 survey, which had not been followed up, and during the visit of Helen Schneider discussed improved approaches to socio-economic monitoring, including discussion of the

“Livelihoods Framework” used by FFI. During Year 3 we will cooperate with Nazca and the fishers on a modified, expanded monitoring regime and discussion of the results, in order to decide how to adapt and improve their lobster recovery programme.

At the same time that this work was taking shape, came the request by USCM to work on zoning of the whole Reserve, as mentioned above. Though not species-specific (as in the DI logframe) this is an exciting opportunity to take the DI-supported work on participatory monitoring for adaptive management to a new level. FFI has worked closely with Nazca and FFLA throughout the process. Though deadlines were tight, we were able to hold an initial workshop with fishers and other local leaders to talk about the purpose of zoning, the potential costs and benefits, and principles appropriate to the zoning process in the GSFMR context. That workshop requested Nazca and FFI to prepare three zoning scenarios, with different proportions of NTZ, as a starting point for local discussions. A second workshop reiterated the guiding principles, discussed the scenarios and the various data layers used to generate them, one of which was based on the proposals of each community for zoning in “their” nearshore areas. That workshop exceeded all expectations in producing consensus on a zoning scheme that would set aside substantial areas of NTZ and give each community a degree of responsibility for, and preferential access to, certain adjacent waters. These proposals are now being discussed more widely in each of the GSF communities, prior to finalisation of the Management Plan. If things proceed, then this would be something completely new for Ecuador MPAs so the monitoring for adaptive management has national as well as local significance.

With regard to activity 2.7, we have applied successfully for funds both to support initial monitoring of the lobster recovery programme and the overall zoning scheme. Furthermore, we have provisional approval of a Civil Society Challenge Fund grant, which is broader in scope but will strengthen participatory monitoring processes in GSF, Machalilla and Jambelí.

At **Machalilla NP** the request to FFI to help with the adaptive management of the Spiny Rock Scallop, **Spondylus** (*Spondylus princeps* and *S. calcifer*) has been less productive. Surveys by the National Fisheries Institute, which involved fishers, revealed that *Spondylus* populations are extremely low, making a prolonged total ban on the harvesting of *Spondylus* essential. The workshop with authorities and stakeholders, which took place in June 2010, was very well attended. It revealed that the main interest of the dive fishermen is to gain support for change of activity, which is understandable but not ideal for the Darwin project theme of monitoring and adaptive management. Key issues for a *Spondylus* conservation strategy relate to the stock of raw material held by craftsmen (they propose registration of the stock), consumption in restaurants (now largely stopped), trade with Peru in both raw material and finished products, enforcement of the harvesting ban, and possibilities for identifying, protecting (and potentially re-stocking) and monitoring key sites for reproduction. Whilst FFI and FFLA will remain involved in this effort, and have sought (unsuccessfully so far) funding for it, its contribution to the Darwin project objective will be less than we had hoped.

At **Jambelí** the management of **red crab** (*Ucides occidentalis*) and **cockles** (*Anadara simulis* and *A. tuberculosa*) in the mangrove concessions already involves limits on size and offtake and in some cases rotating zones for harvesting. Basic monitoring of catches is undertaken by communities and there is considerable scope for working with a concession-holding community on expanding the monitoring programme and introducing simple experimentation, perhaps on extending the duration of the “fallow” period allowed for harvested zones to recover. This will require additional co-financing, for which we are investigating possibilities. Even with fast reproducing species, there is a limit to how much will be achieved before the end of the Darwin project, however.

4.1.3 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.*

The activities concern facilitation of meetings for the development of the MPA “sub-system” and the presentation of recommendations about legal and institutional changes for innovative governance.

In Year Two FFLA facilitated, and FFI participated in, three workshops in April, September and March. These workshops addressed a variety of topics, identified and prioritised with the Ministry of Environment. They included: the significance of “sub-system” and “network” in relation to MPAs, the current state of MPA management and sources of support for MPAs, the status of MPA management plans at all sites, the value of inter-institutional coordination and ways to strengthen it, case studies of conflict management in MPAs, and a proposed statute or procedures document for the MPA network. The latter document, in its current draft, expands the network to encompass not only the State protected areas, as legally defined, but also the mangrove concessions and Fisheries Reserves (under the Under Secretary for Fisheries Resources). The workshop evaluations averaged 3.7-4.6 on logistics and time management and 4.2-4.5 on facilitation. Priority topics for further meetings have been identified, and complementary methods to sustain communication between participants are being considered.

With regard to the presentation of governance recommendations, Year 1 provided an opportunity and need to make general recommendations early in the process of developing the MPA sub-system or network. In Year 2 the emphasis has been on the site-specific proposals, as discussed under Output 1 above. The proposed statute for the Management Committee of GSFMR is breaking new ground and presenting the Ministry with challenging legal and institutional decisions. The tensions over the reduced participation at Machalilla NP could also lead to reconsideration of the role and structure of that Management Committee. At Jambelí FFI and FFLA are participating in the discussions about policies and regulations that will enable the ongoing expansion of the mangrove concession system to be expanded and applied through much of El Oro Province, whilst being as inclusive as possible and minimising hardship. Thus, it makes sense to concentrate on these specific discussions, through direct dialogue with the Ministry, other authorities and stakeholders, then use the results of these processes as the basis for writing up and presenting legal and institutional recommendations.

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

The activities for this output involve internal dissemination within the Ministry of Environment and external dissemination through national, regional and international events and media.

In Year 2 FFLA published a 31-page document on “The Governance of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas: the case of Ecuador” by Vincent Gravez, Cristina Rivadeneira and Pippa Heylings. It draws heavily on the project experience and includes five recommendations for MPA governance systems. Encouragingly, the Ministry of Environment distributed the report to its MPA managers and other staff at the fourth workshop of the MPA Network. The publication has also been distributed at two other events in Ecuador and at our workshop in Costa Rica (see below). It is in Spanish but an English version will be produced and provided to Darwin Initiative.

FFLA also collaborated with the government planning service, SENPLADES, to produce a cartoon booklet to communicate principles of participation in the context of the new law on participation. This was much broader in scope than just MPAs but useful for Darwin project communication in communities and a valuable link with this influential government body.

The project has accumulated video and other material for dissemination purposes, but most of that dissemination through media will happen in Year 3. In Year 2 the emphasis has been on events in Ecuador and the region.

The project provided co-financing to the 2nd National Symposium on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity, which also aspired to be the 1st Symposium on Coastal and Marine Biodiversity of Latin American and the Caribbean, held in Manta, Ecuador, in December 2011, and attended by >400 people. This enabled us to include a half-day mini-training-course by FFLA on participatory governance within the 4-day symposium, as well as a presentation and 2 posters. The audience of 22 students, scientists and other professionals gave a very positive evaluation of the mini-course (4.00-4.72/5) and expressed a demand for further training in governance (67% of replies) and conflict management (61%).

In March 2011 FFI used co-financing to organise a regional team to share the principles and experiences of the Darwin project with those of FFI and other organisations in Nicaragua,

Costa Rica and Honduras, and use this to develop new project proposals. The core regional team comprised FFI, FFLA and CoopeSoliDar R.L., which is a Costa Rican professional cooperative specialising in working with fishing communities in Central America. We were joined by representatives of environment and development organisations from Nicaragua (notably the leading NGO Fundenic) and Honduras (notably Recoturh, which is a network of communities developing ecotourism on the Caribbean coast of Honduras). At the heart of the three-week collaboration was a study visit to learn about the pioneering efforts of the Tárcoles fishing community in Costa Rica followed by a one-day meeting at which experiences from the four countries (including Ecuador) were presented and lessons discussed. The weeks around this core were dedicated to visiting and learning about one site in each of the Central American countries and outlining concepts for a participatory governance project at each site. It was a highly valuable learning experience for all concerned, not least the FFI participants, and with a practical product, namely the project concepts, which we are now working on. There is every intention to maintain this 4-country collaboration.

Abstracts have been accepted for presentations, based on the project's results, at marine conferences in Norway (July 2011) and Scotland (September 2011).

4.2 Progress towards project outputs

Output 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 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 project remains on track to deliver this output in GSF and this will be reflected in the three indicators. Evidence for this is that the Ministry has appointed 4 rangers, carries out periodic patrols to control industrial fishing, maintains a dialogue between Reserve director and stakeholders. The Ministry is leading an intensive effort to finalise the Management Plan, which includes a locally produced section on participatory governance and is accompanied by a statute for the key participatory body, the Management Committee. It is not a done deal, however, because there is still concern in the Ministry of Environment about how much power they can legally cede or feel they should cede. This relates to the second assumption in the logframe. FFI and FFLA are working on strategies both to confirm the legality of the proposed statute and build Ministry confidence that participation is not a threat to their role as final authority for MPAs. The inter-sectoral cooperation part of the output is so far only partial, with the Under Secretary for Fisheries Resources and the National Fisheries Institute actively involved in the governance working group but the Navy notably absent (prompting a recent joint letter from stakeholders and local authorities to the Navy). The assumption about community commitment remains valid, even though workshop attendance has declined because of the long time spent on negotiation and planning without formal definition yet of their role and only partial success in excluding industrial fishing. Leaders are nevertheless able to mobilize people for the most important events and have been proactive throughout the management planning exercise.

At Jambelí the situation is different so the platform referred to in the indicator will be for mangrove concession holders of Jambelí archipelago to work collectively for their common conservation and development objectives. Most likely the platform will involve concession holders from all El Oro province. At the same time, the participation of representatives of UOPPAO in the platform will ensure that the interests of those fishers who are not affiliated to any concession-holding group will also be expressed, so that processes to foresee and prevent conflict can be instigated. The activities so far are progressing well, despite a slower than intended start (local recruitment delays) and all indications are that both assumptions remain valid i.e. committed concession holders and authorities wanting to extend and improve the concession system.

Unlike the newer initiatives, Machalilla has the disadvantage of seeking to change established practices and expectations, and the recent setback shows how, without changes to the statute, the participatory mechanisms remain dependent on the attitude of the Park director. As things stand, the project is not on track to deliver this part of the output. However, this mini-crisis could also catalyse positive change. As the project encourages and facilitates dialogue to resolve the conflict before it deteriorates, we will also put on the table new ideas to improve the situation, such as:

- Designing more agile structures for participation e.g. by giving more powers to the Management Committee's 13-member directorate, which can be a more functional partner for the Park director than the 50+ member Management Committee.
- Revising the Statute to oblige the Park Director to debate certain kinds of issue (e.g. regulatory changes) in the Management Committee or its directorate, prior to a decision.
- Agreeing a full participatory process to consider the Ministry's aim of expanding the marine part of the National Park, which is ecologically well justified and could be locally beneficial, provided that it is a collective commitment not an imposition.

Thus, Machalilla has changed from being a case of steady improvement in participation to one that is less predictable, but could turn out well.

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 essence of this output is the strengthening of local stewardship by enabling them to generate and use various kinds of information for management decisions. We are progressing towards this broader aim, even though we have not been able to follow the neat linear sequence of species-specific activities envisaged. Rather, the local priorities have been presented to us and we have sought to respond. In GSF we are endeavouring to add value by strengthening the monitoring, learning and adaptive management aspects of the lobster initiative. This will contribute substantially to the output. The work to establish and monitor No Take Zones could prove to be much more significant in strengthening local stewardship and, as benefits are documented, stimulating replication. On the other hand, responding to the *Spondylus* request, though not fruitless, is not going to deliver this output, especially as the assumption about co-financing has not been fulfilled (unlike GSF where it has been). With hindsight, an earlier move to work on crab and cockle management in the mangrove concessions would have been advisable. Time there is short but we are seeking internal FFI funds to develop some experimental management, that would fit well with the output. This would involve the Technical University of Machala and the National Fisheries Institute.

Bearing in mind, the essential aim of enabling stakeholders to participate in generation and use of various kinds of information for management decisions, the current output and indicators are valid but quite restrictive. We do not propose changes to the output at this late stage but should consider that the limited progress on resource plans at GSFMR is offset by the – potentially far more significant – progress on constructing the Reserve zoning system and then starting to monitor it. As mentioned in the Monitoring Manual, we are considering the addition of an indicator that reflects more broadly how effective the project has been in empowerment of stakeholders by strengthening their use of information. The extra indicator may come very late for this project but will be useful for our continuing work on the programme, beyond the Darwin project.

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.*

The assumption about the Ministry's openness to advice holds good, with our primary channel of communication being the USCMM. Many aspects of the project are helping to build national capacity to develop the "sub-system" of MPAs. In the first place, the workshops themselves have not only enabled the Ministry to learn about and debate issues from the field, but also clarified what they mean by and want from the "sub-system". The Ecuadorian Constitution, which is very detailed, refers to protected area sub-systems defined according to their legal and institutional basis: State PAs, Municipal PAs and communal and private PAs, so an ecologically defined sub-system does not really fit. Nor, it emerged, was it what the Ministry and MPA practitioners want. Rather, they want a network for coordination, cooperation and learning across sites that are linked ecologically, in social and economic context, in management challenges and in being part of a concerted effort to restore marine ecosystems along the coast (hence the proposed expansion to include mangrove concessions and Fisheries Reserves). They are well on the way to achieving this. Most MPA directors have attended the workshops, along with technical experts, and they treat the network as a valuable, established entity, even if it does not yet have any supporting legal document or formal procedures. Recent workshops have also been attended by the Navy and National Fisheries Institute; their participation adds significant value. A future objective of the network is to link with the regional MPA practitioners network of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific, which covers Chile to Panama.

Other project activities have also strengthened national capacity in relation to participatory processes. For example, the Ministry's decision to take a protagonistic role in the GSFMR management planning was initially rather top-down, mainly due to time pressure, but they accepted our advice to respect the role of the provisional Management Committee and to try to approve Plan and the Committee statute together. If the local zoning negotiations continue to go well, this will build the Ministry's confidence that participation can achieve decisions that are robust technically as well as supported by stakeholders. Even the unfavourable situation for participation in Machalilla NP may be transformed into positive change in the Ministry.

The local processes have also repeatedly highlighted the problem of the "tragedy of the commons" and hence the need to develop a legally acceptable policy on preferential access by local communities to marine resources, beyond mangroves. This is new territory for the Ministry and a high priority for Year 3 is to help them to take ownership of the access issue and develop a policy to address it.

In Jambelí the guidance to be produced by the project will comprise recommendations on adjustments to the legal and institutional framework for mangrove concessions, and lessons from the concession experience relevant to MPA governance and resource access.

Evidence that all of this is taking root in the Ministry includes:

- The USCMM collaborated on the FFLA publication about governance of MPAs and the Under Secretary signed the prologue.
- The USCMM's decision to include in the MPA network areas under different forms of governance, notably the mangrove concessions;
- Unconfirmed information that the Government of Ecuador is earmarking \$10m for development of MPAs, in addition to an ongoing GEF project of \$8.3m (including co-financing). Our Darwin project had no part in this decision, but if the funding does indeed materialise and is well used, then it would be concrete evidence of national commitment and capacity to achieve the CBD 2012 targets for MPAs.

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

Nationally and in the Central American countries we visited, there is increasing awareness of and interest in new systems of governance, in which communities play a strong, central role. FFLA's recent publication, the December symposium and the regional collaboration have already contributed significantly.

A next critical step towards achieving this output will be the approval of the statute of the Management Committee of GSFMR, because this will formalise the changed role for stakeholders and give it official endorsement. Though there will be limits on the degree of empowerment which the GoE will authorise, the statute will nevertheless mark a new course for the GoE and, by communicating this, the project can influence attitudes across national and local authorities and influence expectations of coastal communities.

The resolution of the situation at Machalilla NP will also influence attitudes and awareness, for better or for worse. FFLA and FFI will endeavour to make sure the outcome is positive, in reaffirming the stakeholders' right to participate and the mechanisms for doing that.

Later in Year 3, if we can help the Ministry to set policies for consolidating the mangrove concession system, that minimise conflicts while maintaining the basic principle of protecting the mangrove in exchange for exclusive use rights, that will be important in influencing attitudes in relation to preferential access to resources in MPAs.

Lastly, if the GSF zoning continues to exceed expectations in terms of delivering a strong zoning scheme through local consensus, this can do much to calm anxieties of those in government who see participation as a barrier to serious conservation measures.

4.3 Standard Measures

Code No.	Description	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Year 4 Total	Total to date	Number planned for reporting period	Total planned during the project
6A	Number of people to receive other forms of education/training (which does not fall into categories 1-5 above)	36 Ecuadorians (34% women)	0			113 Ecuadorians	0	60
6B	Number of training weeks to be provided <i>Training events were all <3 days this year</i>	21.6	0			21.6	12	36
7	Number of (ie different types - not volume - of material produced) training materials to be produced for use by host country	0	2			2	2	3
8	Number of weeks to be spent by UK project staff on project work in the host country	13.1	15,9			29	14.6	43.7
9	Number of species/habitat management plans (or action plans) to be produced for Governments, public authorities, or other implementing agencies in	0	0			0	2	2

Code No.	Description	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Year 4 Total	Total to date	Number planned for reporting period	Total planned during the project
	the host country							
14A	Number of conferences/seminars/workshops to be organised to present/disseminate findings <i>3 Network workshops, 2 joint courses with Nazca/Ecolap, 1 regional meeting in C.Rica.</i>	0	6			3	1	2 <i>We underestimated here because of overlooking the many short courses organised.</i>
14B	Number of conferences/seminars/workshops attended at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated. <i>Training session and presentations at biodiversity symposium at Manta</i>	1	1			3	1	3
15A	Number of national press releases in host country(ies)	2	0			2	2	8
15B	Number of local press releases in host country(ies)	1	3			4	2	7
15C	Number of national press releases in UK	0	0			0	0	2
18A	Number of national TV programmes/features in host country(ies)	0	0			0	0	2
19A	Number of national radio interviews/features in host county(ies)	0	0			0	0	5
19C	Number of local radio interviews/features in host country(ies)	0	0			0	0	3
23	Value of resources raised from other sources (ie in addition to Darwin funding) for project work	£87K	£105K			£192K	£62K	£188K
New measures	NONE							

Publications

Type (eg journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (title, author, year)	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (eg contact address, website)	Cost £
Manual	Governance Course manual, FFLA, 2010	FFLA	FFLA or FFI	£265
CD	Governance Course materials, FFLA, 2010	FFLA	FFLA or FFI	£212
Book (31 pages) * Available for download, as shown. English version will be produced.	Gobernanza en las Áreas Protegidas Marinas y Costeras: el caso del Ecuador.	FFLA	https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=explorer&chrome=true&srcid=0B5nPPtb5xmVxNTg2OGM2Y2QtYWNIiM00OTI1LTk2OGItMzZmYWE1Y2ZlODFh&hl=en&authkey=CIPDhllC	£2705
Cuaderno	Material de incidencia	FFLA-FFI-NAZCA		£1262
Booklet	“Cartilla Popular Sobre Participación Ciudadana” by Astaiza M., Guarnizo P., Méndez P., Rivera J., & Torres J. Ed. Castillo D. & Engel S. 17pp. ISBN: 978-9978-9960-8-9	FFLA, Fondo Ecuatoriano Populorum Progressio (FEPP), and Servicio Nacional de Planificación y Desarrollo (SENPLADES) (2010),	Download from FFLA website: http://www.ffla.net/new/es/publicaciones.html	£550
Folder with 3 inserts	GSFMR : History, participatory governance and fisheries.	NAZCA-FFLA-FFI	In preparation. Will soon be available through Nazca, FFLA and FFI.	GBP 892
Notebook	Notebook with pages about marine conservation included	FFLA-FFI-NAZCA	In preparation. Will soon be available through Nazca, FFLA and FFI.	£1262
Other, minor materials, are listed in the monitoring manual.				

4.4 Progress towards the project purpose and outcomes

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 progress on Outputs 1 and 3, described above, represent very significant advances towards the achievement of the purpose of the project. Output 2 has not progressed well in the direction originally envisaged, but the project purpose is arguably served even better by the unforeseen progress in relation to zoning, in which FFI and partners are playing a crucial role, thanks to the DI project and co-financing raised in Year 2.

The first indicator for the purpose remains valid. As mentioned in the Year1 annual report, the second indicator was very similar to indicator 1.2 of Output 1, and we found the latter to be a more complete measure of participation, so that is what we have used during Year 2. Note that the two indicators of purpose need to be considered together. The logic is that the Purpose will have been achieved if the participatory governance structures are in place **and** there is substantial participation in them. What we are looking for in Year 2 of the project is for the first indicator to increase (i.e. institutionalised system in place), which should stimulate an increase in the second indicator (i.e. empowerment motivates participation). It is not realistic to expect much increase in the second indicator, if there is no movement on the first.

So the next crucial steps towards the Purpose concern the legal formalisation and institutionalisation of the participatory governance systems, primarily at GSFMR but also in different ways at Machalilla and Jambelí. The Ministry is clearly on board with the idea of participation but uneasy about the decision on how far to let go, particularly since a change in the leadership of the USCMM early in Year 2; the new Under Secretary is more cautious than his predecessor on the matter of participation. The challenge for the project is to build confidence to bring about a degree of change that significantly empowers local stakeholders while reflecting the Government's obligations under the Constitution. Our assumption remains, as in the project document, "Ecuadorian government continues to favour local empowerment /participatory processes."

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 indicators for the sub-goal remain valid.

We are on track towards this sub-goal, subject to the same assumption as for the purpose, namely that the Government will be willing to take the final step of institutionalising participatory governance.

The regional interest in the approach is evident from the initial investment in reaching out to Nicaragua, Honduras and Costa Rica (Central America, not South America as in the sub-goal).

Notwithstanding some scope for future negotiation of agreements between sites about widespread species, such as lobster, with "migratory" larvae, the sub-goal's reference to migratory species is no longer applicable. The potential migratory species were not the management priorities of local communities.

4.5 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 marine management actions, listed in the Year 1 report, some of which are progressing well and others not. In this context, the project occupies a very important niche, namely governance, which complements direct actions by the Government, such as increasing enforcement to exclude industrial fishing from nearshore waters. GSFMR is particularly significant, for its role as a pioneer in participatory governance and potentially in the use of No Take Zones as a management tool. The mangrove concessions are strategically important, because of their innovation in terms of access to resources and of coordination between multiple relatively small units within a larger ecological unit. Machalilla is significant as the one long-established, if little managed MPA, where a real change in governance system would be very visible.

The cross-cutting nature of governance means that, if successful, the project will impact all three elements: biodiversity, sustainable use and the distribution of costs and benefits. However, it is too early for a measurable impact at the level of the status of species and ecosystems or livelihoods.

5. Monitoring, evaluation and lessons

Participatory governance and influence on policy are difficult things to measure objectively or quantitatively. In Year One we refined the project indicators and developed a “manual” – in effect it is a rolling report, to which we can periodically add new data. This format has the advantage of allowing us to incorporate extensive observations about trends and details underlying the indicator data. In using the monitoring information, the value is as much in discussion of the details and the causative factors as it is in the numbers themselves. We could organise it to be more user-friendly for detailed year-on-year comparisons, especially for those unfamiliar with the project history. The Monitoring Manual, which is now translated into English, will be sent with this report. Here is a summary of the monitoring results, plus any comments on the application of the indicators during Year 2.

- SG1: The total area of MPAs (excluding Galapagos) has increased from 298,000 ha to 364,000 ha but the proportion implementing effectively their mechanisms for participation has declined from 3/13 to 2/14, because of the setback in Machalilla.
- SG2, 3.2 and 4.1: There has been a significant increase to 5 requests for support on participatory governance of MPAs within and outside Ecuador.
- P1: 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, was assessed at level 2, which is the same as in April 2009. The scale is characterised in the Monitoring Manual. Level 2 is “2 – Substantial references to participatory governance at conceptual level but not reflected at operational level in decision-making structures and power balance.”
- P2: As foreseen in the Year One report, we adjusted 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. The transition between stages can take time. Currently GSF remains at stage 1, where it was at the start of the project, but is on the verge of moving to stage 2. Machalilla started at stage 3 (albeit with a legal base that was purely consultative) but could slip back to stage 2 or become a more robust stage 3. Jambelí has clearly progressed from stage zero to 1.
- 1.2/2.1/P2: This measure of participation reflects whether the actors that should be participating in a particular forum are present, and at what level they are represented. There is no significant increase or decrease between Year 1 and 2. As mentioned above, a significant increase is likely to follow formal empowerment, especially the approval of the GSF Management Committee statute or a clear Ministry decision on participation at Machalilla. We are continuing to work on improving the measures of participation.
- 1.3: During Year 2 we have provided additional training, through workshops and accompaniment in the field, to the people who received training in Year 1, so the indicator number has stayed level but the overall impact on capacity is increasing.
- 2.2/2.3: The score on number of resource agreements has increased to 1, but not as a result of this project, and the indicator on the generation and use of information has increased in the case of Spondylus at Machalilla from a score of 2 to a score of 3, because of the participatory use of information to develop a conservation strategy. We also include in the manual information about progress on GSFMR zoning and associated monitoring and a possible experimental management initiative in the Jambelí mangrove concessions. As discussed above and in the Manual, these indicators are valid but should be complemented by an indicator to measure advances in stakeholders' capacity to generate and use information, which is the essential purpose of this output.
- 2.4: Substantial co-financing has been raised, focused almost entirely on GSFMR. Even so, we need to raise additional funding to co-finance implementation of the management plan, without which the decisions of the participatory governance system cannot be converted into action and momentum will be lost. Co-financing for Jambelí and Machalilla is near zero.

- 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). The indicator reveals increasing uptake and internalisation of the governance recommendations, with 9 of the 11 recommendations reaching level 2, but the number reaching level 3 or 4 remains at zero, highlighting the fact that this is the critical challenge for the project.
- 3.2: The indicator “Number of fora at which national government authorities are exposed to project-related recommendations on legal and institutional aspects of participatory governance” scored 4, the same as in Year 2. This exposure in structured settings is complemented by regular dialogue, especially at the level of the advisor to the SSCMM, the Ministry’s directors of coastal provinces, and MPA staff.
- 4.2: Project-related materials disseminated in Ecuador were 9, similar to the number in Year 1. International dissemination has declined from 7 materials to 2, mainly because of shortage of time to edit and upload video material to You Tube. We have still not produced materials specifically for UK distribution, so UK and international dissemination are behind schedule. However, they will pick up sharply in Year 3. It was discussed and agreed with Darwin Initiative towards the end of Year 1 that much UK and international dissemination will take place in Year 3, when we have more concrete results to disseminate and important CBD processes to contribute to.

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

- To achieve fully its objectives, the project needs political decisions. With the Ministry hesitating on the legal and institutional instruments and more cautious leadership of the SSCMM, we may need to review and reinforce our strategy. Much has been done to strengthen local stakeholder groups and build consensus locally, and this collective strength can now be directed at achieving legal empowerment, consistent with Ecuador’s Constitution and government policies. At the same time, the project can help to build the Ministry’s confidence in a more participatory model. For this we can use hypothetical scenarios and real examples: in backsliding Machalilla conflict looms whereas in more empowered GSF local stakeholders are opting for establishment of extensive NTZs.
- The experience at Machalilla reinforces the fact that any participatory governance system is vulnerable to changes of key individuals, notably the park director, until the system is institutionalised.
- The question of a mechanism for preferential access to resources cannot be avoided. It comes up repeatedly in different guises, be it in theoretical discussions about incentives or in the stakeholders’ expressions of their visions of a sustainable future. In many cases NGOs and government officials shy away from this sensitive and difficult issue but FFI and FFLA have persisted and have managed to get the issue firmly on the table. We are optimistic that we can help find workable mechanisms, that are legally, socially and politically viable in the Ecuadorian context. In doing so, we can draw on lessons learned from the successes and failures amongst the early mangrove concessions and from the challenges of scaling up, with which we are now helping the Government. The zoning negotiations at GSFMR are also contributing to the debate about mechanisms for preferential access. The imminent approval and implementation of the GSFMR Management Plan will demand clarity on these issues. It is striking that an apparently narrow focus on the theme of governance can generate discussion and drive decisions on issues that are fundamental to the restoration of coastal and marine ecosystems, such as resource access and spatial management.

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

Last year the reviewer requested an English version of the monitoring manual to accompany this year's report. This is provided.

Of the three comments for action by mid-year (October) two were addressed: the question about over-extending ourselves through involvement with the MPA sub-system/network and the one about how much could be accomplished at Jambelí in the shorter time. With regard to the latter, after discussions with Darwin Initiative, it was decided not change the log frame.

The third comment suggested participation of government and stakeholders in the scoring of some indicators. We have thought about this but have not yet had time to define specific changes or additions and put them into practice. Essentially, there are certain existing indicators where simply discussing the scoring with stakeholders could bring new considerations and perceptions to light and reinforce the sense of what we are collectively trying to achieve. Then there are specific results we are trying to achieve, for which an indicator based on perceptions (disaggregated as appropriate) would be a useful complement to the indicators we have defined, which aim to be fairly objective. This is especially the case in relation to participation and empowerment. Indeed, we have realised that we need to do this in order to obtain a more robust measure of participation. We started with slightly different measures of participation, according to the issue (management committee or resource management strategy). We consolidated these into one indicator, which is applied for both (1.2, 2.1 and P2). However, we recognize that we should improve the measures of participation (see manual) and that the assessment would be more robust if we could compare our scores with stakeholder and government perspectives on participation. We will advance on this early in Year 3 and also include it in the evaluation in the last semester (with some adaptation to allow some retrospective assessment of change, since we are well past the time for a "baseline").

It is worth mentioning that indicators of effectiveness of training are already based largely on trainee perception.

7. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere

In terms of project design, two issues discussed above but worth highlighting here are.

First, we are strengthening the strategy and focus on convincing the government to approve the legal and policy instruments necessary to institutionalise the mechanisms for participatory governance. The strategy combines direct engagement of the authorities and helping local stakeholders and authorities to express both their demands for a formalised role and commitment to fulfill their responsibilities.

Second, we see that the process of zoning may prove more fruitful for us than single-species resource management, in terms of building local capacity to generate and use information for adaptive management. It is an open niche, because zoning has barely been used as a management tool in Ecuadorian MPAs, the Ministry has requested this as a priority, and local stakeholders at GSF have been constructive, even bold, in the planning. Potential for replication in Ecuador is high. FFI can add a great deal of value on both technical and process aspects, and some co-financing. Therefore, whilst maintaining some species-specific work, we are putting significant additional effort into zoning.

8. Sustainability

The project is firmly positioned as the testing ground for MPA governance in Ecuador. It covers the key sites, with Machalilla starting out as the traditional protected area, GSF being the pioneer community-driven MPA and the mangrove concessions as the one model where communities have been empowered to protect and manage coastal resources. Within the project we are awaiting the legal instruments that will institutionalise participatory structures. That milestone will be important in ensuring sustainability of the results of this project. However, it will also mark the beginning of the next stage, going beyond the Darwin project, which is to help the new governance systems deliver effective management and to support replication to other MPAs. Full sustainability will come when the improved management is delivering improved local livelihoods, thereby consolidating local and political commitment to maintain this

approach. A significant issue associated with sustainability is that of preferential access by coastal communities to the resources they are helping to manage, and hence security that they will benefit from their own conservation efforts. As mentioned above, we have already started working on this and will continue to do so beyond the duration of the Darwin project.

FFI, FFLA and Nazca are all committed to maintaining their support to the Ecuador MPA initiative. The approval of the Civil Society Challenge Grant, if confirmed, will be important in enabling FFLA and FFI to continue collaborating with MPA stakeholders and authorities.

FFI is also involved in discussions about the GSF financial sustainability strategy, which is being developed for the management plan. The costs of running the participatory governance system will be considered as part of the core costs of the MPA.

9. Dissemination

Dissemination in Ecuador has continued during Year 2 through a variety of events and publications, as described in Section 4.1.4 (activities under output 4) and Table 2. Table 2 also mentions communications materials that are in preparation and will soon be used to disseminate some of the project's essential messages more widely.

Hitherto the audience for dissemination work has principally been professionals (resource management, fisheries, science, environment, community development) involved in this kind of work. Local dissemination has been much more through meetings, showing video excerpts of the process hitherto, and informal discussion. In Year 3 this will be complemented by more targeted dissemination, including (i) higher level provincial and national government personnel and other figures whose support is needed for legal approval, institutionalisation, investment and political backing, (ii) dissemination to coastal communities, who are not the main MPA stakeholders, but live in the vicinity of the project sites and need to know about the conservation efforts and comply with restrictions, (iii) dissemination of official documents to be approved in Year 3, such as the GSF Management Plan, GSF Management Committee statute, MPA network statute, mangrove concession regional grouping instrument etc.

10. Project Expenditure

Table 3 project expenditure during the reporting period (1 April 2010 – 31 March 2011)

Item	Budget (please indicate which document you refer to if other than your project application or annual grant offer letter)	Expenditure	Variance/ Comments
Staff costs specified by individual			
FFI Americas & Caribbean Director (based in Quito)			
FFI Ecuador Country Manager (based in Quito)			
FFI Livelihoods (based in the UK)			
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)			

Overhead costs			
Overheads			
Travel and subsistence			
International travel			
National travel (MAE personnel)			
Fieldwork travel and subsistence			
Operating costs			
Conferences, workshops and seminars			
Bank cost			
Capital items/equipment (specify)			
Others: Consultancy			
Others (please specify)			
Communications/dissemination materials			
Communication (cellular plan)			
Printing and publications			
Materials			
TOTAL			

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

I agree for LTS and the Darwin Secretariat to publish the content of this section (please leave this line in to indicate your agreement to use any material you provide here)

We would prefer to hold back from claiming “outstanding achievements”, until we have achieved the relevant formal, legal approvals. We hope to have some outstanding achievements to report in the first half of Year 3!

Available images include:

- Machalilla beach and landscape, fishermen working on their nets, birds around fishing boats, boats in port etc.
- GSF habitat and marine life, catch monitoring by fishermen, meetings.
- Jambelí mangrove concession with concession-holders, nursery for mangroves, rubbish trapped in mangroves, rustic surveillance post, workshop group photo.

We also have large amounts of video material of the workshops, interviews and so on (but are short on time to process it).

Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year 2010-2011

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2010 - March 2011	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>The cross-cutting nature of governance means that, if successful, the project will impact all three elements, but it is too early for a measurable impact on status of species and ecosystems or livelihoods.</p>	<p><i>(do not fill not applicable)</i></p>
<p>Sub-Goal:</p> <p>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>SG1 Number and size of MPAs in Ecuador, and proportion of them which have a participatory governance model.</p> <p>SG2 Number of requests to project participants to participate in the development of MPAs and MPA networks in the region.</p>	<p>SG1. # of MPAs (excluding Galapagos) increased by 1 to 14 MPAs, total size from 298,000 ha to 364,000 ha. Mangrove “concessions” increased from 34 to 40, with total area from 28,600 ha to 37,100 ha. On scale of 0-5 for having an approved participatory governance mechanism, there is no significant change, with almost all MPAs scoring 1 or 2. The proportion with participatory mechanism functioning effectively has dropped from 3/13 to 2/14, due to setback in Machalilla.</p> <p>The mangroves all have a highly participatory mechanism (level 4), which we can now confirm exists in practice. We are reviewing available data on effective functioning.</p> <p>SG2. Requests for support on participatory governance have increased to 5: Min of Environment, Provincial govt of Guayas, Nobis Foundation, Municipal govt of Muisne, Community tourism network of Honduras.</p>	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2010 - March 2011	Actions required/planned for next period
<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>P1. Proposed MPA network at the national level has specific reference to participatory governance structures.</p> <p>P2. Percentage attendance and participation by each of the members of the three local management committees. (adopted this indicator as discussed in Year 1 report)</p>	<p>P1. On the scale of 0-4, the indicator remains at level 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).</p> <p>P2. No significant change in this indicator, with attendance in the 40-70% range and with most groups represented either at the highest level (3) or through an official delegate (2). GSFMR attendance may have declined slightly but level of representation there has strengthened.</p>	<p>Intensify strategy to achieve legal approval of statute for GSFMR Management Committee and to reassert role of Management Committee in Machalilla.</p> <p>Increase momentum of mangrove concession work at Jambelí to ensure completion of outputs and use mangrove experience in developing proposals on preferential local access to marine resources.</p> <p>Increase UK and international dissemination.</p>
<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>1.1 One participatory and multi sectoral platform designed and established through ministerial decree at two pilot sites</p> <p>1.2 Percentage attendance and participation by each of the members of the three local management committees.</p> <p>1.3. 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 On the scale of 0-3 GSF remains at level 1 i.e. a platform exists but with no legal basis, but is on the verge of moving to level 2. Jambelí has progressed from level 0 (no platform exists) to level 1. Machalilla is at level 3 but could either slip back to level 2 or become a more robust level 3.</p> <p>1.2 See P2.</p> <p>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 GSF FFLA organised the group producing the governance chapter of the management plan, which is complete and under review, prior to formal approval in the management plan. The same process generated the draft statute, which has been submitted to the Ministry for official approval, along with a request for clarification on certain legal issues, with detailed legal analysis. The Ministry has not yet responded on this and a Year 3 top priority is to move this forward,</p>	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2010 - March 2011	Actions required/planned for next period
		<p>facilitating agreement on any issues of concern to the Ministry, and intensifying activities to ensure a positive response to the local stakeholders' demand for a strong role in the governance system.</p> <p>At PNM, where the Management Committee statute already existed before the project but was weak on empowered participation, the new Park director has largely by-passed the management committee. FFLA is working with member organisations to help them respond to this situation, as well as raising the issue at higher levels of the Ministry. A priority for Year 3 is to ensure that the solution of this potential conflict at PNM results in ratification of a strong role for the stakeholders, whether through reaffirmed commitment to the Management Committee model or possibly through some changes in the participatory structure.</p> <p>At Jambelí the project has begun work with concession-holders and authorities on a provincial platform but formalising this in a statute will come later in Year 3.</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 GSF FFLA has continued to facilitate meetings about the governance structure, in the context of the management planning process, reaching consensus at the local level.</p> <p>At PNM the parties to the inter-institutional coordination agreement met 3 times, plus a fourth meeting with the local fishing sector to explain the new surveillance system combining radar and radio (AIS). However, the Park's new tendency to unilateral action has also been notable in relation to surveillance and control, as well as the implementation of a new visitor management system. The project priority in Year 3 is to work with local stakeholder groups, collaborating sectors (fisheries, tourism, Navy) and higher levels of the USCMM to restore the level of dialogue and cooperation, and seek to institutionalise it fully.</p>	
<p>Activity 1.3 FFLA to facilitate meetings of management committee to prioritize, negotiate, validate, and evaluate activities and products; practice skills learned in training.</p>		<p>At GSF FFLA and FFI were involved in meetings of the pre-committee leadership and of sub-groups dealing with particular topics for the management plan. At one point the momentum on specific topics threatened to undermine the cohesion of the whole plan and the oversight of this by the pre-committee and Ministry, but FFLA and FFI helped to restore the role of the pre-committee. In addition to the work on the governance system and the overall management plan, FFLA and FFI have had a central role, alongside Nazca, on the particular topic of zoning, with meetings and workshops to explain concepts, discuss principles and then consider specific scenarios, in order to produce the corresponding chapter of the management plan. We will be taking all this work forward into Year3.</p> <p>At PNM in Year 2 the Management Committee's directorate met only twice, facilitated by FFLA, because the Park director has not taken the initiative to call more meetings. Whilst working to resolve this problem, FFLA has concentrated</p>	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2010 - March 2011	Actions required/planned for next period
		<p>on working with the Management Committee members.</p> <p>At Jambelí the project organized 2 workshops with the 15 mangrove concession holders, then a third at which various authorities were first taken on a field visit to see the concessions in practice (as few had) then engaged in discussions on the priority issues identified by the concession holders. The workshops have provided a basis for planning collective action, by characterizing the concession model, identifying strengths, weaknesses and training needs, mapping actors, learning about Ministry requirements, identifying ways to improve the concessions, and sharing ideas and experiences.</p>	
<p>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</p>		<p>In PNM FFLA facilitated in Dec 2010 General Assembly at which the Management Committee elected a new president.</p> <p>No equivalent yet in GSF or Jambelí.</p>	
<p>Activity 1.5 FFLA to design and implement training courses in MPA governance, participation and negotiation</p>		<p>FFLA delivered a second, abbreviated course on governance to 9 staff of the Ministry of Environment and Under Secretariat for Fisheries Resources. In addition, FFLA delivered a short course on conflict prevention to fishers in GSF and a component on methods for evaluating governance as part of a course on MPA management effectiveness (28 participants), led by the San Francisco University of Quito. Three other brief (half-day) training sessions bring the total number of people receiving some basic training in Year 2 to 77.</p>	
<p>Activity 1.6 FFLA to organise exchange visits between pilot sites as support to capacity-building in governance and resource management</p>		<p>No exchange visits in Year 2. They will be resumed in Year 3.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>2.1 Percentage attendance and participation by each of the members of the three local management committees. (adopted this indicator as discussed in Year 1 report)</p> <p>2.2 Signed agreement document for resource management strategy at 2 sites</p> <p>2.3 Information starts to be generated by participatory monitoring system for use in adaptive management strategy.</p> <p>2.4 Co-financing raised and other funds leveraged for implementation of resource use strategies</p>	<p>2.1 See indicator P2 above.</p> <p>2.2 One agreement signed for lobster in southern part of GSFMR (the agreement was not a product of this project, but we are helping the monitoring component).</p> <p>2.3 GSF lobster level 2, GSF zoning (new) level zero, Machalilla Spondylus (level 3), Jambelí crab and cockle (new) level zero.</p> <p>2.4 Substantial co-financing has been raised for GSFMR but we need more co-financing for plan implementation (level 2). We still need to raise co-financing for Machalilla (which has a plan and proposal – level 1) and Jambelí (which does not - level 0).</p> <p><i>Indicators 2.2 and 2.3 are valid but should be complemented by an indicator to measure advances in stakeholders' capacity to generate and use information, which is the essential purpose of this output</i></p>	
<p>Activity 2.1 Technical working group created; and to hold meeting to present and discuss local biodiversity based on scientific and traditional knowledge.</p>		<p>As explained in Year 1 report, this activity was pre-empted by local identification of priority species and requests for support. In PNM the request was for support to conservation of Spondylus and early in Year 2 the request at GSFMR was</p>	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2010 - March 2011	Actions required/planned for next period
		confirmed to be spiny lobster.	
Activity 2.2 Technical working group to identify and prioritise key resources used at 2 pilot sites.		See above. In addition, in Jan 2011 the Ministry asked FFI, Nazca and FFLA to develop the zoning scheme for GSFMR, with associated monitoring. We held an initial workshop with fishers and local leaders to talk about purposes, principles costs and benefits, prepared 3 zoning scenarios using multiple data layers, and held a second local workshop to discuss these. In April 2011 (Year 3) the resulting draft zoning scheme was discussed in a series of village-level meetings. The inclusion of substantial No Take Zones and explicit consideration of issues of preferential access to resources for the communities participating in management mean that, if this can be approved and implemented, it will be a highly significant pioneering scheme for Ecuador MPAs, as well as an excellent basis for monitoring and adaptive management.	
Activity 2.3 Technical working group to study lessons learned from successfully implemented resource use strategies and experiences.		Information on Spondylus has led to the conclusion that the species needs full protection with no harvesting for a long period, which is not ideal for the project's intended activity of monitoring for adaptive management. In Year 3 we will compile and communicate information on restoration of severely depleted populations of marine molluscs. For GSF we will compile and communicate information on lobster management. This activity is behind schedule. In relation to the GSF zoning, FFI has drawn on a variety of information and experiences from the Galapagos, Caribbean, New Zealand, Kenya etc, in order to prepare with Nazca the materials used to introduce the concept of zoning and discuss it in the workshops described above. In Year 3 we will extend this use of experience from elsewhere in wider communication about the zoning scheme (once approved in the management plan) and in designing the monitoring programme.	
Activity 2.4 Technical working group develop and pre-negotiate 2 final resource use management strategies, present proposals for final negotiation		FFI and FFLA, together with Environment and Fisheries authorities, organized in June 2010 a workshop on Spondylus, attended by representatives of most relevant authorities and stakeholders (57 in total). It was successful in diagnosing the problem and debating strategies for recovery, largely based on full protection of Spondylus populations and measures to raise awareness, reduce demand, curb trade with Peru, and deal with economic impacts ,especially on craftspeople. See Monitoring Manual for more details. The lobster conservation agreement in the southern part of GSFMR was negotiated during 2009/2010 without involvement of FFI and FFLA. We were	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2010 - March 2011	Actions required/planned for next period
		<p>asked to get involved a little late in the process, in the case of FFLA to address conflicts and FFI to help on monitoring. We will continue this in Year 3.</p> <p>Discussions on the possibility of monitoring and adaptive management of crab and cockle at Jambelí are just beginning, and will continue in Year 3.</p>	
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.		FFI is supporting Nazca on the analysis of a socio-economic data set from Dec 2009. During her visit, Helen Schneider (FFI) discussed monitoring methods with Nazca and in Year 3 FFI will help Nazca to develop and implement with local actors a revised monitoring method.	
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.		FFI has been working with Nazca on reviewing existing baseline data on lobster and discussing monitoring methods. In Year 3 this work will generate the baseline analyses and participatory monitoring activities.	
Activity 2.7 FFI, FFLA and other partners generate and present funding proposals and also liaise with government and development agencies		For GSF FFI has raised £105K to support the overall zoning scheme, including a budget for initial monitoring of the lobster recovery programme and the overall zoning scheme. We have provisional approval of a five-year, £480K grant under the Civil Society Challenge Fund, which is broader in scope but will strengthen participatory monitoring processes, primarily in GSF, with some support for Machalilla and Jambelí. In Year 3 we will apply for further funds from FFI's Halcyon marine programme, including follow-up for zoning and lobster management at GSFMR and £6000 for a small experimental management project at one mangrove concession. We will continue to submit proposals for additional funds from other external sources.	
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.	<p><u>3.1</u> Percentage of recommendations made that are incorporated in new legal and institutional framework.</p> <p><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.</p>	<p>3.1 3 recommendations have moved from level 1 (concept underlying the recommendation is used in authorities' discourse and presentation but not taken into account in strategies or activities) to level 2 (authorities have accepted the essence of the recommendation and are working on institutional or legal instruments for its application), so there are now 2 recommendations at level 1 and 9 at level 2. None have yet reached level 3 (recommendation is formally included in the legal and institutional framework).</p> <p>3.2 Number of fora in the period April 10 to March 11 was 4, the same as the previous year. This exposure is complemented by regular dialogue with government officials.</p>	
Activity 3.1 FFLA to support MoE in the design and facilitation of key national and regional meetings for participatory development of national subsystem		MoE called, FFLA facilitated, and FFI participated in, three workshops of the national network of MPAs. Topics addressed included: the significance of "sub-system" and "network" in relation to MPAs, the current state of MPA management	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2010 - March 2011	Actions required/planned for next period
		and sources of support for MPAs, the status of MPA management plans at all sites, the value of inter-institutional coordination and ways to strengthen it, case studies of conflict management in MPAs, and a proposed statute or procedures document for the MPA network. In Year 3, we will help to formalise the Network's legal basis and expand it to include mangrove concessions and fisheries reserves.	
Activity 3.2 FFI/FFLA to present at key events their recommendations on legal and institutional changes necessary for innovative governance models.		In Year 2 the project has focused on presenting site-specific proposals (see activities of Output 1), because these have national significance. The proposed GSFMR Management Committee statute would set a new model, at Machalilla the degree of dependence on the Park director's goodwill is being tested, and at Jambelí the expansion of the mangrove concession system will require new rules and instruments. In Year 3 FFI and FFLA will use the results of these cases in writing up and presenting general legal and institutional recommendations	
Output 4. Key groups informed about project results and awareness about local stewardship of marine biodiversity raised nationally and internationally.	<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.</p> <p>4.2 The scores for the indicator for the period April '10 to March '11 are: UK: Zero Internationally: 1 – Powerpoint on MPA governance in Ecuador, presented at the workshop in Costa Rica Ecuador national and local: 8 - Training course manual and CDROM, Training course poster, Leaflet about the project, Booklet about participation, Powerpoint presentation and technical poster at Manta Biodiversity Workshop (mainly Ecuadorian but some international audience), publicity poster for conference.</p>	
Activity 4.1 MoE to internally disseminate governance models and merits.		Scheduled to happen in Q4 of Year 3, once the Ministry establishes the legal instruments and formally adopts a new model(s). The topic of participatory governance is already being discussed within MPA network	
Activity 4.2 Project partners to present /expose project at/through regional conferences and networks (including MoE for SA MPA network).		In March 2011 FFI used co-financing to organise a regional team to share the principles and experiences of the Darwin project with those of FFI and other organisations in Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Honduras, and use this to develop new project proposals. Main participants were FFI, FFLA, CoopeSoliDar R.L. (Costa Rica cooperative working with fishing communities), Fundenic (Nicaraguan NGO) and Recoturh (Honduran network of communities developing ecotourism). We met with diverse authorities and stakeholders over a 3-week period. In Year 3 we will, funding permitting, develop collaboration at MPA sites in each country and maintain regular communication and cooperation between sites involving various actors (government, NGO, coastal communities).	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2010 - March 2011	Actions required/planned for next period
		We are exploring other regional dissemination and cooperation opportunities, including further links with the South Pacific Permanent Commission and the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape programme led by Conservation International.	
Activity 4.3 Project partners to present/expose project to various international fora and media.		In Year 2 the project has not done any significant international exposure beyond the region. However, we are planning to do much more in Year 3 and have abstracts accepted for marine conferences in Norway, analysing diverse MPA governance structures in Ecuador (http://www.imr.no/om_havforskningsinstituttet/arrangementer/konferanser/ICZM_2011/en) and Aberdeen, focusing on governance and multi-disciplinary analysis for zoning (http://www.marine-biodiversity.org/). The abstracts are attached as annexes. Other Year 3 actions include (i) participation in preparatory processes for the CBD 2012 COP,; (ii) participation by FFLA in IUCN's new specialist group on marine social policy; (iii) dissemination through an article in FFI magazine, website material and the communications component of FFI's global marine programme.	
Activity 4.4 Project partners to disseminate project goal, progress and results to national media.		FFLA published and distributed a 31-page book, "The Governance of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas: the case of Ecuador", which draws heavily on project experience and includes five recommendations for MPA governance systems. Other posters and materials were also produced and disseminated. In Year 3 the project will make greater use of national media to disseminate information about the GSFMR participatory governance system and management plan, once approved.	
Activity 4.5 Project partners to organize national events to disseminate project results.		Project co-financed, helped to organise and presented a paper and a mini-course at a conference on marine biodiversity at Manta in Dec 2010, attended by >400 people. In Year 3 we will organise a conference focused on participatory governance of MPAs, to disseminate project results, including space for local stakeholders to communicate their own achievements.	

Annex 2 Project's full current logframe

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Goal:</p> <p>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:</p> <p>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.</p> <p><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 .</p> <p><u>SG2</u>. Results of interviews undertaken</p>	
<p>Purpose</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>P2</u>. Percentage attendance and participation by each of the members of the three local management committees.</p> <p><i>(Same as 1.2. Replaces "At 2 pilot MPA sites, percentage of key actors identified that participate actively in the negotiation of resource management strategies through the local management</i></p>	<p><u>P1</u>. Proposal document by MoE for National Subsystem of MPAs.</p> <p><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>

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
	<i>committees to be established as foreseen in Year 1 report.)</i>		
<p>OUTPUTS</p> <p>1. At two pilot sites (Galera-San Francisco and Jambeli) 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><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 constituencies in platforms (fora); Field reports from field assistance visits; exchange visit reports.</p>	<p>Stakeholders keep willingness to participate in the design of governance models.</p> <p>Government decentralisation is retained.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p><u>2.1</u> Percentage attendance and participation by each of the members of the three local management committees (<i>adopted this indicator as discussed in Year 1 report</i>). <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</p>	<p><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.</p>	<p>Willingness of communities and stakeholders to participate and reach consensus on difficult issues, such as resource management.</p> <p>Local stakeholders support and attend workshops /training and remain committed to the project.</p> <p>Funds leveraged to permit start-up of participatory monitoring system.</p>

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p>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.</p>	<p><u>3.1</u> Percentage of recommendations made that are incorporated in new legal and institutional framework.</p> <p><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.</p>	<p><u>3.1</u> Interviews notes. Baseline analysis document.</p> <p><u>3.2</u> Results of interview undertaken; register of receipt of document.</p>	<p>MoE continues with the predisposition of receiving support from civil society to fulfil their CBD targets.</p>
<p>4. Key groups informed about project results and awareness about local stewardship of marine biodiversity raised nationally and internationally.</p>	<p><u>4.1</u> Number of requests to project participants to participate in the development of MPAs and MPA networks in the region.</p> <p><u>4.2</u> Number of communicational materials with Darwin Initiative logo that have been disseminated in Ecuador, the UK and at international fora</p>	<p><u>4.1</u> Results of interviews undertaken</p> <p><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.</p>	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
Activities (details in workplan)			
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.			

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<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

The **monitoring manual** is attached as a separate file.

Links to various materials are provided in the text of this report and the monitoring manual.

To be posted separately: The CDROM and manual of the training course.

Abstracts for forthcoming conferences:

1. Abstract for conference in Norway (July 2011)

Governance systems for marine protected areas in Ecuador

Vincent Gravez, Robert Bensted-Smith and Pippa Heylings

The paper analyses the emergence of a variety of governance systems for Marine Protected Areas in Ecuador. The Galapagos Marine Reserve was created in 1998 under a participatory governance system, but in mainland Ecuador marine protection was minimal until political change in 2006 opened opportunities for local conservation initiatives. The 2008 Constitution affirms the right to participation but the recently enacted Law on Participation stresses consultation and leaves the State with the dominant role in decision-making. Within this context, several new MPAs have been created, with Galera San Francisco Marine Reserve in particular pioneering the negotiation of a new role for the Management Committee, which comprises State agencies, local authorities and civil society organizations. The issue of preferential local access to marine resources is also under discussion. In parallel with MPA initiatives under the Ministry of Environment has come the creation of special reserves under fisheries legislation and the exclusion of industrial fishing from nearshore waters along the entire coast. Lastly, dating from 2000 - well before the current government – there are mangrove management agreements, which go furthest of all in granting local groups use rights and responsibilities in relation to crab and shellfish. These have yielded encouraging social and ecological results. This melting point of evolving governance models has generated valuable lessons about the potential and limitations of community participation in MPAs and the need for coordination between government institutions. The paper suggests ways forward for Ecuador and assesses relevance of these lessons to other countries in the region.

2. Abstract for conference in Aberdeen (Sept 2011)

Participatory governance and multi-disciplinary planning for a new marine reserve in Ecuador

Soledad Luna, Robert Bensted-Smith, Julio Bernal, Vincent Gravez, Pippa Heylings and Cristina Rivadeneira

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 discuss with Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line.	-
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.	Selected
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.	One CD ROM and manual
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.	