



Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species

Final Project Report on:

**Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Building
for Guyana's Protected Areas System**

Project Doc no: 162/11/016

2002 - 2005

**Prepared by:
FFI and EPA
with inputs from GMTCS**



CONTENTS PAGE

1. Darwin Project Information.....	2
2. Project Background/Rationale.....	2
3. Project Summary.....	4
4. Scientific Training and Technical Assessment.....	10
5. Project Impacts.....	12
6. Project Outputs.....	18
7. Project Expenditure.....	20
8. Project Operation and Partnerships.....	21
9. Monitoring and Evaluation/ Lesson Learning.....	21
10. Actions taken in response to annual report reviews	24
11. Darwin Identity.....	24
12. Leverage.....	25
13. Sustainability and Legacy.....	25
14. Value for Money.....	26
15. Appendix 1: Project Contribution to Articles of CBD.....	27
16. Appendix II Outputs.....	28
17. Appendix III: Publications.....	32
18: Appendix IV: Darwin Contacts.....	33
19. (Appendix V. Revised LogFrame).....	34
20. (Appendix VI. List of All Project Outputs Submitted).....	35

Darwin Initiative

Final Report

1. Darwin Project Information

Project Reference No.	162/11/016
Project title	Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Building for Guyana's Protected Areas System
Country	Guyana
UK Contractor	Fauna & Flora International
Partner Organisation (s)	Guyana Environmental Protection Agency
Darwin Grant Value	£177,300 (reduced in Yr3 to £175,915)
Start/End date	1 Sept, 2002 – 31 August, 2005
Project website	n/a.
Author(s), date	Kerstin Swahn (FFI); Shyam Nokta (EPA-FFI), Dr Indarjit Ramdass, Ramesh Lilwah, and Richard Persaud (EPA), and Annette Arjoon (GMTCS)

2. Project Background/Rationale

- Describe the location and circumstances of the project

Guyana, formerly known as British Guiana, is located in the North-eastern portion of the South American continent and is one of the countries that embodies the Guiana Shield, the oldest and one of the most biodiverse ecosystems in the world with high levels of endemism. Being the poorest country per capita on the continent, the financial and human resources needed to address fundamental conservation issues is greatly lacking, indeed it is the only country in Central and South America that lacks a Ministry of Environment and a comprehensive National System of Protected Areas. Guyana is a signatory to the CBD and in 1999 prepared a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. The Environment Protection Agency (EPA) was established by the Environmental Protection Act of 1996 as the central level government branch mandated to oversee the establishment of a nationwide system of protected areas, and embarked on a strategy of assigning "lead agencies" or partners in the primary role in developing particular potential protected areas. The Guyana Marine Turtle Conservation Society (GMTCS) was one such designated lead agency for a proposed protected area called Shell Beach, and together with EPA, urgently needed technical and administrative support to develop their capacity to implement conservation measures to support the protected areas process.

- What was the problem that the project aimed to address?

The project's aim was to enhance the capacity of Guyana's embryonic protected areas system at two levels: central administration and at the site level for Shell Beach. Guyana's EPA had identified the priority areas for biodiversity conservation but lacked the resources, staff skills and management capability to develop and manage the protected areas.

- Who identified the need for this project and what evidence is there for a demand for this work and a commitment from the local partner?

The Guyana EPA and Office of the President identified the need for strengthening its National Protected Areas System (NPAS), which was clearly laid out as the overwhelming conservation priority for the country in the Guyana National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and in the First National Report to the Conference of the Parties.

Demand and commitment to the project from national partners was developed through two consecutive FFI missions to Guyana during 2001 in which a series of meetings and stakeholder workshops were held with EPA, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Minister of Amerindian Affairs (MoAA), and NGOs involved with conservation in Guyana (Conservation International – Guyana {CI-G} and a local NGO, the GMTCS). A preliminary needs-based analysis was undertaken with these participants, and priorities for support were agreed. Follow-up meetings with the EPA and GMTCS served to identify the specific roles and responsibilities of each collaborating institution and overall project aim and objectives were agreed. MoUs were signed between EPA –FFI; GMTCS- FFI and EPA – GMTCS at the start of this project and have been annually reviewed.

3. Project Summary

NOTE: In the following Sections, responses have been made jointly by FFI, EPA and GMTCS based on a detailed project evaluation carried out in August 2005. Where EPA and GMTCS have specifically wanted to stress issues separately, these are indicated by coloured texts: EPA, and GMTCS.

- What were the purpose and objectives (or outputs) of the project? Please include the project logical framework as an appendix if this formed part of the original project proposal/schedule and report against it. If the logframe has been changed in the meantime, please indicate against which version you are reporting and include it with your report.

See Appendix A for the full and revised Logical Framework, as approved by the Darwin Secretariat in early 2003.

The project purpose was to strengthen the National Protected Areas System (NPAS) at central and site levels by increasing levels of trained PA personnel and by drawing out model approaches /best practice of the PA process at Shell Beach. Over 150 persons relevant in protected areas planning representing 40 different institutions have been trained. Specifically, the EPA Protected Areas Unit and GMTCS field and office staff have been consistently present at all project workshops/training modules. Model approaches have been developed for an overall institutional framework for protected areas management, a national awareness strategy and action plan, and community consultation processes for protected areas. These three have been further refined for the Shell Beach PA process.

Project objectives/ outputs:

1) Institutionally strengthened central PA administration (and GMTCS at site level)

Completed through a series of workshop and training sessions which primarily targeted the EPA, as the recognised central coordinating unit of the Protected Areas process, and other institutions but also benefited GMTCS at local level by adapting all workshop/training and research components to the Shell Beach context:

Workshops: Proposal Preparation; Basic Project Management and Administration; Models of protected areas structure and management; Development of a National Awareness Strategy and Action Plan; Development of a Community Consultation Strategy and Action Plan; Protected Areas Categories and Management Implications; Financing Protected Areas.

Training: Conducting Community Consultations; Conducting Rapid Biological Assessments, Technical Protected Areas Management Planning; Conducting Community Resource Evaluations and Assessments; and Becoming Community Environmental Workers.

Both senior and young EPA professionals were consistently present for all workshop/training components. Office GMTCS staff were also consistently present; various deliverables also specifically targeted increasing skills of local Shell Beach community members, notably the training of 8 Community Environmental Workers (CEWs), 4 Community Resource Evaluation (CRE) workers, and 2 rangers.

All of the workshops and training applied the general protected areas scenario of Guyana through discussions and exercises. The Shell Beach context was applied in every workshop/ training component for a very minimum of one day in a closed session for relevant stakeholders to the Shell Beach PA process. The closing session of each workshop, which was open to all interested persons/groups, included a summary of conclusions from the Shell Beach sessions in order to keep the key discussions and ensuing issues transparent.

There is a clear mandate for the Lead Agencies Conservation International-Guyana (Kanuku Mountains & Southern Region Guyana – Kanashen District) and GMTCS (Shell Beach) to lead the PA processes through Memorandum of Understanding.

Central and site level management and administration for both EPA and GMTCS was further built up through the purchase of computer equipment, LCD projector, digital cameras (hardware), field equipment, acquisition of field guides/books and the availability of training manuals. Contributions towards salaries, travel costs to/from Shell Beach, and communications also gave support.

2) Enhanced protected areas network

The enhancement of the protected areas network was addressed through two areas:

- 1) Protected Areas fora through the cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder nature of the workshops, and
- 2) preparatory work for the establishment of Shell Beach as a gazetted Protected Area.

Protected Areas Fora

In the first instance, lead agencies (EPA and GMTCS) plus various key Amerindian representative groups and Ministries such as Forestry, Mining, MoAA, and Education met to enrich discussions for the NPAS and give suggestions and advice for the Shell Beach PA process. As well, given that the workshops have encouraged the participation of other protected areas stakeholders and lead agencies through presentations and active discussion, Iwokrama¹ and CI-G² have all been able to divulge their experiences on protected areas issues in Guyana as a whole where successes and lessons learned have been focal points. As such, the Shell Beach process has also been able to draw upon the experiences of others, which has reinforced the overall key protected areas messages from FFI's regional experiences given in workshops and training components. Notable key exchanges of information with other Guyanese lead agencies have been on community consultation processes, technical management planning, and sustainable livelihoods.

For Shell Beach specifically, in early 2003 UNDP-Guyana was planning a coastal zone management project, therefore their participation in workshop fora was also crucial for the realistic development of their project, but also for keeping local stakeholders updated. Shortly thereafter in 2004, the EPA recognised the new GMTCS-WWF³ project as another initiative to progress the protected areas process at Shell Beach and agreed to merge the deliverables with the existing

¹ In March 1997, Iwokrama International Centre for Rainforest Conservation and Development became lead agency for the Iwokrama International Rainforest Reserve, which encompasses 360,000 ha and constitutes a Wilderness Preserve, and a zone for sustainable utilisation of natural resources.

² Conservation International is the lead agency for the proposed protected area, the Kanuku Mountains.

³ In 2003, WWF was able to access funds to work with GMTCS on the protected areas process at Shell Beach, which had been stalled for two years and at the time of the Darwin project, was not expected to come on line. The resultant GMTCS-WWF G-49 project focused on conducting on the ground assessments and studies, whereas the Darwin project concentrated on planning and training. Thus, FFI informed the Darwin Secretariat that the Darwin project would work in parallel to the G-49 project and all efforts would be made to synergise the outputs and activities of the two in order to achieve maximum conservation impact.

Darwin project. Thus, the combined regional, national and local experiences and efforts raised in the Darwin project fora helped produce valuable approaches, tools, lessons and models for Shell Beach on technical management planning for protected areas, developing awareness strategies and production of awareness materials, training of technical teams in biodiversity and social assessments and training locals in becoming CEWs to communicate key protected areas messages and facilitating discussion.

The participants of the various workshops and training sessions were able to develop solid networking linkages for the National Protected Areas System (NPAS). The participants merged field and national experiences creating a realistic picture of the process and the needs for the NPAS. Local and national participants blossomed in the process of capacity building growing into key players of the NPAS championing the process locally and nationally.

The existing networks before the Darwin project were based on the Administrative linkages created by the Regional District Councils (RDCs) through its Administrative, Education and Health programs. PA was a new concept and not well accepted by the few who were aware of the move to have a PA declared in Regions One or Nine. Local linkages also existed within communities supported by the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs. The Amerindian interest groups maintained a network in the communities which supported various levels of activity per community. Some communities were more aware of PA due to the activities of the Amerindian interest groups.

The change of attitude and gradual embracing of the concept of PA in Region One is attributed to a large extent to the Darwin project, the work of the Lead Agency and the support of the Regional District Council Region One. This process was well supported by the government through the offices of the MoAA and the EPA.

Shell Beach as a gazetted Protected Area

Evidence of the official expansion of the NPAS was meant to be through the designation of the Shell Beach Study Area as a protected area. This aspect, unchanged in the LogFrame, became apparent as unrealistic in the start of Year 3 for the following reasons: institutional issues within GMTCS that needed to be resolved; the suspension of the GMTCS-WWF project; and the sporadic progress of community consultations at Shell Beach (these factors were previously explained in the Third Annual Report). Indeed, in hindsight it was generally felt by FFI, EPA and GMTCS that achieving gazettement for Shell beach within the 3 years was not entirely realistic, and that greater time and costs needed to be put towards community consultations. However, despite the longer than anticipated time to gazette Shell Beach, the Darwin project has enabled the process to move forwards by: strengthening the Technical Dossier which will be presented to the GoG as a basis for its legal gazettement through biodiversity assessments; giving recommendations for internal zoning from the findings of the socio-economic feasibility study; strengthening GMTCS staff in protected areas skills and issues; and identifying strengths and gaps for management planning. The upcoming World Bank project and the currently running KfW pilot project will /are both building off the backs of the Darwin project.

The Shell Beach Study Area was approved by GoG and submitted to the World Bank along with other documents relating to the Guyana Protected Areas System (GPAS) project. Official gazettement of the PA will be part of the GPAS project. The Darwin project has provided invaluable contributions to the process by empowering the professionals in the project to successfully implement the GPAS project.

The opportunity afforded to a number of participants from the wider stakeholder communities and also the Region 1 Administration has been invaluable in that it exposed the workshop/training participants to the many aspects of protected areas and has enhanced their understanding of the protected areas process. The resulting capacity garnered from exposure to the Darwin initiative has already been utilised in the subsequent projects and ensuing workshops. Both the community and regional representatives have played a part in the awareness programme which updates the various stakeholder communities on the protected areas process.

3) Agreed training programme, methodology and materials for EPA, rangers, awareness outreach and communities

Training needs and programmes, methods and materials for EPA, GMTCS, rangers, national and Shell Beach outreach programmes, and for communities have consistently been developed as required by the joint implementing - lead agencies. In particular, all agendas for the training workshops have been developed through close communication between FFI UK, the Project Officer in Guyana, EPA, GMTCS and the workshop leader (where relevant). Synergy with the GMTCS-WWF project at Shell Beach was actively pursued by holding meetings with the project's Technical Director, who had a central role as the GMTCS-WWF Field Coordinator. In this way, consultation activities had been identified to strengthen the overall protected areas initiative at central and site level as such. Continual review and adaptive management, focussing on pragmatic solutions, were made in order to ensure the overall strengthening and capacity building goals were met as far as possible throughout the project. Moreover, the Darwin Project Officer in Guyana has been crucial in facilitating the dialogue and more so in keeping momentum of the project as EPA and GMTCS coordinators for this project have been weighed down with other project work including the preparation of Shell Beach as the pilot area for the World Bank GPAS⁴ project and its supporting KfW⁵ funds, the latter which have already commenced.

The methods, programmes and materials developed and implemented during the Darwin project will continue to be used throughout the overall protected areas process in Guyana, perhaps most notably the various training manuals, awareness materials, and recommendations for Shell Beach during workshops and training. For example, the Natural Resources Management Division of the EPA currently has all of the training manuals available in its library available to the public and lends materials to other Divisions as well. These materials are also available at the EPA and GMTCS websites.

The most utilised manuals are on technical management planning as this relates more to the PA work and that of the Natural Resources Management Division. These manuals were consulted during implementation of other projects and various training relating to NRM. These include the Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) of the North Rupununi, the Caribbean Regional Environmental Programme (CREP), Project Management and Proposal Preparation training exercises, etcetera.

Some of the manuals produced have been utilised as resource materials in our N-IUCN supported Tropical Rainforest Programme project and will also serve useful in subsequent Natural Resource Management activities.

4) Identification of possible means of economic benefit to communities from biodiversity

Two products resulted from this deliverable, the first being a historical review of livelihoods at Shell Beach. Second, a feasibility study was undertaken by a NTFP expert from UNEP-WCMC that specifically looked at the international and regional market for the medicinal crabwood oil soaps and oil, something which is currently being produced and sold by several local communities at Shell Beach. This study was complimented by funds from N-IUCN that investigated the resource base of this market. The feasibility report has been extremely useful in detailing the realistic options for promoting the market, and identifying further technical, logistical, and financial needs. Possible vendors have already been contacted such as Neal's Yard in London and subsequent to this, the Winged Horse Trust, which is largely focused on medicinal natural products, has become interested in crabwood oil and will be taking a trip to Guyana in early 2006 to explore the potential for production.

This study was most timely in that it complimented the resource base inventory which was ongoing at the time. Various components of this study has already been utilised in subsequent proposal applications which follow up on the recommendations made by the consultant. Apart from the report itself the consultant has been most proactive in providing additional resource material and also serving as an informal advisor on NTFPs matters to GMTCS. The report has been linked on the GMTCS website and will serve as a catalyst for further research on NTFP's in

⁴ The 5-year World Bank project to establish the Guyana Protected Areas System (GPAS) has been stalled for the past 10 years due to Amerindian land issues over the project. Renewed discussions have now resulted in an expected start date sometime in 2006 where the project will focus on two pilot areas of models of protected areas establishment, namely Shell Beach and the Kanuku Mountains.

⁵ German Government Funds (Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau), or KfW, are providing 2-years worth of infrastructural support to the World Bank GPAS funds focusing on the same pilot areas.

the area. It has also been forwarded to both Mr Peter De Groot of the UK who is working on markets for soaps made of natural products and also Dr Pierre Forget of the University of Paris who is collaborating with GMTCS on research on the species of crabwood found in the area.

On a broader PA level, recognition of the role of NTFPs for supporting local communities has witnessed the Kanuku Mountains PA process led by CI-G successfully integrating the production and marketing of NTFPs with conservation efforts of the communities. The Nappi Balata Artisans have led this process with markets in the international arena. This process is currently being explored in the Kanashen District. However; logistics for this site are more challenging.

5) Environmental education and awareness materials produced

The production and the framework for environmental awareness and education through outreach has been successful.

Seven different types of visual material have been produced under the Darwin project: brochures on the PA importance of Shell Beach; calendars on the PA sites in Guyana; Q & A sheets on the relevance of the PA process; posters on Shell Beach as a PA; one 15 minute video on the protected areas of Guyana; and two infomercials (TV adverts). Moreover, a photographic expedition to Shell Beach was undertaken in 2003 that produced images for GMTCS and EPA to use for awareness purposes. Parallel funding by an in-country donor also allowed for all the other proposed PA sites to be photographed and together all these images are available to EPA and relevant authorities to use for free (sighting copyright and logos). Indeed, several of the images have become popular: the President of Guyana displays the Kaieteur Falls (from one of the two existing PAs in Guyana); and several travel magazines have used images in articles about Shell Beach. Images were also used in the public awareness materials produced for the Public Disclosure of the GPAS project. At the individual level, many persons use the images in their various power point presentations with biodiversity as the focus. There have been various discussions over production of other collateral materials with these images, such as postcards and/or posters for display at the airport.

At national level for the general public, there is now an increased understanding and awareness over the concepts of a *protected area* and a *national protected areas system*, and better awareness over existing and proposed PA sites, including likely implications of the PA process. This was carried out through the production of 1 video, 2 infomercials, 1 calendar, and a CD set with photographic images used for media; and through various press releases.

Shell Beach

Increased awareness of Shell Beach in Georgetown and its conservation /protected areas need and issues has been achieved throughout the 3 years of the project. This partly DI funded educational facility ('museum') is strategically located at the Botanical Gardens in Georgetown, which benefits from thousands of visitors each month. The main visitors have been school children and families. This museum has been featured in local/national TV and newspaper media several times.

There has been increased understanding/awareness of primary local communities in Shell Beach over the concept of a *protected area*, and the protected areas process at Shell Beach through at least 8 different workshop/training events, 2 community consultations, 3 different types of awareness materials, and CEW activities. Moreover, all related awareness materials are included in GMTCS information kits, which are distributed to interested parties and schools in the North West district of Shell Beach. The Community Environmental Workers, who were trained under the DI, will continue to take the awareness materials out to the Shell Beach communities, as per the Outreach Action Plan they developed in the workshop / training.

- Were the original objectives or operational plan modified during the project period? If significant changes were made, for what reason, and when were they approved by the Darwin Secretariat?

Originally at the start of the project, the Enhanced PA Network objective was meant to be facilitated by the establishment of a Protected Areas Secretariat. However, this was not feasible given the lack of funds that was expected to come through the World Bank GPAS project,

which is now expected to start in 2006. As such, this element was taken out of the LogFrame and instead replaced by a less formal mechanism by which lead agencies and those groups relevant to protected areas could meet and discuss experiences, give updates etc. One such group was established by the EPA for the Shell Beach Study Area where once every quarter the EPA-FFI representative, EPA, GMTCS, UNDP, and WWF met. However, in the last six months of the project, the EPA as the recognised central coordinating agency took the decision to instead meet individually with the partners and in turn update/ discuss with them each about the various initiatives of the organisations involved. [This mechanism was used as there were no overlapping issues to be discussed among the stakeholders. In the event that issues were to be discussed with a multi-stakeholder group, such a group would have been convened.](#)

More social training and application were added to the operational plan in order to help build the capacity of PA planners and managers and highlight key techniques and lessons learned elsewhere on the importance of e.g. community consultations, considerations over indigenous peoples issues, empowering communities themselves to carry out assessments on resource use and being able to act as go-between's on PA awareness (i.e. the Community Environmental Workers). These were able to be added because an in-country donor wanted to only fund workshops and training, thus freeing up some of the Darwin funds under the Conferences/seminar budget line. These elements also complimented the WWF-GMTCS Protected Areas project at Shell Beach, which was focused on carrying out social and biological fieldwork but lacked the training/ capacity building components.

Additionally, a team of biologists were recruited to be trained to carry out rapid biological assessments at Shell beach. Originally, this pool of biologists were meant to be EPA and GMTCS staff, however given staff shortages, this was not possible, and so a team had to be recruited from a national base. The intention was to use this pool for work in other protected areas as well, thereby retaining the skills learned.

- Which of the Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) best describe the project? Summaries of the most relevant Articles to Darwin Projects are presented in Appendix I.

The project has directly assisted Guyana in implementing the following articles of the CBD: Article 8 in situ conservation; Article 5 Co-operation; Article 6 General measures for conservation and sustainable use, Article 12 Research and training, Article 13 Public education and awareness, Article 17 Exchange of information, and Article 19 Technical and scientific cooperation.

- Briefly discuss how successful the project was in terms of meeting its objectives. What objectives were not or only partly achieved, and have there been significant additional accomplishments?

Overall the project was able to successfully meet the majority of objectives, albeit through somewhat different mechanisms than originally envisaged at the beginning of the project as per original work plan.

The central level PA unit was **significantly** built up through the project where protected areas officials are applying what they learned in training and applying in the field the conclusions of discussions during workshops. They are also lecturing others and sharing methods and techniques; manuals and reports are also made available in the library for interested and/or new staff.

The PA network was also enhanced by the fact that it was the first time that groups across all disciplines were brought together to discuss protected areas issues and share ideas, concerns and/or experiences, which in turn fostered the need for a forum where protected issues are discussed. The wide participation of over 220 participants for all workshops/training representing over 40 different stakeholder groups supports the importance and relevance of the DI in having supported a fora. [Other spin-offs include an EPA program of in-house seminars which sometimes focuses on Biodiversity and Conservation issues. Usually, partners of the Agency are invited to these sessions which generate healthy discussions. The "Friends of Kaieteur" and "Friends of](#)

["Iwokrama" nights also provides opportunities for healthy discussions in PA issues.](#)

The overall programmes, methods and materials for training and field application were not only successfully developed jointly between EPA, FFI and other experts and executed by professionals, but are also able to be used as model approaches for other protected areas work in Guyana, such as how to set a community consultation strategy and action plan with local communities, and how to develop a local awareness strategy and action plan.

Economic benefit to local communities at Shell Beach was also explored through a feasibility study on crabwood oil that raised key issues and recommendations for realistic development and community expectation; and linkages for follow-up work have been identified.

Lastly, over seven types of visual awareness materials covering a range of media have been developed for both the wider PA process, as well as for the Shell Beach one; the latter will be more extensively used in the field post-Darwin by local community members trained under the DI. For the wider PA process, awareness materials continue to be distributed by EPA's network, the most recent productions being a video and 2 infomercials that will be aired shortly and repeatedly to advertise the importance of the PA process. (Note, the latter awareness materials will be presented on national TV in late March and through the various spin-off PA fora; these materials will be sent to ECTF as soon as they are received. Delays in the airing have been due to the reliance of local TV stations to air them at will given that no funds are available to support their airing time). Perhaps the single-most important outcome of the production of awareness materials has been in the increased awareness of national and Shell beach communities over the concept of a protected area. Fewer national and local Shell beach communities are viewing the PA process as a threat and are instead seeing it as something positive given joint planning and decision-making.

Three of these objectives, however, faced setbacks for reasons largely out of the implementing and executing agencies' control.

First, under the strengthened central PA objective it was hoped that more EPA and GMTCS personnel could be trained in specialised skills of carrying out biological and social assessments, however both organisations were short on staff and those available were overburdened with work. As such, persons for technical teams had to be sourced and this proved difficult as few were available and qualified enough due to the high emigration rate of skilled professionals and/or other work commitments. Indeed, results of the applied biological assessments uncovered to the project implementers a significant need for more prolonged and supervised field training and application as the quality of information from the Rapid Biodiversity Assessment proved discouraging. Additionally, few members could be sourced for the social pool of experts; rather training focused on giving these social skills to local community members instead for the CEW and CRE training events. Given the lesson learnt for the need of more biological and social training, FFI together with in-country partners are now looking for funds to support these kinds of activities.

Second, community consultations under the Education and Awareness objective stalled due to problems between GMTCS and WWF over their project which was meant to apply in the field the theory of the Darwin funded community consultation training. This in turn delayed the community support for implementation of the established and agreed awareness strategy and action plan for Shell Beach, which the Community Environmental Workers were meant to take forward with the aid of the awareness materials produced under the Darwin Initiative. The net result of the situation as a whole was that only two consultations ensued out of a planned five and as such only about half of all the awareness materials were disbursed by the close of the project in late August. EPA and GMTCS have put in contingency plans to deliver the remaining awareness materials.

Third, under the enhanced Protected Areas Network objective unfortunately the outcome between GMTCS and WWF over the G-49 project was the stalling of the project and negotiations between EPA and WWF are still underway as to how to move forward. Since the WWF project was highly complimentary to the Darwin Initiative in that the joint (though independent) goal was the establishment of Shell beach as a Protected Area, the inability of WWF to take the lead on compiling Technical and Legal compendiums to support the PA gazettelement impacted the DI (which supported the Technical Compendium). As such, the gazettelement came to a standstill; it was clear in late 2004 that Shell Beach would most likely not be declared as a PA in time for the

close of the Darwin project.

Despite the obstacles in meeting the full extent of the objectives, the project has undoubtedly made very good progress in establishing the means for taking the PA process forward both at a national level as well as the site level. What is required are initiatives that build on the Darwin project—centrally and locally-- and this is expected to be realised through the German KfW funds and the upcoming World Bank project.

4. Scientific, Training, and Technical Assessment

- Please provide a full account of the project's research, training, and/or technical work.
- **Research** - this should include details of staff, methodology, findings and the extent to which research findings have been subject to peer review.

Research studies were carried out through the Rapid Biological Assessment at Shell Beach and the feasibility study on commercial markets for crabwood oil production. The biological work at Shell Beach was carried out by 4 biologists with specialities in birds, fish, mammals, and herpetofauna. The criteria for their selection were previous training and/or experience, many of them having been trained through Smithsonian and now working for other institutions in Guyana such as Iwokrama. Previous biological work in the area was reviewed as a basis for work to be carried out and methodology was designed during the training session facilitated by a FFI Biodiversity Officer. Methods were tested in the field with participants. The biodiversity team then carried out transect surveys in two stages sampling different habitat types representative of the Shell Beach proposed protected area. Their findings were then meant to be statistically analysed by the FFI Biodiversity Officer with the final report being compiled by the team leader. It became apparent upon peer review of the raw data that the data was not collected consistently and as such, only very simple stats could be run. Moreover the study had to be re-written by a FFI biodiversity specialist due to its poor quality and the inability of the team leader to complete it. The resultant Analysis of the Study was only able to outline species identified in the study, as well as problem areas and recommendations for follow-up. However, species sightings coupled with the GPS coordinates are still useful.

The feasibility study was carried out for Shell Beach with the overall objective being to provide the EPA and GMTCS with an assessment of the most probable sustainable economic activities, focussing on non-timber forest products, in particular Crabwood Oil. This was carried out by a NTFP expert at UNEP-WCMC who has much experience with market analysis methods and development of different NTFPs in South America. As the *resource base* for the production had already been assessed under a N-IUCN grant, this study focused on the recommendations for the feasibility of crabwood oil *commercialization* for the Waini communities at Shell Beach. Methodology involved meeting with the project partners in-country, carrying out site visits and having both open structured meetings as well as closed structured interviews with key informants/crabwood oil producers. Conclusions and recommendations were made regarding both markets for commercialization, as well as for sustainable use of the crabwood oil tree.

- **Training and capacity building activities** – this should include information on selection criteria, content, assessment and accreditation.

The following training elements were carried out by professionals but not in association with a learning institution therefore none of the training activities were accredited. (Not presented in any particular order).

Evaluations for all workshops and training were carried out with extremely positive results for all of them. The majority of participants for each workshop/training found that their understanding of issues and confidence in discussing them was significantly increased. All events had a sign-up sheet for participants for each day so that number of types of participants could be tracked. This list was also used to send/circulate final workshop/training reports/presentations and manuals to **ALL** participants, without fail.

Participants who had attended 75% of each event also received a certificate of attendance, which was much appreciated and also helped to show employers/employees of the value of

attending such events.

See Project Impacts Section 5 for the Table listing in more detail the number of participants for each workshop/training.

Activities were:

Project Proposal Preparation was delivered by a FFI protected areas staff member who has years of experience writing proposals for private individuals, trusts/foundations, bilateral and multilateral agencies. The target audience was senior and young professionals in EPA, GMTCS and other institutions involved in protected areas issues. Training focused on reviewing and application of proposal terminology, such as various indicators, writing LogFrames etc. The trainer also reviewed different types of donor applications / procedures and the difference in the quality/quantity of information sought between various types of donors (i.e. private individuals versus EC proposals). Discussions followed on the importance of building up a relationship with a donor.

Project Administration and Management was delivered by an Americas FFI Projects Manager. This workshop was run back to back with the project proposal preparation and hence, delivered the training to more or less the same audience. The content focused on 3 areas required for successful project management: 1) administration (finances, communications, establishing procedures; templates; project cycle documents) 2) Operational management (M&E tools, financial tracking, reporting skills); and 3) People management /communication dynamics (qualities of a good leader/manager; Emotional Intelligence; team dynamics; work styles; effective communication).

Conducting Community Consultations was run by a FFI staff member who has had extensive experience working with indigenous and local communities in a natural resource and protected areas context. Participants were selected based on their involvement in protected areas issues, position and ToR within institutions, and who they were representing. As such, a number of core EPA and GMTCS staff attended this training with representation from various national and local indigenous peoples groups and Community Representatives from various Regions in Guyana. The applied training at Shell Beach was then held only for Shell Beach stakeholder groups and was not facilitated by the Trainer since she was not a community member—it was felt that this element should be led by a local, which it was. This training resulted in an agreed Strategy and Action Plan for Community Consultations at Shell Beach designed by local community participants.

Developing Awareness Strategy and Action Plan for Guyana's Protected Areas Process. This was led by a British environmental educator, doing work for both UK and international projects. This training and workshop was the most widely attended of all workshops having representation from various stakeholder groups at national including EPA and the Ministry of Education to local teachers and Community Captains at Shell beach. The approach for how to develop an awareness strategy was based on FFI's internal approach already adopted and used widely within PA contexts. The training leader went through the various steps, and with participants in open and groups sessions applied them first for the protected areas process at national scale, and then in a separate day for the Shell Beach process. The results were two strategy and action plans; one for the national PA process and the other for Shell Beach. The workshop/training decided what kinds of materials would be most appropriate for various audiences, and which ones were priorities for production under the DI (which later became the public awareness materials developed by the DI). A spin-off to this workshop was an awareness group for Shell Beach that worked on texts and image design for the awareness materials.

Conducting Rapid Biological Assessments (see Research section above).

Technical Protected Areas Planning I and II were carried out by a British Protected Areas Specialist. He first facilitated and led the workshop on Models of Protected Areas management at the start of the project. The technical training was actually a joint workshop and training since it involved both considerable illustration and facilitation by the leader but also involved much discussion and applied exercises to existing versus proposed protected areas contexts. The method and resultant training manual incorporated best practice and lessons learned from other protected areas in Asia Pacific, Eurasia and Central and South America, but followed the

Management Plan approach recommended by GTZ and IUCN for the Latin American context. The training lasted 6 days in total and resulted in conclusions and recommendations for the preparation and compilation of management plans for Shell Beach and Kaieteur National Park, including information gap analyses.

Conducting Community Resource Evaluations and Assessment: This was a 4-day training event for 12 community participants, GMTCS office and field staff, and an EPA Protected Areas Officer. It was lead by a Guyanese social scientist and a community resource mapper from the Amerindian People's Association (APA). The training focused on the rationale and use of CREs, approach and methods, determination of resource needs, identification of techniques, documentation of information and its analysis, and finally the development of a plan for CREs of Shell Beach communities. The approach for the highly participatory resources mapping method was lifted from Giacomo Rambaldi et al. "Participatory Methods in Community-based Coastal Resource Mapping, Volume 2 Tools and Methods" (more info found on www.iapad.org).

Becoming Community Environmental Workers (CEWs): This was delivered over a 2 day workshop in Georgetown where community-designated trainees were trained and orientated as GMTCS CEWs for developing and implementing the Community Education and Awareness Programme at various Shell Beach communities. GMTCS, EPA, FFI and WWF protected areas staff gave a basic background to protected areas work in Guyana and the rationale for its establishment. Visits were made to the various agency offices to meet staff, view information and maps, and to discuss any issues of interest. A work plan was then developed for the CEWs.

Ranger training was carried out by and at the Iwokrama Centre for International Conservation and Research over a one month period and eight individuals from Shell Beach (and greater Region One) and two wardens from Kaieteur National Park were trained. Iwokrama's method has been applied for several years to various institutions. Each ranger received a basic ranger kit, reference materials including species guide books, and a complete ranger training manual. Topics included everything from basic biological concepts to safety in the field and basic species surveys. It did not, however, apply the skills to the context of each participant as training was done at the Iwokrama Centre.

Financing Protected Areas was carried out by a Protected Areas Specialist very familiar with financing mechanisms working for UNEP-WCMC and TripleLine Consulting Limited. This workshop targeted senior EPA members and various protected areas lead agencies. The contents of the workshop focused on types of financing mechanisms for protected areas, most notably Environmental Trust Funds since this was a request made especially by EPA since they are negotiating over this with WB and CI.

5. Project Impacts

- What evidence is there that project achievements have led to the accomplishment of the project purpose? Has achievement of objectives/outputs resulted in other, unexpected impacts?

The purpose of the project was to strengthen Guyana's national protected areas system at central and site level by i) strengthening official legislation ii) increasing levels of trained protected areas personnel and iii) drawing out model approaches from the Shell Beach protected areas process. The achieved objectives and outputs of the project support these in the following ways:

(i). Strengthening official legislation At this time there have been no new legislation regarding conservation and sustainable use issues. However, some will agree that the revision of the Amerindian Act now adequately addresses resource use issues on Amerindian lands. This development can be attributed to the key staff members of the MoAA being trained under the Darwin Project.

(ii). Increased levels of trained protected areas personnel can be verified through workshop and training reports, attendee lists, participant evaluations, and training manuals. In total over 40 institutions and 220 persons (cumulative figure) representing various Government Ministries, Regional Democratic Councils, national and local conservation NGOs, community women's

groups, Amerindian NGOs, University of Guyana, Regional Area groups, and community village captains and representatives have benefited from the Darwin project. EPA and GMTCS have consistently been present throughout all the deliverables. The workshops with the highest number and most diverse array of participants were: Protected Areas Management in Guyana - Institutional Management, Roles and Responsibilities; Project Proposal Preparation; Project Management and Administration; Technical Protected Areas Management Planning; and the Development of a National PA Awareness Strategy and Action Plan. Outputs from all the activities can be viewed digitally.

(iii). Model approaches / lessons learnt from the national and/or Shell Beach protected areas process that can be applied to other protected areas contexts, can be verified from workshop and training evaluations in terms of which ones were most effective and valuable, and through various processes that helped formulate and/or implement concrete actions or results. The most valuable workshops for EPA and GMTCS were technical management planning; financing protected areas; conducting community consultations; and proposal writing and preparation.

For Shell Beach communities, the action plan for community consultations, the methods and programmes used for training CEWs and conducting CREs were most useful, as was the production of awareness materials and community consultations that helped clarify local concerns and issues over protected areas as a concept but also the process. Rangers obviously found the ranger training programme and manual most beneficial to them. As an awareness strategy and action plan was developed for the national protected areas process, this can be adapted to local protected areas contexts going through the same approach that Shell beach stakeholders used to identify their awareness programme.

GMTCS noted the following unexpected good impacts:

1. Most of the rangers trained under the FFI project actively participated in the recently concluded TRP Crabwood forest inventory and gained valuable on the ground experience.
 2. Subsequently some of these participants with the sea turtle wardens have grouped themselves into a North West body with rangers and inventory skills to undertake similar activities in the North West District of Shell Beach. They have actually had initial discussions with the Ministry of Agriculture to undertake mapping of an area which is infected with a banana parasite and the Regional Administration is aware of their skills being available to undertake any such activity in Region 1 thus removing the reliance on having to import such expertise from outside of the Region.
 3. Two rangers from the Waini communities have been elected in senior management positions in the recently established Waini Management Committee which was set up to specifically to manage the crabwood resource in the inventoried area. This will serve as a pilot in collaborative management of natural resources and is expected to widen once the capacity of the members is adequately built. It is not unrealistic for this initiative to expand to a North West District Development Board similar to the NRDDDB as the rangers during the Iwokrama training were exposed to the Surama and NRDDDB examples and Mr Sydney Allicock of the NRDDP played an active role in the workshops on collaborative management held in Region 1 under the TRP project and was largely responsible for the enthusiasm and positive attitude of the participants
 4. The NTFP study served as a stimulus for attracting more research and GMTCS will be entering in a memorandum of cooperation with Dr Pierre Forget of the University of Paris to conduct further scientific research on the crabwood species in the area.
- To what extent has the project achieved its purpose, i.e. how has it helped the host country to meet its obligations under the Biodiversity Convention (CBD), or what indication is there that it is likely to do so in the future? Information should be provided on plans, actions or policies by the host institution and government resulting directly from the project building on new skills and research findings.

The project has contributed to Guyana's commitment to the CBD in many ways. Capacity has been built to execute the GPAS project. First, this project will increase the total land area under protection from 2% to over 6%. Second, various legislative issues are currently being addressed

including an Access and Benefit Sharing Policy. Third, there are other Natural Resource Management (under which the PA Unit falls) projects being implemented by the EPA and other organisations that have benefited from the Darwin project.

- Please complete the table in Appendix I to show the contribution made by different components of the project to the measures for biodiversity conservation defined in the CBD Articles.

Please see Appendix I.

- If there were training or capacity building elements to the project, to what extent has this improved local capacity to further biodiversity work in the host country and what is the evidence for this? Where possible, please provide information on what each student / trainee is now doing (or what they expect to be doing in the longer term).

The various training and capacity building elements described in Scientific Research, Training and Technical Assessment targeted a number of groups and individuals and accounting for all of them would be difficult. Therefore, we focus accounts on how EPA and GMTCS have benefited from these in terms of improving local capacity to further biodiversity work and what evidence there is for this.

Activity and beneficiary	How it has furthered biodiversity work in Guyana (or Shell Beach)	Evidence for this	Comments on individuals trained or in attendance
Identification of Models of Protected Areas Structure and Management			
EPA	Model developed for overall PAs and will be used when NPAS is further advanced under WB GPAS. Laid the basis and identified the members and structure. EPA now central coordinating role and effectively taking place of the PA Secretariat by holding consistent meetings with all PA lead agencies and stakeholders including local governments, MoAA. Wai Wai only group not involved but this is due to a language and logistic barrier.	Workshop report with Conclusions and Recommendations. Clarification on institutional roles and mandates. Minutes of meetings (only available upon special and direct request to EPA).	22 different institutions represented with 31 participants in total. EPA- 5. All still within EPA in PA unit.
GMTCS	Model developed for Shell Beach. The process has lead to a similar framework identified for the Kanuku Mountains. The Kanuku Mountains PA process has an additional body – Community Representative Group.	Workshop Report/ Conclusions and Recommendations for Shell Beach. Workshop Report	GMTCS - 2 including 1 field staff; both retained. CI-G – 2 trained
Project proposal preparation			
EPA	refined the WB GPAS proposal in terms of making indicators in the LogFrame more precise; helped with KfW grant as well. Also helped in proposal to CBD for National Capacity Self-Assessment and in BioSafety proposal. Recently a proposal was submitted to IDB by 2 participants of the workshop. In total 6 proposals written using skills learnt.	Training manual; proposals submitted	15 participants/. Activities coordinated with Lead Agencies who were attended training sessions
GMTCS	Improved quality of proposals including successful rounds to Tropical Rainforest Programme, and USAID; helped with the donor relationship with World Bank; a concept proposal with the IADB and a full proposal with UNDP	Training manual; proposals submitted.	4 GMTCS staff attended (3 remain)
Project Management and Administration			
EPA	Helps administer other projects including CREP; good for young professionals	Training manual; daily project work	15 participants. Currently project staff on many projects of NRM

Activity and beneficiary	How it has furthered biodiversity work in Guyana (or Shell Beach)	Evidence for this	Comments on individuals trained or in attendance
GMTCS	More efficient systems in place	Training manual; daily project work	4 GMTCS staff attended (3 remain)
Conducting Community Consultations			
EPA	<p>EPA and GMTCS followed the community consultation plan when leading 2 consultations specifically for the Darwin project in the field involving full attendance from 88 captains, council members and locals from 22 communities.</p> <p>EPA staff now use this overall community consultation approach in Guyana's Southern Region with Wai Wai groups, which is now part of a community conservation area.</p> <p>Approach was also used by EPA staff for GPAS disclosure visits at Shell Beach to nearly 10 different communities.</p> <p>Other NGOs improved community consultation processes, i.e. CI at Kanuku Mts. and in southern region.</p>	<p>Workshop Report for theory and applied session at Shell Beach; minutes of meetings; trip reports.</p> <p>Meeting minutes.</p> <p>Approach used in other projects</p> <p>NGO to be formed and capacity built in the CREP project</p>	<p>Training: 4 from EPA all within PA unit. 1 from NPC (still current), CI-G still current.</p> <p>Application in the field: 2 EPA, both still within PA unit.</p> <p>Projects implemented by NRMD</p> <p>NRMD staff to facilitate process.</p>
GMTCS	<p>GMTCS also shared responsibility for the 2 project consultations at Shell Beach (see EPA comments) and will use this protocol for when Shell Beach is declared as a protected area. The consultations also laid the foundation for the community-level work that CEWs will carry out.</p> <p>GMTCS engaging better with communities in general.</p>	<p>Workshop Report; Shell Beach community Consultation Report (including Strategy Action Plan including Stakeholder Analysis)</p>	<p>Application in the field: 19 different groups/ representation with 22 participants including Ministry of Education, and Amerindian Affairs; 2 from GMTCS, both still with GMTCS (one Field Warden).</p>
Development of a Awareness Strategies and Action Plans for the Protected Areas Process			
EPA	<p>Resulted in the design and production of various materials to promote the development of the NPAS. Calendars and other media displayed the information which generated interest from Office of the President, and from various Ministries such as Education and Tourism, who in turn have promoted the NPAS and Shell Beach.</p> <p>Assisted EPA in the preparation of the GPAS disclosure project and for the production of Shell beach materials. The Education Information and Training Division of EPA also participated in the disclosures and used the Strategy and Action Plan as a reference tool. The group working on the awareness reported enriching discussions on PA issues and awareness.</p>	<p>Workshop/training report including National Awareness Strategy and Action Plan. Specific materials include CD of protected areas in Guyana, newspaper articles, presentations of Guyana's (proposed) PA system, videos and infomercials.</p> <p>Printed materials, presentations, reports</p>	<p>40 participants in total representing 26 different institutions.</p> <p>4 staff from EPA; 3 still in PA unit and other in the Information and Training Division.</p>
GMTCS	<p>Received many good ideas from the group, as well as other approaches from a regional and national context. Ideas and messages identified in the strategy and action plan were incorporated into GMTCS's 2005 Environmental Awareness Curricula, funded by USAID. Also links up with Nabu Waku newsletter funded by USAID that informs on PA Progress. This training led to the production of specific awareness materials.</p>	<p>Shell Beach awareness strategy and action plan in Workshop/training report. Specific materials produced: brochures, Q&A sheet, posters, newspaper articles.</p>	<p>6 staff from GMTCS present, 4 of which still in current roles.</p>
Rapid Biological Assessments			

Activity and beneficiary	How it has furthered biodiversity work in Guyana (or Shell Beach)	Evidence for this	Comments on individuals trained or in attendance
EPA	Created a technical pool of biologists that can be contracted for future rapid biodiversity assessment work; highlighted general technical problem areas and skills needs, i.e. statistical analysis, interpretation and validity of results. This in turn has led to discussions between FFI and EPA for more prolonged and in-depth biodiversity training and subsequent concept and proposal preparation by FFI.	Training report; Biological Considerations for Guyana Protected Areas Planning: Biodiversity Assessments and Monitoring.	Overall 14 participants for EPA, GMTCS, independent technical persons and 2 community representatives. 5 EPA staff in attendance for workshop and field practice, all still within PA unit. 4 technical persons trained.
GMTCS	Very useful training for EPA and GMTCS staff with no biological field knowledge. Reports have identified species sightings and general vegetation types, which can be used for further work under the World Bank project. It also furthered biodiversity work by compiling a history of biodiversity assessments in the areas and identifying gap areas. Concrete recommendations for future biodiversity work have also been made.	Rapid Biological Needs Assessment for Shell Beach; Shell Beach monitoring protocol; Shell Beach Biodiversity Report;	3 GMTCS staff in attendance, including one warden. All but one still part of GMTCS.
Conducting CREs			
EPA	EPA officer participated in the gathering of Resource Information at the Kanashen District, Planning Resource Analysis and Mapping for the CREP project, and review of various documents including the Draft Regulatory Guidelines for the Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) plan of the North Rupununi.	Training report; video and camera coverage,	19 participants representing 12 different communities. Slightly more women than men present. 2 EPA members, one still within PA unit-deals with community relationships. Other left.
GMTCS	Allowed community members to be trained those in training went on to conduct CRE exercises under the N-IUCN TRP grant for natural resource use inventories at Shell Beach and may now continue their work under a new IDB grant.	Training report; Santa Rosa sketch maps; Shell Beach CRE action plan.	4 persons from GMTCS including field staff. 3 still retained (admin officer left).
Technical PA management planning			
EPA	Allowed more exploration of PA Categories V and VI, which are more relevant to the Guyana context. Expertise utilised in the development of the Regulatory Guidelines for the CBNRM plan of the North Rupununi.	Training manual produced; workshop report.	56 participants over the 2 workshop training events. All the lead agencies attended both events. 4 EPA participants, of which 3 still with EPA PA unit.
GMTCS	Understand PA systems better and made community reps feel less threatened by PA concept and are now more confident about PA issues especially with World Bank mission teams.	Identification of potential PA category options for Shell Beach; workshop report.	2 participants from GMTCS, one still with GMTCS.
Action Plan for CEWs			
EPA	CEW's are used in the Kanuku Mountains and in the CBNRM plan of the North Rupununi, CEWs were identified for each community.	Training report including Action Plan for Shell Beach	5 different institutions with total of 16 participants. 4 from EPA, all remaining within PA unit.

Activity and beneficiary	How it has furthered biodiversity work in Guyana (or Shell Beach)	Evidence for this	Comments on individuals trained or in attendance
GMTCS	Trained GMTCS staff and 3 community elected members from Shell Beach. The CEWs trained have been involved in the TRP project and have had their capacity built substantially.	Training manual; Shell Beach CEW Awareness Action Plan.	8 staff from field and office. 6 remain, the Technical Director subsequently moved to Canada but is now carrying out a consultancy for EPA Guyana.
Financing PAs			
EPA	Expertise to be used in the establishment of Trust Fund for the NPAS and for Konashen District CCA	Workshop Report and handouts.	16 participants attended. Expertise retained in the EPA
GMTCS	Nothing concrete as yet. Shell Beach has yet to be declared as a protected area first and will then need to seek the assistance of EPA for category types and financing options.	Workshop report.	3 staff attended. Knowledge retained to date.
Ranger training			
EPA	2 KNP rangers trained that benefited enormously from it; would like further training and want to become involved with management planning issues. FFI and NPC have a proposal in progress to build on this training at KNP.	Training manual; proposals (for KNP).	Senior Warden and Junior Warden still at NPC. The Senior Warden expressed to FFI an interest to take a course in PA management planning as he is very keen to help build up KNP NP
GMTCS	2 primary community members trained; both <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participated in one year inventory project. • Formed North West ranger and inventory group and are about to undertake an exercise for the Ministry of Agriculture • Formed Waini Management Committee 	Training manual: TRP project documentation	Working at Shell Beach in same positions with more active involvement in ranger and natural resource management activities at Shell Beach.

- Discuss the impact of the project in terms of collaboration to date between UK and local partner. What impact has the project made on local collaboration such as improved links between Governmental and civil society groups?

The Darwin project was developed and implemented in joint collaboration between EPA and FFI and with GMTCS for Shell Beach specific activities. The impacts of this collaboration on FFI's part has resulted in a greater understanding of the national to site-specific dynamics of protected areas / conservation work, the adverse challenges that the EPA Protected Areas Unit faces in terms of acquiring and keeping human and financial resources, and lessons learned in terms of meeting and engaging on various in-country conservation needs and merging that with other interests. Overall, FFI is extremely keen to continue to support and work with, and through, local partners in Guyana to meet the on-the-ground conservation needs, especially recognising the biodiversity that Guyana possesses, the comparably low number of initiatives in operation, and the largely intact natural environment that it contains. As Guyana faces relatively low pressures on its pristine natural resources when compared to other countries in South America, it has enormous potential for preventing many mistakes that have led to the classic degradation of habitats, ecosystems and landscapes elsewhere in the region. FFI would argue that working to establish effective institutions and mechanisms for preventing the degradation of its natural environment is equally valid to working to save remnants of once previously intact biodiversity rich environments. To this end, FFI has been exploring other areas of interest such as the Kaieteur National Park and local partners given that the Shell Beach Study Area will be the focus of World Bank and KfW funds. FFI also intends to keep the EPA updated on project development plans by maintaining correspondence

and to respect the central coordinating role that EPA has for protected areas work. Similarly, FFI would also like to maintain contact with GMTCS for any future potential collaboration over initiatives there.

The EPA recognises its supporting role in protecting Guyana's biodiversity and the limitations the government faces to achieve this objective. The EPA welcomes the assistance offered by FFI and applauds the initiative to develop further the KNP. The EPA also encourages FFI to explore other initiatives and areas in Guyana which needs urgent attention.

GMTCS encourages FFI to compliment the KfW components supporting community collaborative management and PA infrastructural activities by continuing developing awareness activities and community consultations necessary for buy in by the stakeholder communities so that momentum for awareness and increased skills is not lost. Equally important is for work to focus on meaningful employment opportunities at the end of the projects. This oversight has been an obvious shortfall of most projects initiated in the Shell Beach Area thus far with the exception of the sea turtle wardens who have been employed at Almond Beach.

- In terms of social impact, who has benefited from the project? Has the project had (or is likely to result in) an unexpected positive or negative impact on individuals or local communities? What are the indicators for this and how were they measured?

The focus of the Darwin Project was largely on training and capacity building measures at national level and application of them at Shell Beach, and to some extent implementation at Shell Beach. Therefore the project has had some, albeit limited, direct social impacts on the Shell Beach communities in question. The project has enabled participation from mainly some primary stakeholder communities at Shell Beach to participate in workshops and training elements through representation of Village Captains or select community members, which in turn has empowered the communities for involvement in the Shell Beach protected areas process in the following ways:

- Identified a process and strategy for community consultation directly developed by the Shell Beach communities in support of Amerindian NGOs and human rights groups.
- With the participation of local community teachers, developed awareness materials appropriate for Shell Beach communities.
- Community Environmental Workers (CEWs) were selected by communities themselves to a) learn more about the protected areas process itself and specifically about the process and implications of it at Shell Beach b) transmit those messages through an established community-led action plan, c) illustrate those principles or messages through produced awareness materials according to the Shell Beach awareness strategy and action plan.
- Built up the confidence of the GMTCS wardens to speak up and get involved in the Shell Beach protected areas issues. Specifically one of four wardens has become very active in the conservation of Shell Beach and is active in the issues and decision-making. This warden was also participating in the biodiversity assessment training and field assessment based on his intimate knowledge of the area and its habitats and species. An added benefit to the wardens has also been through the GMTCS-WWF project, which has allowed him to travel within the region to learn more about marine turtle conservation and regional linkages.
- The feasibility study identified sustainable crabwood commercialization opportunities for households in the upper, middle and lower Waini areas of Shell Beach and made recommendations for policy, resource management, organisational strengthening, external support for market development and product diversification, and possible sources of investment or funding. Additionally, samples of the crabwood soap and oil were given to 3 different people residing in the UK with links to potential markets, and were subsequently distributed. Specifically, the Winged Horse Trust has become very interested in the Guyana crabwood oil market and is scheduled to visit Guyana to research production potential and ways to improve the product using sustainable and biodiversity friendly production techniques. Another potential donor is the Guyana Trade and Investment Service (GTIS). Thus, through this study, several Waini households have benefited from concrete recommendations for improving their products and trade, and expansion to other households may well follow. Moreover, the World Bank and KfW funds will specifically be funding sustainable livelihoods enterprises, giving these households a chance to benefit from more specialised technical and

financial support.

6. Project Outputs

- Quantify all project outputs in the table in Appendix II using the coding and format of the Darwin Initiative Standard Output Measures.
- Explain differences in actual outputs against those in the agreed schedule, i.e. what outputs were not achieved or only partly achieved? Were additional outputs achieved? Give details in the table in Appendix II.

Additional outputs were achieved under the project due to the extra funding secured for more social and biological activities (though these do not appear to fit under any of the output categories): Biodiversity Report for Shell beach; Biological Considerations Manual for Guyana's Protected Areas Planning and Management; a CD of images on Guyana's Protected Areas; CEW Action Plan for Shell Beach; Community Consultation Strategy and Action Plan for Shell Beach; Shell Beach Awareness Strategy and Action Plan; Recommendations for the Protected Areas Infrastructure Model.

Note that originally 3 videos were meant to be produced. Given the difficulty in obtaining and paying for footage of remote areas of protected areas in Guyana, it was decided to replace two videos with 2 infomercials which would serve to repeatedly advertise the PA process during airing time.

- Provide full details in Appendix III of all publications and material that can be publicly accessed, e.g. title, name of publisher, contact details, cost. Details will be recorded on the Darwin Monitoring Website database.

See Appendices II and III.

- How has information relating to project outputs and outcomes been disseminated, and who was/is the target audience? Will this continue or develop after project completion and, if so, who will be responsible and bear the cost of further information dissemination?

Dissemination of project outputs and outcomes has/ will continue to be done by EPA, who is the appropriate and responsible authority to convey the successes and lessons learned under the Darwin Initiative to the more central protected areas stakeholders at national level: EPA PA Unit, The Ministry of Amerindian Affairs, the Forestry Commission, the National Parks Commission, and the various PA lead agencies. They have made agreements with other initiatives at Shell Beach to build on the outputs/outcomes of the Darwin project.

At Shell Beach level, GMTCS will continue to highlight the successes and lessons learned through its newsletter (funded under USAID), additionally the website will continue to display the Darwin reports and studies. This final report will also be posted on the website, albeit in a more condensed format. The target audience for Shell Beach is mostly CEWs, community representatives, and other institutions carrying out work or planning on doing so, such as the KfW Coordinator.

7. Project Expenditure

- Tabulate grant expenditure using the categories in the original application/schedule.
- Highlight agreed changes to the budget.
- Explain any variation in expenditure where this is +/- 10% of the budget.

<i>Expenditure Details</i>	Total Project Expenditure (£)				Notes
	<i>Allocated</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>Diff</i>	<i>% Diff</i>	
Rents, rates, heating, lighting, cleaning and overheads				-0.17	
Postage, telephone, stationary				4.18	
Travel & Subsistence				-1.34	
Printing				25.49	Reallocation from savings on Conferences, Seminars (see below). Approved by Darwin Secretariat.
Conferences, Seminars, etc				-100.00	No spending was incurred as an in-country donor picked up all Conference and Seminar costs. This line was reallocated towards Printing costs, Capital Items, and Salaries. Approved by Darwin Secretariat.
Capital Items: computer equip				90.68	Reallocation from savings on Conferences, Seminars (see above). This afforded EPA and GMTCS with more hardware and field equipment, which were priority needs for them. Approved by Darwin Secretariat.
Other: GMTCS office construction (museum)				-15.10	Cost less than expected. Approved by Darwin Secretariat.
Salaries				9.60	Reallocation from savings on Conferences, Seminars. Approved by Darwin Secretariat.
TOTAL	177,300	175,915	1,385	-0.78	The difference in overall project expenditure is due to the Darwin Secretariat's decision to reduce the final year sum by £1,385, hence the total project sum, due to an error in project claims, which could not be rectified.

Please note that the project suffered significant delays in spending during Years 1 and 2 due for various reasons reported in detail to, and acknowledged by, the Darwin Secretariat. Thus, Yr 3 had a c/f into 2005/06 and a revised budget was submitted to the DS, which made up for the difference in underspend, minus the £1,385.

8. Project Operation and Partnerships

- How many local partners worked on project activities and how does this differ from initial plans for partnerships? Who were the main partners and the most active partners, and what is their role in biodiversity issues? How were partners involved in project planning and implementation? Were plans modified significantly in response to local consultation?

As was originally agreed, the project was executed in conjunction with EPA at central level and GMTCS at site level; the former in charge of protected areas coordination and management at national level, the latter specifically declared as the lead agency for the Shell Beach Study Area. EPA is the primary partner of this project based on their institutional role and mandate at national level, which also encompasses Shell Beach. GMTCS took an active lead in SB components as they have more in-depth knowledge of the area and the people. Work plans were consistently developed and adapted with EPA and GMTCS (where appropriate) through consistently held meetings, facilitated by the FFI-EPA Project Coordinator.

- During the project lifetime, what collaboration existed with similar projects (Darwin or other) elsewhere in the host country? Was there consultation with the host country Biodiversity Strategy (BS) Office?

As previously described, there has been explicit collaboration with the GMTCS-WWF project over the advancement of the protected areas process at Shell Beach. Moreover, the Darwin Initiative has been able to contribute towards other parallel projects at Shell Beach, such as USAID funded awareness materials, and the TRP crabwood oil project.

At national level, EPA has been able to integrate the outputs and outcomes of the Darwin Initiative into the expectant World Bank GPAS project and the currently running KfW project. The EPA Darwin Coordinator, Ramesh Lilwah who is Head of the Protected Areas Unit, and Dr Indarjit Ramdass, Head of the Natural Resources Division, have been key in cascading the relevant information for biodiversity conservation and protected areas between project partners and the relevant biodiversity officers at EPA.

- How many international partners participated in project activities? Provide names of main international partners.

No international partners participated in the project activities.

- To your knowledge, have the local partnerships been active after the end of the Darwin Project and what is the level of their participation with the local biodiversity strategy process and other local Government activities? Is more community participation needed and is there a role for the private sector?

Yes, EPA and GMTCS will continue to collaborate as per their institutional roles and mandates. It is expected that community participation will increase with regards to the Shell Beach process as the foundations of community consultations, awareness materials and protected areas management planning (among others) have now been laid.

The private sector does have a clear role to play in the conservation of biodiversity in protected areas in Guyana. FFI is currently developing concepts and proposals for a local private business under FFI's Business & Biodiversity Partnership and in addition to other funds, hopes to secure financial support for further protected areas / biodiversity work in Guyana.

9. Monitoring and Evaluation, Lesson learning

- Please explain your strategy for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and give an outline of results. How does this **demonstrate** the value of the project? E.g. what baseline information was collected (e.g. scientific, social, economic), milestones in the project design, and indicators to identify your achievements (at purpose and

goal level)

For the past 3 years, the strategy for monitoring and evaluation of the project has been judged against to the project purpose and against the indicators of the LogFrame Monitoring and evaluation has taken place through: daily communication with the EPA-FFI in-country officer and his frequent meetings with EPA and GMTCS; through internal FFI bi-annual reporting; Darwin reporting; and yearly M&E project visits to Guyana by FFI UK. Equally valuable is the feedback from the evaluation forms from participants at the workshops and training events to know if participants have understood objectives and activities and if they have gained new skills/knowledge that facilitate their work with PA issues. Furthermore, the perception that in-country partners (EPA and GMTCS) and local communities and their representatives have of the Darwin Initiative is crucial.

Specifically, achievements were monitored and evaluated against the following criteria:

- a) Darwin Initiative LogFrame including indicators at *goal* and *purpose* levels: progress in the Guyana protected areas process; increased levels of trained PA personnel; model approaches drawn out from Shell Beach PA process.
- b) Feedback from questionnaires at workshops and training events
- c) Before and after baseline information: biological (Shell Beach Biodiversity Assessment), socio-economic (Shell Beach livelihoods report; Crabwood oil feasibility study).
- d) The availability of trained individuals/teams for technical work: community awareness (CEWs); Community resource use evaluations (CREs) and how many of those individuals can be recruited for central and local level work.
- e) The availability of training manuals and reference documents for other interested individuals within EPA and GMTCS as well as for each workshop/training participant.
- f) Key Milestones: list of training needs and methods agreed: PA structure workshop in place; public environmental awareness programme agreed; ranger field training manual published; training course in PA management systems completed; ranger training courses completed; public awareness and education materials produced; public awareness videos completed; national press release in Guyana.
- g) Use of British expertise.

Key results of the final project evaluation by FFI, EPA and GMTCS highlight the value of the project demonstrated by the completion of the M&E criteria outlined above:

- a) The DI was able to make a significant contribution in shaping the approach and direction of the protected area process in Guyana by empowering EPA, through increased knowledge, skills, and equipment, to strengthen the institutional capacity to coordinate and supervise the national PA process as per EPA mandate. Many other protected areas stakeholders at both central and site level also benefited from the training and workshops, which served as forums for discussing and debating protected areas issues and reaching consensus on several issues. Similarly, GMTCS was also strengthened to together with EPA lay a firm foundation for the future designation of Shell Beach as a protected area by developing and implementing model approaches and strategies for carrying out community consultations, awareness programmes and collection of rapid biological baseline information, as well as by training locally elected community representatives to undergo resource use and educational training and/or carry out field work. The specific objectives / outputs of the LogFrame are described in previous sections.
- b) Participant workshop and training evaluations were extremely positive both in terms of the relevancy of information being taught/ facilitated, as well as for the knowledge and skills gained.
- c) Baseline information on Shell Beach was significantly built up through biological and livelihood baseline studies. Previously, little comprehensive work in both these areas was available and the recommendations of the two studies will build a platform for future research activity.
- d) The CRE and CEW training significantly built up the local expertise of local community members at Shell Beach as trained individuals are now employed under other projects to carry out similar work and have become active in other natural resource use initiatives. Biologists trained for the rapid biodiversity assessments are retained by various groups in

- Guyana, such as Iwokrama, and can continue to incorporate the skills at their work places.
- e) Over X manuals have been produced that are housed at EPA and GMTCS libraries; they have also been given to all workshop and training participants for free. EPA has also received various field guides on biodiversity and manuals for carrying out biological baseline work.
 - f) All the key milestones have been met with the exception of the national press release as it pertained to the planned gazettement of Shell Beach.
 - g) Without fail, all of the workshop and training events either used professionals with British nationalities or who had been trained / educated in the UK, to lead those events. Thus, the project has upheld the nature and spirit of the DI, which aims to use British expertise to help host countries deliver their obligations under the CBD.
- What were the main problems and what steps were taken to overcome them?

M&E activities uncovered several problems, the majority of them resolved:

- a) The lack of sufficient EPA and GMTCS staff to train for two components: biological rapid assessments and social work such as CRE training. The biological trainee situation was overcome by recruiting a pool of biologists that would be trained to carry out an initial baseline assessment of Shell Beach and then be retained by EPA and GMTCS for future biological work at protected areas sites. For the CRE training, social scientists were extremely difficult to find even for a technical team, as such, EPA and GMTCS felt it was best to recruit locally elected community members for the training and have them carry out a mock exercise at Shell Beach. Although these remedial steps were extremely useful, it also uncovered some more training needs for biological work, most notably more extensive and consistent field supervision of trainees. FFI is now exploring the possibility of collaborating with a university course for running training courses in field biology research that addresses on-the-ground conservation needs.
 - b) The delay in community consultations. As described elsewhere in this report, the delays in running community consultations under the GMTCS-WWF project impacted the DI by stunting local awareness and support for the protected areas process at a critical time when the World Bank reopened negotiations. This was compounded by GMTCS internal issues, which the partners agreed needed to be addressed between EPA, WWF and GMTCS staff and Board. Unfortunately, as the GMTCS-WWF project has been suspended until further notice the highly complimentary deliverables of this project could not proceed in tandem with the DI. For this reason, gazettement was deferred until the KfW and /or WB projects could start protected areas work at Shell Beach. Despite this regrettable setback, the DI initiative has been instrumental in progressing the PA process in the area, which the ensuing KfW and WB projects will need to build upon.
- During the project period, has there been an internal or external evaluation of the work or are there any plans for this?

As part of its internal M&E, FFI undertook yearly visits to Guyana and met with DI partners to discuss project progress in terms of work plans and outputs, as well to discuss and resolve areas of difficulty. A final project evaluation was carried out in August 2005 but beyond this, FFI has no formal plans for future M&E of the impacts of the project. However, FFI is currently exploring other project opportunities, especially long-term partnerships with local NGOs or community groups, and therefore, it is in FFI's interest to maintain contact with EPA and GMTCS to receive feedback on the impacts of the DI.

- What are the key lessons to be drawn from the experience of this project? We would welcome your comments on any broader lessons for Darwin Initiative as a programme or practical lessons that could be valuable to other projects, as we would like to present this information on a website page.

Project-related lessons to be drawn from this project are the following:

- MoUs should be taken very seriously by formally establishing them at the outset of a project and reviewing them on a yearly basis. Not only are they invaluable for explicitly stating the roles and responsibilities of each partner organisation and thereby making sure that everyone is in agreement over expectations, but through yearly reviews, they also help to highlight areas that need further clarification and/or attention. This DI has used MoUs consistently throughout the project duration and has been an invaluable as a tool for monitoring and evaluating partner relationships.
- Much care should be taken when designing projects and identifying outcomes that involve community consultations and dissemination strategies. Ensuring that consultation strategies (developed together with local target groups) are adhered to both in timing and in content should be of utmost priority to all project partners and all partners must take equal responsibility to individually and/or jointly monitor and evaluate this process.

10. Actions taken in response to annual report reviews (if applicable)

- Have you responded to issues raised in the reviews of your annual reports? Have you discussed the reviews with your collaborators? Briefly summarise what actions have been taken over the lifetime of the project as a result of recommendations from previous reviews (if applicable).

Yes, feedback has been given to project reviewer comments and issues of concern or interest raised in subsequent reports. They have also been raised with EPA and GMTCS for comment and/or discussion both remotely as well as on yearly visits to Guyana. Specific issues were raised about the delays in community consultation, as well as on the impacts of the closure of the GMTCS-WWF project on the DI. The reviewer has also been very keen to know about the retention of the workshop beneficiaries, especially considering the high emigration rate of skilled professionals to other countries. All of these issues have been raised in this report.

11. Darwin Identity

- What effort has the project made to publicise the Darwin Initiative, e.g. where did the project use the Darwin Initiative logo, promote Darwin funding opportunities or projects? Was there evidence that Darwin Fellows or Darwin Scholars/Students used these titles?

The project has used the DI logo on:

- awareness raising materials (i.e. video, infomercials, brochures, calendars, posters)
- workshop/training agenda and invitations, workshop reports and training manuals.
- Equipment such as computers, flashdrives, LCD projector and GPS and other biological inventorying equipment; field guide books.

DEFRA and the DI have been promoted through:

- An acknowledgements page in workshop manuals where the initiative was described as well as its intentions for the project in Guyana.
- An introductory speech at each workshop and training event.
- Interviews with the media for TV and newspapers.

- What is the understanding of Darwin Identity in the host country? Who, within

the host country, is likely to be familiar with the Darwin Initiative and what evidence is there to show that people are aware of this project and the aims of the Darwin Initiative?

The DI has been exposed to central and site level groups and individuals in Guyana, notably lead agencies for various protected areas (such as NPC, Iwokrama, CI, WWF) as well as various key stakeholder groups e.g. Ministry of Amerindian Affairs, various Amerindian representative groups and individuals active with the Shell Beach PA process.

- Considering the project in the context of biodiversity conservation in the host country, did it form part of a larger programme or was it recognised as a distinct project with a clear identity?

Both. Centrally, it was perceived as a more distinct project since nearly all of the workshops were undertaken in Georgetown with, among others, EPA, GMTCS participants, and representatives from the Shell Beach area. Although training components were mostly carried out at Shell Beach with a relatively small group of participants, these events tended to work in scantily populated areas or with little interaction with the communities depending on the nature of the activity.

At community level, however, the DI was largely perceived as part of the wider Shell Beach protected areas process –and indeed the more encompassing GPAS-- given that other projects with protected areas elements were also running, such as the GMTCS-WWF initiative and smaller and more discrete funds through WWF, UNDP, USAID, Flagship Species Fund and N-IUCN. As consultations stalled under the GMTCS-WWF project, there were widespread concerns and/or misconceptions about the GPAS project, which EPA and GMTCS then had to address through a wider consultation process. The FFI-EPA Darwin Project Officer also attended to answer any queries over the DI. The different discrete projects were outlined, however, the perception is that most local people still regard the various initiatives as one and understandably so considering that in some way, many of the projects were sensitizing the local communities to the importance of declaring Shell Beach a protected area.

12. Leverage

- During the lifetime of the project, what additional funds were attracted to biodiversity work associated with the project, including additional investment by partners?

Private sector funds from Guyana were secured by FFI throughout the 3 years of the project. The total amount secured was 25,000 USD/year. Additionally, 13,500 Pounds sterling was secured from BAT for the first year under the BAT Business and Biodiversity Partnership.

EPA has been negotiating with the World Bank and with KfW over funds for the GPAS project.

GMTCS has secured funds from USAID, UNDP, N-IUCN and WWF that has strongly complimented the DI in terms of awareness raising, natural resource use, livelihoods and marine turtle conservation.

- What efforts were made by UK project staff to strengthen the capacity of partners to secure further funds for similar work in the host country and were attempts made to capture funds from international donors?

The DI incorporated a workshop/training element for preparing and writing proposals. FFI has been seeking project opportunities with other partners for reasons described previously and with full support from EPA has been preparing several proposals together with national counterparts for protected areas work at KNP. So far, 4 proposals have been prepared with the NPC including one Darwin Initiative, which would have built on the training NPC management staff and wardens received under the DI.

13. Sustainability and Legacy

- What project achievements are most likely to endure? What will happen to project

staff and resources after the project ends? Are partners likely to keep in touch?

There are a number of achievements that will endure. The training materials will continue to be used in future projects by EPA staff and interested individuals, as will the knowledge and skills gained through, for example, the PA management planning, proposal preparation and writing, CEW etc. Moreover, awareness materials can be used for the next several years as they are not strictly time dependent, the most relevant and timely now being the video and infomercials. The Museum at the Botanical Gardens is firmly established and will continue to attract school children and families in order to widen the messages about the importance of the biodiversity at Shell Beach and why conservation is important.

Various model approaches / lessons learned such as the National Awareness Strategy for Protected Areas Process and Community Consultations will be used as a basis for more work of this sort and adapted to future needs and specific contexts. Moreover, the findings and the recommendations of the crabwood oil feasibility study will serve as a basis for continued or expanded work.

- **Have the project's conclusions and outputs been widely applied? How could legacy have been improved?**

The majority of the outputs of the project, such as capacity building, the Museum, the production of awareness materials, and the biological and livelihood study have been applied as intended. However, awareness materials have yet to be fully disseminated at Shell Beach and the video and infomercials will continue to be viewed by the general public on TV.

Conclusions of the project will be made public upon request through a condensed version of this report.

- **Are additional funds being sought to continue aspects of the project (funds from where and for which aspects)?**

Yes, under WB and KfW projects; as well as work at KNP. GMTCS is also fundraising for natural resources management work at Shell Beach.

14. Value for money

- **Considering the costs and benefits of the project, how do you rate the project in terms of value for money and what evidence do you have to support these conclusions?**

All things considered, on a scale between 1 – 10, FFI, EPA and GMTCS would rate this project as a 7-8 based on the ability of the project to help lay a solid foundation for further national and site level protected areas work and build up the capacity of EPA and other central institutions, GMTCS and local Shell Beach groups and individuals to establish and monitor conservation activities, specifically for the establishment of protected areas. For reasons out the project's control, the project, however, was not able to see the gazettelement of the Shell Beach Study Area.

15. Appendix I: Project Contribution to Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

Project Contribution to Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity		
Article No./Title	Project %	Article Description
7. Identification and Monitoring	1	Identify and monitor components of biological diversity, particularly those requiring urgent conservation; identify processes and activities that have adverse effects; maintain and organise relevant data.
8. In-situ Conservation	20	Establish systems of protected areas with guidelines for selection and management; regulate biological resources, promote protection of habitats; manage areas adjacent to protected areas; restore degraded ecosystems and recovery of threatened species; control risks associated with organisms modified by biotechnology; control spread of alien species; ensure compatibility between sustainable use of resources and their conservation; protect traditional lifestyles and knowledge on biological resources.
10. Sustainable Use of Components of Biological Diversity	9	Integrate conservation and sustainable use in national decisions; protect sustainable customary uses; support local populations to implement remedial actions; encourage co-operation between governments and the private sector.
12. Research and Training	50	Establish programmes for scientific and technical education in identification, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity components; promote research contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, particularly in developing countries (in accordance with SBSTTA recommendations).
13. Public Education and Awareness	20	Promote understanding of the importance of measures to conserve biological diversity and propagate these measures through the media; cooperate with other states and organisations in developing awareness programmes.
Total %	100%	Check % = total 100

16. Appendix II Outputs

Please quantify and briefly describe all project outputs using the coding and format of the Darwin Initiative Standard Output Measures.

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)
Training Outputs		
1a	Number of people to submit PhD thesis	n/a
1b	Number of PhD qualifications obtained	n/a
2	Number of Masters qualifications obtained	n/a
3	Number of other qualifications obtained	n/a
4a	Number of undergraduate students receiving training	n/a
4b	Number of training weeks provided to undergraduate students	n/a
4c	Number of postgraduate students receiving training (not 1-3 above)	n/a
4d	Number of training weeks for postgraduate students	n/a
5	Number of people receiving other forms of long-term (>1yr) training not leading to formal qualification(i.e. not categories 1-4 above)	n/a
6a	Number of people receiving other forms of short-term education/training (i.e not categories 1-5 above)	<p>Total = 250 (cumulative individuals; about 150 different individuals trained covering 40 different stakeholder groups)</p> <p>Workshop to develop the model and structure of a centralised PA management entity (31); Developing Environmental Awareness Strategy and Action Plan (40); Project Proposal Preparation (15); Project Administration and Management (15); Protected Areas Financing Mechanisms (15); Technical Protected Areas Management I and II (56); Community Consultation and Outreach (28); Becoming Community Environmental Workers (16); Conducting Community Resource Evaluations (19); Ranger Training Course (4); Conducting Rapid Biological Assessments (14).</p>

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)
6b	Number of training weeks not leading to formal qualification	<p>Total = 24 weeks Workshop to develop the model and structure of a centralised PA management entity (3 days); Developing Environmental Awareness Strategy and Action Plan (4 days); Project Proposal Preparation (3 days); Project Administration and Management (2 days); Protected Areas Financing Mechanisms (3 days); Technical Protected Areas Management I (3.5 days); Technical Protected Areas Management II (3.5 days); Community Consultation and Outreach (7 days); Becoming Community Environmental Workers (4 days); Conducting Community Resource Evaluations (5 days); Ranger Training Course (4 weeks); Conducting Rapid Biological Assessments (10 weeks).</p>
7	Number of types of training materials produced for use by host country(s)	<p>Total = 7 Formal Training Manuals: Ranger Training Manual+ Biological Considerations Manual for Protected Areas Planning and Management + Rapid Biological Assessments + PA Technical Management Planning; video; 2 infomercials; brochures; Q & A Sheet on Shell Beach protected Areas process; posters on Shell Beach PA process; Calendars on Guyana's Protected Areas System;</p>
Research Outputs		
8	Number of weeks spent by UK project staff on project work in host country(s)	<p>Total = 23.5 weeks Project Leader(s) (7 weeks); PA Specialist (3.5 weeks); Proposal Preparation (.5 weeks) ; Admin and Mngmt (.5 weeks); Biodiversity Specialist (4.5 weeks); PA Finance Specialist (.5 weeks); Education Specialist (1 week); Photographer (2.5 weeks); Community Worker (1.5 weeks); NTFP/Crabwood Feasibility Study Specialist (2 weeks)</p>

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)
9	Number of species/habitat management plans (or action plans) produced for Governments, public authorities or other implementing agencies in the host country (s)	n/a
10	Number of formal documents produced to assist work related to species identification, classification and recording.	n/a
11a	Number of papers published or accepted for publication in peer reviewed journals	n/a
11b	Number of papers published or accepted for publication elsewhere	n/a
12a	Number of computer-based databases established (containing species/generic information) and handed over to host country	n/a
12b	Number of computer-based databases enhanced (containing species/genetic information) and handed over to host country	n/a
13a	Number of species reference collections established and handed over to host country(s)	n/a
13b	Number of species reference collections enhanced and handed over to host country(s)	n/a
Dissemination Outputs		
14a	Number of conferences/seminars/workshops organised to present/disseminate findings from Darwin project work	n/a
14b	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops attended at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated.	n/a
15a	Number of national press releases or publicity articles in host country(s)	Total = 12 Video; infomercials; 8 press releases ("Shell Beach cited as model Protected Area"; "Debate on Shell Beach becoming protected area again mooted"; Work begins on designing model for Shell Beach"; "Protected Areas should encompass needs of communities"; "Shell Beach-- one of Guyana's Proposed Protected Areas"; "Public awareness strategy for protected areas"; "Workshop opens on Shell Beach environmental plan"; "Developing public awareness of Guyana' Protected Areas"); CD images; posters
15b	Number of local press releases or publicity articles in host country(s)	Total = 13 same as above + brochures
15c	Number of national press releases or publicity articles in UK	n/a
15d	Number of local press releases or publicity articles in UK	n/a
16a	Number of issues of newsletters produced in the host country(s)	n/a

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)
16b	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the host country(s)	n/a
16c	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the UK	n/a
17a	Number of dissemination networks established	n/a
17b	Number of dissemination networks enhanced or extended	n/a
18a	Number of national TV programmes/features in host country(s)	Total = 3. video on Guyana's Protected Areas System; infomercials (2) on Guyana's Protected Areas System.
18b	Number of national TV programme/features in the UK	n/a
18c	Number of local TV programme/features in host country	Total = 2.
18d	Number of local TV programme features in the UK	n/a
19a	Number of national radio interviews/features in host country(s)	n/a
19b	Number of national radio interviews/features in the UK	n/a
19c	Number of local radio interviews/features in host country (s)	n/a
19d	Number of local radio interviews/features in the UK	n/a
Physical Outputs		
20	Estimated value (£s) of physical assets handed over to host country(s)	Total = GMTCS Museum ; Equipment including ; Books, Ranger materials, and Hardware
21	Number of permanent educational/training/research facilities or organisation established	Total = 1 GMTCS Museum.
22	Number of permanent field plots established	n/a
23	Value of additional resources raised for project	Total = £54,000 Co-financing in-country Demerara Tobacco Co-financing BAT

17. Appendix III: Publications

Provide full details of all publications and material that can be publicly accessed, e.g. title, name of publisher, contact details, cost. Details will be recorded on the Darwin Monitoring Website Publications Database that is currently being compiled.

Mark (*) all publications and other material that you have included with this report

Type * (e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (title, author, year)	Publisher s (name, city)	Available from (e.g. contact address, website)	Cost £
* Report	Shell Beach Biodiversity Assessment Summary Report Dr Clarke, Frank. 2005.	n/a	www.epa.guyana.org: Natural Resources Division. Ramesh Lilwah www.gmtcs.org.gy	0
* Report	Review of the History of Livelihoods at Shell Beach Nokta, Shyam. 2005.	n/a	EPA: www. epaguyana.org: Natural Resources Division. Ramesh Lilwah www.gmtcs.org.gy	0
* Manual	Community Consultation Manual EPA-FFI. 2003	n/a	www. epaguyana.org: Natural Resources Division. Ramesh Lilwah	0
* Report	Shell Beach Consultation Forum Report EPA-FFI. 2003	n/a	www. epaguyana.org: Natural Resources Division. Ramesh Lilwah www.gmtcs.org.gy	0
* Report	Protected Areas and their Management Implications: A Focus on Shell Beach EPA-FFI. 2003.	n/a	www. epaguyana.org: Natural Resources Division. Ramesh Lilwah	0
* Report	Protected Areas Public Awareness Strategy Report. EPA-FFI. 2003	n/a	www. epaguyana.org: Natural Resources Division. Ramesh Lilwah	0
* Manual	Training manual for the Protected Areas Management Planning Process. EPA-FFI. 2004	n/a	www. epaguyana.org: Natural Resources Division. Ramesh Lilwah	0
Video	Guyana's Protected Areas Process		to be determined	

Note: All Darwin deliverable are made public; additional items should be requested from EPA, Natural Resources Division, Protected Areas Unit.

18. Appendix IV: Darwin Contacts

To assist us with future evaluation work and feedback on your report, please provide contact details below.

Project Title	Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Building for Guyana's Protected Areas System
Ref. No.	162/11/016
UK Leader Details	
Name	Kerstin Swahn, Fauna & Flora International
Role within Darwin Project	Project Leader
Address	Great Eastern House, Tenison Road, Cambridge, CB1 2TT, UK
Phone	
Fax	
Email	
Other UK Contact (if relevant)	
Name	Shyam Nokta
Role within Darwin Project	FFI In-country Darwin Project Officer
Address	
Phone	
Fax	
Email	
Partner 1	
Name	Ramesh Lilwah
Organisation	Guyana Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Role within Darwin Project	Direct implementing partner
Address	IAST Building, University of Guyana, Turkeyen, Greater Georgetown, Guyana
Fax	
Email	
Partner 2 (if relevant)	
Name	Annette Arjoon
Organisation	Guyana Marine Turtle Conservation Society (GMTCS)
Role within Darwin Project	Local partner for issues/activities pertaining to Shell Beach
Address	GMTCS c/o Shell Beach Adventures, Le Meridian Pegasus, Georgetown, Guyana
Fax	
Email	

19. Appendix V: Darwin Revised LogFrame

<i>Project summary</i>	<i>Measurable indicators</i>	<i>Means of verification</i>	<i>Important assumptions</i>
GOAL: To assist countries rich in biodiversity but poor in resources with the conservation of biological diversity and implementation of the Biodiversity Convention	PA gazetted Progress in PA process Number of communities accepting the project	End of project report	Government of Guyana remains willing to cooperate; continues to recognize GMTCS as lead agency
PURPOSE: To strengthen Guyana's National Protected Area System at central and site level	New legislation passed supporting PA process.	Training/workshops completed; Evaluations of workshops and training carried out; training manuals produced.	Amerindian land rights issue does not adversely affect protected areas in Guyana Trained personnel continue in employment in protected areas system.
	Increased levels of trained PA personnel.		
	Model approaches/lessons learnt from Shell Beach PA process.	Consensus/decisions taken for Shell Beach PA process documented in reports.	
<i>Objectives/ Outputs</i>			
Institutionally strengthened central PA administration	Recognition of EPA as central coordinating unit of PA process.	Revised mandate of lead agencies for management of protected areas.	Funds available to maintain personnel
	GMTCS administration is strengthened.		
Enhanced protected areas network	PA stakeholders have fora/ mechanism for discussion/ experiences of PA process	Fora, group or other means of interchange between groups operational	EPA as coordinating agency establishes fora/ mechanism Local communities willing to collaborate with project and GMTCS
	Official recognition of Shell Beach as Protected Area	Establishment of Shell Beach with protected area status	
Agreed training programme, methodology and materials for EPA, rangers, communities and outreach	Defined set of roles and responsibilities for EPA and Shell Beach lead agency	Programme agendas, training manuals, workshop/training reports	Local conditions remain stable with implementing partners remaining in the field
Identification of possible means of economic benefit to communities from biodiversity	ID possible sustainable livelihoods for community households at Shell Beach	Community socio-economic surveys Feasibility report on livelihoods option	Favourable weather conditions prevail
Environmental education and awareness materials produced	Production of at least three types of visual material	Visual materials available and widely disseminated in the media	
<i>Activities</i>			
Planning meetings with project team to establish priorities, methodologies and procedures for development of training programmes profiles /training materials	Planning and training workshops held	Project reports on meetings / workshops	Good collaboration between FFI, EPA, GMTCS, Iwokrama and others maintained throughout the project
Conducting of training workshops / courses	Before-and-after skills audits of national counterparts and trainees; technical team of biologists; community training in CREs	Project development documents; training manuals; workshop reports with recommendations; Biodiversity report on Shell Beach; CRE action plan for Shell Beach.	The Guyanese Ministries (e.g. Education, Agriculture, Amerindian affairs) willing to collaborate with EPA
Consultations with project team and communities	community consultation training; Consultation strategy and action plan	Shell Beach community consultation action plan adopted; minutes of consultation meetings	Communities support the PA process and GMTCS, Indigenous Advocacy groups support the process
Public awareness programme materials produced and disseminated	Production of range of materials: Protected Areas manuals; guides; preparation of at least 3 television videos	Radio, TV and other media coverage. Collateral materials produced.	Materials widely disseminated and discussed at the ground level.
Community outreach to deliver environmental awareness programme	CEWs trained; Awareness Strategy and Action plan training	CEW representation, CEW training manuals, and CEW Shell Beach work plan; Shell Beach awareness action plan	Availability of funds for activities of the CEW's considering the geography of the region.
Preparation of funding proposals for further conservation activities	High quality funding proposals submitted to major donors	Funding proposals submitted to donors by EPA and GMTCS	Skills remain within the Agencies.

**20. Appendix VI: List of All Darwin Outputs Submitted
on CD "Darwin Deliverables"**

ARCHIVE PATHWAY: DARWIN DELIVERABLES/ ...	NAMES OF ITEMS INCLUDED ON CD	COMMENTS
BIODIV MANUAL	Biological Considerations for Protected Area Planning and Management: with Special Reference to Assessment and Monitoring of Biological Diversity in Guyana's National Protected Area System	
MEDIA COVERAGE	7 Press Releases from the following national/local newspapers: The Chronicle, Starbroek News; Kaieteur News.	This list is non-exhaustive. Other articles have been published related to PA process and Shell Beach, these have been sent to the ECTF previously but are not logged digitally. 3 TV interviews have been made with GMTCS over the Shell Beach area; one with the involvement of FFI. These, however, are not available in originals or as copies
AWARENESS MATERIALS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. List of Jeremy Holden's images (under DI); 2. Shell Beach promotional poster; 3. Shell Beach Protected Areas Brochure 	Other materials produced are: 4. Calendar on PAs; 5. Q & A sheet on PA process. These have been submitted to ECTF in hardcopy for previous reports; however are not logged digitally. The 6. video and 7. 2 infomercials have not yet been received by FFI from Guyana. As soon as we receive them, they will be forwarded to the ECTF.
RANGER TRAINING	Brief on Ranger Training Course; Certificate; Graduation photo; Ranger Manual	
RESEARCH	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BIODIVERSITY ASSESSMENT REPORT (Rapid Biodiversity Assessment Report; Rapid Biodiversity Assessment Report revised; Rapid Biodiversity Assessment Summary Report) 2. REVIEW OF HISTORY OF LIVELIHOODS AT SHELL BEACH. (Review Document) 	3. THE CRABWOOD FEASIBILITY STUDY is being sent directly to the ECTF by Elaine Marshall (the author) under reference 162/11/016

<p>WORKSHOP & TRAINING</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MODELS FOR PA (Workshop Report; images; Evaluation) 2. PROPOSAL PREPARATION (Manual and cover & Handouts; Images, Evaluation) 3. PROJECT ADMIN AND MANAGEMENT: A SMORGASBORD OF THE ESSENTIALS. (Manual and Handouts; Images shared with Proposal Preparation; Evaluation) 4. COMMUNITY CONSULTATIONS: (Community Consultation Manual and Handouts; Images, Evaluation; Shell Beach Consultation Forum: (Report, Handouts, Images, Evaluation) 5. TECHNICAL PA MANGEMENT PLANNING (Handouts; workshop Participant Report; Evaluation; Images). 6. AWARENESS STRATEGY (Handouts/Presentations; workshop Participant Report and Appendices Including National and Shell Beach strategies/action plans; Evaluation; Images) 7. CEWs (Participant Report including Action Plan; Handouts, Evaluation and Images) 8. RAPID BIODIV ASSESSMENTS (Participant Report and Manual; Handouts; Evaluation) 9. PA TECH II MANAGEMENT PLANNING (Manual, Report, Handouts, Evaluation) 10. CRE (Participant Report, handouts and Appendices; Evaluation; Images) 11. FINANCING PAs (Report, Materials/Handouts, Evaluation) 	
------------------------------------	---	--