



**Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species**

**Third Annual Report on:**

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

**Project Doc no: 162/11/016**



1. Darwin Project Evaluation.....	2
2. Project Background.....	2
3. Project Purpose and	3
4.	4
5. Actions Taken in response to previous	7
6.	8
7. Impact and Sustainability.....	8
8. Post-project Follow Up	9
9. Outputs, Outcomes and Dissemination.....	9
10. Project	10
11. Monitoring, Evaluation and Lessons.....	11
12. OPTIONAL. Achievements.....	11
Annex 1: Logical	12
Annex 2: Biodiversity Report/Evaluation.....	Separate document
Annex 3: CRE Report/Evaluation.....	Separate document
Annex 4: PA Management Workshop Report/ Training Manual and Evaluation.....	Separate document
Annex 5: Ranger Training	Separate document
Annex 6: Ranger training impact.....	Separate document

*Prepared by Kerstin Swahn FFI and Shyam Nokta EPA-FFI.*

# **Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species**

## **Annual Report**

### **1. Darwin Project Information**

Project Ref. Number	162/11/016
Project Title	<i>Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Building for Guyana's Protected Areas System</i>
Country(ies)	<i>Guyana</i>
UK Contractor	<i>Fauna &amp; Flora International</i>
Partner Organisation(s)	<i>Environmental Protection Agency (Guyana)</i>
Darwin Grant Value	<i>177,300</i>
Start/End dates	<i>1 Sept 2002 – Aug 31, 2005 (due to 5 months late start)</i>
Reporting period (1 Apr 200x to 31 Mar 200y) and report number (1,2,3..)	<i>Report 3: 1 April 2004 – 31 March 2005. (note that Yr 3 actually runs between 1 Sept – 31 Aug)</i>
Project website	<i>n/a</i>
Author(s), date	<i>Kerstin Swahn, FFI; Shyam Nokta EPA-FFI.</i>

### **2. Project Background**

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

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

### 3. Project Purpose and Outputs

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

Please refer to the revised Logical Framework in Appendix 1.

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

DATE	PROJECT OUTPUTS
November 2002	Workshop on models of Protected Areas Structure and Management <b>COMPLETED</b>
April 2003	Training in Community Consultation with applied session at Shell Beach <b>COMPLETED</b>
April 2003	Photographic expedition at Shell Beach. <b>COMPLETED</b>
May 2003	Training course in community consultation and <b>COMPLETED</b>
July 2003	FFI review project with EPA and GMTCS <b>COMPLETED</b>
October 2003	General training course in PA categories and their management <b>COMPLETED</b>
October 2003	Training Needs Assessment for EPA and GMTCS. <b>COMPLETED</b>
November 2003	Workshop to develop an awareness strategy about Protected Areas <b>COMPLETED</b>
January 2004	Public awareness and education materials produced. <b>COMPLETED</b>
March 2004	Community environmental awareness on protected areas. <b>COMPLETED</b>
April 2004	Training course in biodiversity assessments for EPA and GMTCS. <b>COMPLETED</b>
August 2004	Training course in Management planning <b>COMPLETED</b>
September 2004	Training course in Community Resource Evaluations <b>PARTIALLY COMPLETED.</b>
September 2004	Feasibility study for livelihoods options at Shell Beach <b>TO CARRY OUT</b>
2005	Three public awareness videos for TV dissemination completed. <b>ON-GOING</b>
January - February 2005	Ranger training course <b>COMPLETED</b> Ranger field training manual completed and published. <b>COMPLETED</b>

- Have the outputs or proposed operational plan been modified over the last year, for what reason, and have these changes been approved by the Darwin Secretariat? (Please note that any intended modifications should be discussed with the Secretariat directly rather than making suggestions in this report).

*One item, the social training in community resource evaluation and assessment did not occur in May/early June as scheduled but took place in September 2004. This delayed implementation was due to extreme rainy conditions in the field making coordination and logistics difficult, as well as community representatives and the facilitator not being available in May/early June.*

*The ecotourism/alternative livelihood survey, scheduled for August – September 2004 has not yet taken place. This deliverable was shifted to early January 2005 because the consultant could not travel before then. However, Guyana was hit with a flood disaster which prevented the consultant from travelling to Guyana. Also, our collaborating partners in-country wanted more focus on livelihoods and less on eco-tourism for which the FFI consultant was not appropriate. Efforts to source an alternative consultant were not successful taking into consideration time and budget. An alternative approach to meeting this deliverable is being discussed between FFI and the Darwin Secretariat.*

Additionally, an underspend from years 1 and 2 has presented several options for adding to the operational plan and outputs. We are currently negotiating with the Darwin Secretariat on this and expect an answer by next week (according to Margaret Oki)

All changes have been approved by the Secretariat and/or noted.

#### 4. Progress

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

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

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

**Institutionally strengthened central and site level PA administration:** Completed through a series of workshop and training sessions. *Biodiversity Training and Assessment, the mid project evaluation, Ranger training scoping mission, technical protected areas planning workshop, ranger training and production of ranger training materials were all carried out on time. Social Training in Community Resource Evaluations and Assessment (May/Early June) was delayed by two months due to bad weather at Shell Beach, and unavailability of community representatives, local expert and workshop facilitator. This element could not be applied. Additionally, the Ecotourism/.Alternative Livelihood Survey Community (August-September) has been delayed twice due to Guyana being hit with a flood disaster which prevented the consultant from travelling to Guyana. The consultant subsequently fell ill with pneumonia before his research could start.. Efforts to source an alternative consultant were not successful taking into consideration time and budget. An alternative approach to meeting this deliverable is being discussed between FFI and DEFRA. Community consultations and awareness raising where several forums were held in collaboration and with funds from the WWF protected areas project, plus consultation on the wider GPAS World Bank KfW PA Project led by the EPA. GMTCS, through its Community Environmental Workers (CEWs) continued to engage with communities but in a sporadic way.*

*Public Awareness videos are now being designed and will be produced in the next 5 months of the project. Heightened costs in petrol and increased costs for footage/production since the start of this project has halted the planning. We are currently in communication with the Darwin Secretariat whether 1 good video can be produced instead of 3 rather poor quality. Video(s) will be targeting local communities audience to raise awareness and education on the PA process.*

**To enhance PAs network/ System.** *This is continuing to be addressed through the cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder nature of the workshops, where lead agencies (EPA and GMTCS) plus various Amerindian representative groups and other Ministries meet to enrich discussions for the national protected areas system and give suggestions for the Shell Beach PA process. As well, given that the workshops have encouraged the participation of other protected areas stakeholders, Iwokrama, Conservation International and WWF have all been able to divulge their experiences on protected areas where successes and lessons learned have been focal points. Shell Beach has been a case study for applying lessons/ successes on community consultation process; awareness strategy and production of awareness materials, training of technical teams in biodiversity and social assessment and progress of these activities wil need to be summarised in order to build models for the PA network.*

*Shell Beach will not be able to reach gazetment by the end of this project. Reasons include:*

- *internal staffing and management issues of GMTCS that led to stunted progress in community consultations and applied activities. Conflicts arose between GMTCS HQ and field staff (including wardens) and communities. Therefore, it was felt by all*

partners that a greater risk of moving ahead with the PA process without local support/ confidence in GMTCS was not worth it. As well, EPA was slow to respond and step in to reach a resolution to the problems. This was eventually done in August of last year but left GMTCS still institutionally weak with a lack of human resources and a strong Board of Directors to help lead.

- The suspension of the WWF-GMTCS project that was highly complimentary to the Darwin project. FFI had a MoU with WWF for synergising project outputs and outcomes for the PA Process there. The inability of WWF's funded consultations to go ahead due to reasons in the preceding bullet point directly impeded the progress of ours. Both initiatives at Shell Beach were meant to be overseen and coordinated by EPA.
- EPA has been poor in coordinating various initiatives at Shell Beach and showing consistent representation through consultations with communities. FFI had flagged this up as a major risk and has repeatedly encouraged EPA to be consistent according to the Community Consultation strategy developed between EPA, GMTCS and the communities. As well, negotiations with the World Bank for Guyana Protected Areas System (GPAS) project has dominated the EPA PA Division resulting in stunted progress of on-the-ground activities and slow progress on resolving GMTCS management issues.

**To agree on training programmes, methodologies and principles for EPA and GMTCS, rangers, outreach and communities.** Training needs and basic programmes of action are developed as required by the joint implementing and lead agencies. Agendas for the training workshops have been developed through close and intense communication and add-on consultation activities have been identified to strengthen the overall initiative. Continual review and adaptive management, focussing on pragmatic solutions, are made in order to ensure the overall strengthening and capacity building goals are met through the project. Various reports show the design and the outcomes of the workshop and training. The EPA-FFI liaison officer has been crucial in facilitating the dialogue and more so in keeping momentum of the project as EPA and GMTCS coordinators for this project are over burdened with work and preparation of Shell Beach as the pilot area for the World Bank GPAS project (this project is due to start at end of 2005 but a KfW financial grant will commence in July 2005).

**To increase financial benefit to communities from biodiversity.** The deliverable on identifying potential sustainable livelihoods derived from biodiversity was scheduled for April 2005 but was cancelled as mentioned above. The workshop on Financing Protected Areas raised some interesting ideas for potential sources of income during the applied discussion on Shell Beach. One suggestion that came from FFI and indeed from a MSc thesis carried out at Shell Beach by a DICE student, was to focus on income from research expeditions. However, in-country partners would not consider a feasibility study on this despite repeated encouragement from FFI.

**To produce of environmental education and awareness materials.** A photographic trip was made to Guyana by FFI photographer and all images have been made available to our in-country partners who are producing public awareness materials. Awareness materials are being designed and produced according to the National Awareness strategy formulated at a workshop Nov 2002. As mentioned above, the outstanding videos are planned for production post April 2005 and before August 2005.

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

One workshop programmes, 3 training modules, 1 field research element, and various on-site consultation visits were developed jointly between FFI, EPA and GMTCS based on needs specified by EPA and GMTCS and the professional assessment of their needs by FFI. All workshops have been participatory as the nature of the workshop will allow (through working groups and joint discussions) and attempt to tie in subjects as closely and relevant to the daily

*work/life of the participants so that it is as realistic and practical as possible. In every deliverable, without fail, there is practical application of issues reviewed and discussed to the Shell Beach context where concrete outputs are made including training manuals/guides; report with summary of application to Shell Beach; and evaluations on the activity (see Appendices). Reports on each workshop/training have been made to meticulously document what was covered, discussed, debated, agreed, recommended etc so that participants and non-participants alike can refer back to what was agreed and discussed. In the Guyanese context, this is very important since the skills and knowledge and networking between bodies is quite limited. Moreover, where possible, lessons learned from other in-country experiences are presented or discussed and international experiences are shared by FFI staff when they are contextually relevant to the situations in Guyana. All activities, especially those relating to community liaison/consultation and awareness materials, have been made with the recommendations of, and agreement by, the local community representatives and field workers.*

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

*Please see an example of how important the Ranger Training\* was to one local trainee of Shell Beach (see Annexes). This testimonial was intended for submission for the Darwin Newsletter but was submitted too late. We hope to submit it for the next one together with more testimonials).*

*\* Note that a Report for the Ranger Training did not take place due to the input of about 8 different trainers under Iwokrama not to mention that the training manual was only provided to FFI, EPA and all trainees in hardcopy form (with 150 pages). As well, since much of the training took place outdoors and as needs arose under different training sessions, this information was unfortunately not documented. FFI can provide a hard copy of the ranger training manual to ECTF but will need to request it if you require this detail. The programme information is attached based on the scoping and needs assessment carried out by Iwokrama in August 2004.*

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

*Several difficulties have been encountered specifically during the past year's activities. All have been raised in this report and in earlier reports including the biannual report carried out in October 2004. :*

- 1) *Lack of staff available for technical training: this issue has been raised in past reports and over the past year has become an a serious risk to the project due to the fact that skilled and knowledgeable people are leaving Guyana because of low employment and wages. As such, EPA and GMTCS were not able to identify technical trainees for the biodiversity and social assessments since either staff did not exist or they were already committed/ overburdened. This problem was solved by Darwin agreeing to fund a 4-person technical team to train in necessary technical skills and experience who could be contracted (and hopefully thereby stay in Guyana) for future work opportunities in the wider protected areas process, in addition to the on-going one at Shell Beach. The team members were chosen on previous experience, basic knowledge in biological and social sciences and availability. There is a strong understanding and agreement from EPA and GMTCS that this team will be used in other initiatives to carry out biological and social assessments elsewhere in Guyana, especially related to protected areas. However, the social team could not be assembled to carry out field training due to other commitments and therefore the applied deliverable was not carried out. Additionally, the biodiversity team did not perform as well as expected in the field and our conclusion is that future training activities must have a continuum of physical presence to supervise trainees in the field. FFI has a volunteer (PhD field biologist) working on the biodiversity report and*

making recommendations for follow-up (incidentally, FFI is attempting to retain this individual in Guyana in order to develop projects where Guyanese biologists will be trained further and supervised in the field).

- 2) Slow progress in community consultations and awareness raising leading to stunted progress in the SBPA process. EPA and GMTCS, despite good intentions and careful planning, have not been carrying out community consultations to the extent needed, as stressed by the workshop/training and as agreed by participants. As such, the project risked not getting the local support for the project as needed. This issue has been raised at several fora by FFI with both the EPA and GMTCS attending. The underlying factor for this has been difficulties faced internally by GMTCS with many organisational and management issues festering without any resolutions by the GMTCS Board and difficulties in the management of the WWF funded project which was suspended by WWF in November 2004 due to just these issues. The on-the ground implications of this was that conflicts arose between GMTCS and local communities. EPA and FFI therefore did not want to be seen as driving a process that did not have a suitable lead agency). Despite discussions with EPA and the insistence on their part that the situation is resolved, FFI remains wary. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that GMTCS is now without a Technical Director who immigrated to Canada in April 2005. The EPA-FFI liaison officer has been helping to support the GMTCS responsibilities during this time until a new person can be recruited. FFI views the fundamental issue as institutional weakness where both EPA and GMTCS staff have no other human resource options.

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

The project has become much more focussed to address needs and solutions based on actual scenarios, and tailored to focus on the greatest needs that fall under the remit of the Darwin project. For example, while certain applied deliverables needed to be put on hold at Shell Beach area, theoretical application in workshops and training was still applied (although without any formal decisions. As well, the process addressed a wider approach examining issues in the context of Guyana's efforts towards establishing a national system of protected areas. This was especially important as the World Bank project was opened again and EPA was concentrating efforts to secure a financial commitment.

We are currently in dialogue with the Darwin Secretariat over additional deliverables.

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

<b>OUTPUT</b>	<b>DATES</b>
Trust Fund Workshop (ALREADY COMPLETED)	April 2005
Livelihoods Feasibility Study (In negotiation with Darwin Secretariat over redefined activity)	May/June 2005
Public Awareness Videos	May/June 2005
PA Manual for Office of the President (who EPA reports to. There is no Ministry of Environment in Guyana and all Protected Areas work reports to the Office of the President). In negotiation with Darwin Secretariat; additional biodiversity inputs.	May – August, 2005
End of Project evaluation	Early August 2005

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

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

Yes, FFI sent a response to the feedback by the reviewer last year. Recommendations that were followed up were improving communications with the EPA Coordinator and clarifying more clearly roles and responsibilities of project staff as well as discussions with GMTCS on the issues which were inhibiting their role as an effective Lead Agency for the Shell Beach Protected Area process. A new institutional Memorandum of Understanding was written and agreed with both GMTCS and EPA. While there has been significant improvement with

regard to EPA performance according to the roles and responsibilities under this project, the same cannot be said of GMTCS who despite efforts at the level of the Board, still continues to grapple with administrative and management issues resulting in low morale of field staff in the organisation. As well, the reviewer was discouraged that not more input was made from our in-country partner institutions and our reply to this was that they view the EPA-FFI project officer (Shyam Nokta, co-author of all the reports) as the representative of their views. Therefore, the same thing applies this year. However, for the Final Project Report in August this year FFI will require direct input from EPA and GMTCS.

## 6. Partnerships

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

*Communication and feedback, especially with regards to timely reporting, with the in-country partners have improved with the appointment of a Technical assistant to the EPA coordinator. Overall administration performance has increased for PA work although FFI has noticed that institutional weaknesses such as the strain of lack of human resources is still a risk. This has been exacerbated by the increased work load of the World Bank GPAS project which has made it difficult for EPA to focus on the Darwin Initiative to the extent their roles and responsibilities outline.*

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

*The MoU between FFI and WWF remains in effect despite the difficulties over the GMTCS-WWF project. Possibilities of collaboration on other protected areas initiatives in Guyana and perhaps in the region continue to be explored between WWF and FFI. Moreover, there has been significant progress on the World Bank protected areas project within which Shell Beach is a pilot study area. This project is complimentary to the work of the FFI-Darwin project and assurances have been provided by both GMTCS and EPA that the World Bank GPAS project will build on the work done by the current Darwin project. The GPAS World Bank project is expected to commence by end of 2005.*

*In addition, the Kaieteur National Park had various representatives at various Darwin workshops where issues pertaining to KNP arose. From this, FFI and the management authority for the KNP park, the National Parks Commission (NPC) began discussions for projects with a site visit. Last year, FFI submitted with the NPC a Darwin project to support participatory management planning for the Kaieteur National Park. This project was not successful in its second round, however FFI and its partner are now looking for more donor opportunities.*

*Lastly, FFI is part of an Association with GITEC Consultancy GmbH and Tropenbos to manage KfW funds of 2.7 million EUR under the KfW financial assistance grant to the GPAS project. Due to FFI's direct involvement with Shell Beach, which is one of the pilot study areas, we are able to enrich the experiences of our partners. Two other tenders have submitted proposals for this bid. An answer is likely within 4 weeks and the project will due to commence in July of this year. Most importantly, we agreed to this Association based on the approach building upon all current PA initiatives at Shell Beach and at Central level, and incorporate various recommendations of the different outputs. In other words, if we are successful, the Darwin outputs will be secured through a longer and larger framework.*

## 7. Impact and Sustainability

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

*The project has been promoted at and through workshop/training components, reports that have been circulated for wider viewing, radio and TV programmes, through FFI's website and magazine, and by word of mouth. According to feedback from workshop/training participants and in-country partners, the Darwin project is seen as perhaps the most successful protected area project to date in Guyana having completed its deliverables in a comprehensive way in*



accordance with the project schedule and one of the few actually delivering on the ground activities for Protected Areas related work in the country. There is general good will about the project and observations from indigenous peoples groups have been pleased at our workshop/training which has strongly emphasised participatory development and monitoring, plus strong community consultation. Moreover, our in-country corporate donor has become increasingly interested in funding other projects with conservation value, plus promoting biodiversity awareness materials and has requested assistance from FFI to produce a booklet for schools on protected areas in Guyana.

Given that the complimentary WWF project has been suspended and that the EPA-FFI project has suffered set-backs in consultation activity and in conducting social assessments in the field, the gazettement of Shell Beach is unlikely (as originally intended) before the close of this project in late August 2005. However, a more or less satisfactory exit strategy is still achievable given that the World Bank and KfW aims to, among other things, declare Shell Beach as a protected area and develop a working co-management structure plus develop livelihoods options for local communities. The KfW grant will start in July this year and the WB is expected to start at the end of the year. EPA has reinforced to them the absolute need to build and follow-up on the protected areas work already undertaken. However, FFI and EPA are exploring the option of carrying out some additional deliverables to the project in the remaining half-year that will link the transition of the two initiatives more effectively. We are awaiting a response from the Darwin Secretariat on this.

## 8. Post-Project Follow up Activities (max 300 words) n/a

## 9. Outputs, Outcomes and Dissemination

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

*Outputs were achieved as per work plan, with the exception of the ecotourism/alternative livelihood which is running late, and CRE's which was only partially achieved (no application at Shell Beach) due to tensions between GMTCS and field staff and communities. The latter is explained in depth at the beginning of the report.*

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

*Dissemination activities have been starting since the previous year and last year as well as some of the public awareness materials are being produced according to the National Awareness Strategy for the protected areas system. Audiences include local people, children, government institutions, and the national audience at large. A range of media are employed: newspaper, internet, radio, TV, and physical activities. Dissemination will be more actively promoted during the remainder of the project and plans for its future implementation of existing material will be disseminated for other protected areas related projects, especially those at Shell Beach.*

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

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

Code No.	Quantity	Description
6A	1	Workshops (PA Management Planning). 15 participants, 2.5 days.

6A	3	Training Sessions (Biodiversity 5 days for 4 core trainees, CRE 5 days for 15 participants, Ranger training for 1 month, 8 participants)
7	1	Materials (Ranger training manual. 150 pages)
18A	1	1 TV coverage of PA Process at Shell Beach
23	1	In-country value of funding raised towards this project at 39,000 Pounds Sterling.

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

*No publications have been made over the last year. However, FFI In-Country staff have placed all reports, supporting materials, presentations and manuals, posters and other collateral materials produced by the project thus far, onto a CD.*

## 10. Project Expenditure

- Please expand and complete Table 3.

**Table 3: Project expenditure during the reporting period**

Item	Budget (Year 3 but running from 1 Sept – 31 August 2005)	Expenditure (1 Sept – 31 March)	Balance (to be spent 1 Apr – 31 Aug)
------	--	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

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

*The actual Year 3 runs between 1 Sept – Aug 31 2005 since DEFRA was 5 months late transferring original disbursement for the project. As such, we have only used up roughly half of our year 3 funds. The c/f work plan and budget has been agreed with the Darwin Secretariat.*

## 11. Monitoring, Evaluation and Lessons

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

*For the past year, monitoring and evaluation of the project has been judged against to the project purpose and against the indicators of workshops held and training manuals, workshop reports, and community consultations and number of awareness materials produced. Monitoring and evaluation has taken place through daily communication with the FFI in-*

country officer, through internal FFI reporting, Darwin reporting and through regular meetings with in-country partners. Equally valuable is the feedback from the evaluation forms from participants at the workshops to know if participants have understood objectives of the workshop and if they have gained new skills/knowledge that facilitate their work with PA issues. Furthermore, the perception that in-country partners (EPA and GMTCS) and local communities and their representatives have of the Darwin Initiative is crucial and thus far we have their encouragement through a third round of successful workshops and FFI feels confident that the project has made a significant contribution in shaping the approach and direction, of the protected area process in Guyana and particularly the Shell Beach process.

- What lessons have you learned from this year's work, and can you build this learning into future plans?
- *The fundamental importance of building up institutional resources, performance and sustainability.*
- *The importance to political neutrality in Amerindian land rights issues.*
- *The fundamental importance of community consultations and holding partners to it as any inconsistencies demoralise local people.*
- *The need for continuous on-the-ground activities to happen even as capacity is being built to ensure that communities are kept abreast and remain focused on the overall objective.*
- *The need to not only train and build capacity, but to retain as well since Guyana suffers from a brain-drain scenario which is especially acute in the natural resources sector where there is spare technical and qualified human resources.*
- *It is important to work at the central and site level with Govt, NGOs and local communities since all three have a major role to play in the PA process and within each, institutions are still relatively weak.*

## **12. OPTIONAL: Outstanding achievements of your project during the reporting period (300-400 words maximum)**

### **■ I agree for ECTF and the Darwin Secretariat to publish the content of this section**

In this section you have the chance to let us know about outstanding achievements of your project over the year that you consider worth highlighting to ECTF and the Darwin Secretariat. This could relate to achievements already mentioned in this report, on which you would like to expand further, or achievements that were in addition to the ones planned and deserve particular attention e.g. in terms of best practice. The idea is to use this section for various promotion and dissemination purposes, including e.g. publication in the Defra Annual Report, Darwin promotion material, or on the Darwin website. As we will not be able to ask projects on an individual basis for their consent to publish the content of this section, please note the above agreement clause.

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

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2003-Mar 2004	Actions required/planned for next period
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Goal:</b> To draw on expertise relevant to biodiversity from within the United Kingdom to work with local partners in countries rich in biodiversity but poor in resources to achieve: The conservation of biological diversity, The sustainable use of its components, and The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Purpose</b> <i>To strengthen Guyana's National Protected Areas System at central and site level</i></p>	<p><i>Increased levels of trained PA personnel</i></p> <p><i>Models of best practice of PA process at SB</i></p>	<p><i>Evaluations of workshop and training completed; training manuals completed (together with reports) for all workshops/ training sessions.</i></p>	<p><u>Lessons:</u> Future initiatives will need to focus more in-depth on institutional issues such as resources, performance and governance.</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> Report on lessons learned and model approaches from SB PA Process.</p>
<p><b>Outputs</b></p>			
<p><i>Institutionally strengthened central and site level PA administration and management</i></p>	<p><i>Recognition of EPA as central coordinating unit of protected areas process.</i></p> <p><i>GMTCS administration is strengthened</i></p>	<p><i>Through MoUs and training attendance.</i></p> <p><i>GMTCS has attended all of the workshop and training elements.</i></p>	<p><u>n/a</u></p>
<p>Enhanced protected areas network (system)</p>	<p>PA stakeholders have for fora to discuss issues and experiences.</p> <p>Official recognition of Shell Beach as a protected area</p>	<p>Model approaches/ lessons learned from the Darwin will contribute towards the overall Protected Areas Network/System.</p>	<p><u>Lessons:</u> Appears that gazettment of SBPA is too ambitious given problems with GMTCS. Providing a model approach is a better and more realistic option.</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> Full report on status of PA process needs to be carried out; as well Report on lessons learned/ model application.</p>
<p>Agreed training programme, methodology and materials for EPA, rangers, outreach and communities</p>	<p>Defined set of roles and responsibilities for Shell Beach lead agency and EPA</p>	<p>Project reports for technical management planning training II; biodiversity and CRE training; ranger training; financing options for PA workshop.</p>	<p><u>Lessons:</u> Central level institution is overburdened and is not able to carry all / coordinate of the intended activities, even those that are key. <u>Actions:</u> Reports pending for Biodiversity Assessment and Financing Protected Areas. As well feasibility study report will be produced for livelihoods options.</p>
<p>Identification of possible means of economic benefit to communities from biodiversity</p>	<p>Identification of possible means of sustainable livelihoods for Shell Beach</p>	<p>(was to take place in January 2005 but delayed twice)</p>	<p>Feasibility study to be carried out between April – August 2005.</p>
<p>Environmental education awareness materials</p>	<p>Production of at least 3 types of visual material</p>	<p>TV news coverage. .</p>	<p>Videos will be produced between April – August 2005.</p>