



Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species

Annual Report

1. Darwin Project Information

Project title	<i>Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Building for Guyana's Protected Areas System</i>
Country(ies)	<i>Guyana</i>
Contractor	<i>Fauna & Flora International</i>
Project Reference No.	<i>162/11/016</i>
Grant Value	<i>£ 177,300</i>
Start/Finishing dates	<i>30 April 2002 – 30 April 2005 (original). Actual implementation dates 01 August 2002 – 30 August 2005</i>
Reporting period	<i>YEAR ONE: 01 August 2002 – 29 March 2003</i>

2. Project Background

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

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; and future activities will cover public awareness and environmental education; 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 exchange programmes. 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.

2. Project Objectives

- State the purpose and objectives (or purpose and outputs) of the project. Please include the Logical Framework for this project (as an Appendix) if this formed part of the original proposal or has been developed since, and report against this.

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

The objectives are stated and reported against below:

1. To institutionally strengthen central PA administration. This objective has commenced through initial training needs assessments and a series of workshops on 1) institutional models for protected areas management and roles & responsibilities of agencies 2) project proposal preparation, and 3) project administration and management.
2. To enhance PAs network. This is being addressed through the cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder nature of the workshops, in particular that of the first workshop where lead agencies (EPA and GMTCS) plus various Amerindian representative groups (e.g. the Amerindian Peoples Association), Ministry of Amerindian Affairs, Regional District Captains, Iwokrama project representatives, National Forestry Commission, and other in-country international organisations (CI) etc. met to develop ideas on a national protected areas system. The first two of a series of training workshops also focused towards a narrower and younger audience of EPA and GMTCS staff who are dealing with protected areas projects, and/or with issues specifically pertaining to Shell Beach.
3. To agree on training programmes, methodologies and principles for EPA and Protected Areas Secretariat personnel, 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. A Statement of Intent (see section 5.2.2 in Appendix 3) has also been developed between FFI, EPA and GMTCS that includes outlining specific training needs, define benchmarks and clarify objectives.
4. To increase financial benefit to communities from biodiversity. A Briefing Document to the Government is being drafted to demonstrate to the Government that biodiversity (especially through protected areas status) can have national to local economic benefits. The issue of economic gain from biodiversity came out

in part from the December workshop. Examples are taken from Iwokrama and other protected areas with community income generation schemes. Iwokrama are included in workshops to pass on their experience of the need to include indigenous and local communities in PA management whilst deriving benefits to them. Their involvement further increases the transfer of UK expertise within the project, which will be built up further in the year 2 ranger training components.

5. To produce of environmental education and awareness materials. This will start to be developed in year 2 and photographic materials gained through Demerara Tobacco co-financing.

- Have the objectives or proposed operational plan been modified over the last year and have these changes been approved by the Darwin Secretariat?

The objectives of the project have not changed, nor has the operation plan, however there have been adjustments to the operational schedule of deliverables. These adjustments have been agreed with Sylvia Smith.

3. Progress

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

N/A. This is the first reporting period of the project.

- Summarise progress over the last year against the agreed baseline timetable for the period. Explain differences including any slippage or additional outputs and activities.

The project's start date was due to commence 01 May 2002, however due to late disbursement of funds the project could not start until August. As a result, project outputs have been delayed by two months.

A training needs assessment visit originally scheduled for August was delayed until October. This visit resulted in Memorandums of Understanding being drawn up between FFI and EPA and GMTCS and the appointment of an in-country project officer to liaise with EPA and GMTCS, to ensure deliverables were completed, and to raise awareness of the Darwin Initiative to public, governmental and private audiences. Training needs for institutional capacity building and Shell Beach were also identified. Funds were subsequently transferred for the support of in-country staff, for office equipment and for the construction of an office for GMTCS.

The first workshop on Protected Areas planning scheduled in October 2002 was run in December and involved the participation of cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder groups. The workshop resulted in a series of drafted institutional models to support a NPAS, a comprehensive workshop report sent to all participants, major institutions dealing with the PA process, and other bodies. A Statement of Intent for short-term objectives was also made between FFI and its in-country partners. There was national press coverage on the event.

Two training workshops scheduled in February 2003 took place in April: the first being training in project proposal writing and the second in project administration and management. Both were well received and will equip in-country partners to

more effectively write proposals and to manage projects. Awareness for the Darwin Initiative was raised at a televised interview with FFI visiting staff (workshop trainer) and GMTCS.

Two modifications were made to the outputs scheduled for the first year:

The December workshop on institutional models highlighted the need for community consultations early on in the NPAS process to accommodate for the sensitive indigenous (Amerindian) reservations about protected areas. The consultations would promote awareness of protected areas and the rationale behind them early on, with focus on the Shell Beach site. It was felt that the environmental awareness workshop originally scheduled for January would be more effective once the communities had received awareness on the rationale of the Shell Beach site as a priority for Protected Area establishment, and were in favour of it. This workshop, as such, was not regarded as high a priority and therefore switched with the November workshop on community consultation and outreach. This training workshop on community consultation has now been confirmed for mid-May and will involve wider theory training and hands on application with Shell Beach community representatives.

A workshop to define the character and structure of an Environmental Trust Fund was originally scheduled for March (May) but was moved to a late June 2003 to accommodate for the community consultation workshop and because the trust fund trainer was already committed for this period. This workshop has been postponed until the end of the next reporting period.

- Provide an account of the project's research, training, and/or technical work during the last year. This should include discussion on selection criteria for participants, research and training methodologies as well as results. Please **summarise** techniques and results and, if necessary, provide more detailed information in appendices (this may include cross-references to attached publications).

To date there has only been work on project workshops. Workshop programmes are developed jointly between FFI, EPA and GMTCS based on needs specified by EPA and GMTCS and the professional assessment of their needs by FFI. All workshops are as participatory as the nature of the workshop will allow (through working groups and joint discussions) and attempt to tie in subjects as closely and relevant to the daily work/life of the participants so that it is as realistic and practical as possible. 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. An example of this is from the December Workshop on Institutional Management, Roles and Responsibilities for PAs in Guyana, where FFI presented global trends in institutional models for PA management with special emphasis on the evolution of the Costa Rican and Colombian NPAS that illustrated key relevant points to the Guyanese situation.

For the two training workshops on project proposal writing and project administration and management, the nature of the training was more focused but still involved working group exercises and discussions. The training on project proposal preparation covered adaptations to the GEF proposal guidelines, specifically dealing with proposal structure and rationale, Logical Framework rationale and preparation, donor identification, and donor relationships.

The second training workshop on project administration and management covered basics of these for small to large projects applying points to the Darwin project were appropriate. The workshop also covered dynamics of project team building including

team confidence, effective communication, working styles, and time management. This latter workshop was especially adapted to accommodate needs identified by EPA and GMTCS in their institutional analysis of their project management systems.

Participants for the workshops have largely and initially been selected by the Darwin-financed FFI in-country officer and the EPA, based on participant involvement in PA planning in Guyana and their involvement with PA at Shell Beach. They also consider political sensitive issues and transparency of the PA planning process. National to local Amerindian groups/representatives were given special consideration for participation due to their concerns over the impacts of PAs on their livelihoods, and have been encouraged to actively participate and contribute in the workshops. The first protected areas planning workshop had a wide range of participants, many Amerindian, who represented various government sectors, international to local non-profit non-governmental groups, international donors, universities etc. In certain situations, in-country partners feel that it is important to hold high profile opening sessions to raise support and awareness for the initiative and specific project objectives. This was the case in the aforementioned workshop where the opening session featured a televised opening address from the Prime Minister of Guyana. For the two training workshops on proposal preparation and project administration and management, the audience was narrowed to direct beneficiaries (EPA and GMTCS) although participants also included the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs, various Amerindian group representatives. On the average, this audience was much younger in age to train new professionals in key management issues.

The result of protected areas planning workshop was a set of recommendations agreed on by workshop participants for PA institutional models at central and site level. A workshop report was written by EPA and FFI and sent to all participants to ensure the transparency of perceptions, decisions, and action points. The report is included as Appendix 3. The training workshops produced participant manuals (see Appendices 4 and 5).

- Discuss any significant difficulties encountered during the year.

No major difficulties in project research, training or technical work were encountered during the year. However, one general problem that was highlighted at the December PA planning workshop is that there is no Ministry of Environment and this puts the EPA in a weaker position to support NPAS work since they have little or no legal weight. FFI has made first steps to liaise with other donor agencies, such as World Bank and UNDP, on the benefits and joint potential for collaboration to help assist in the establishment of this Ministry.

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

No changes in methods, indicators or exit strategies have been made.

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

PROJECT OUTPUTS		
Year	Output no.	Details
May 2003	6A	Training course in community consultation and outreach (10 participants, 2 weeks), involving techniques and procedures for ensuring community input at all stages of project cycle (from design to implementation).
End June 2003	6A	Workshop to define character and structure of Environmental Trust Fund (3 days with approximately 15 representatives from EPA, PA Secretariat, Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Justice).
End July 2003	6A,	Workshop to develop an awareness strategy from which environmental awareness and environmental education materials can be developed (12 people for 3 days).
End August/ early Sept. 2003	8	10 day protected area consultation visit. On-site consultations with EPA staff and each protected area to define recommended management systems.
	6A	Training course in Protected Areas Management systems and law enforcement (10 participants for 1 week).
September – December 2003	6A	Ranger training course (2 x 1 month modules) – at Iwokrama Forest Programme (8 rangers) to cover biological survey and monitoring, tourist guiding skills etc. Exact modules to be determined from EPA skills needs assessment above. 16 man-months.
January 2003	7	Public awareness and education materials produced by FFI Communications Department.
February 2004	6A	Community environmental awareness (series of 4 x 1 week training courses) involving 40 villagers in each, using environmental education materials produced.
March/April 2004	18A	Three public awareness videos for TV dissemination completed.

5. 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?

The collaboration between UK and host country partners has been good, especially with the benefits of having a FFI in-country project officer. However, there has been insufficient communication from the Guyana EPA Co-ordinator to the FFI Americas Programme Manager, which has slowed certain project decisions for changes in output, as well as the timely completion of certain deliverables. Despite this setback, which we expect to be solved shortly, the relationship has been beneficial. Principally with the EPA and GMTCS, the relationship has been strengthened and the benefits from the Darwin project deliverables have thus far been well received by in-country stakeholders who are becoming more aware of the Darwin Initiative. FFI was recently able to present the Darwin Initiative in a joint interview (televised) with GMTCS regarding the work at Shell Beach and the popularity of the “interpretational centre and future office” for school children.

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

The project has raised the profile of protected areas in Guyana, especially the Shell Beach process and collaboration has been established with other key initiatives and

local and international organisations working on protected areas at the central and site level. Recently, a WWF initiative at Shell Beach came into force. In April, FFI took the initiative to pursue potential collaboration between the initiatives. The WWF Guyana Director responded very positively and the project co-ordinators are now pursuing a Memorandum of Understanding of organisational project work in the area. FFI has also made attempts to engage the World Bank to discuss their potential GEF/World Bank project, which is also focused on protected areas in Guyana. It may be that the Darwin project can act as the institutional basis for this project with the EPA and that Demerara Tobacco, through corporate social and environmental engagement, can cover in-country training costs.

6. 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? Are satisfactory exit strategies for the project in place?

The project is currently enjoying a high profile in-country at the level of policy, at the institutional level as well as the local level. The focus of the Darwin Initiative on capacity building for Guyana's Protected Areas System is an unprecedented intervention for biodiversity management in Guyana and if facilitating a greater understanding and appreciation of protected areas since the institutions that will be carrying in the process are being strengthened.

During the year, the main efforts to promote the work of the Darwin has been during the deliverables where the media has been present. Additionally, the close working relationship of the FFI In-country Officer with other conservation partners in Guyana, at all level as helped to build the profile of the Darwin Initiative and FFI. The EPA, one of the principal beneficiaries of the Darwin, has been flagging the Darwin support at both public and other fora.

The evidence for increasing interest and capacity for biodiversity management resulting from the project is principally the commitment of resources by other conservation partners to the Shell Beach process (principally WWF); the interest presently being shown by other donors such as UNDP, World Bank, KfW (German Bank); and the increasing policy level support for the Shell Beach process and recognising the important role of the EPA in overseeing the planning and management of protected areas in Guyana.

The project itself will provide a level of institutional strength and improved capacity for the target institutions to allow them some aspect of sustainability. Built into the project as well has been a strong component of resource training and the target institutions are expected to begin utilising these skills for fund raising during the duration of the Darwin Initiative. The interest and commitment of resources from other donors, such as Demerara Tobacco, provides further reassurance that at the end of the Darwin Initiative the momentum can be maintained. FFI will also look to pursue related opportunities in the future.

7. Outputs, Outcomes and Dissemination

- 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
7	30	Handbooks prepared and distributed to participants of Training Courses on project proposal preparation, and project administration and management
14	3	National Workshop to develop the model and structure of a centralised PA management entity, and the roles and responsibilities of local level agencies Two Training Courses, one on project proposal preparation, and the other on project administration and management
15A	1	Press Release sent out by EPA prior to the initial PA planning Workshop (Dec) (the National TV also covered a segment on the workshop)
20	2	Laptop computers requested by EPA and GMTCS in latest tranche request
21		£2000 assistance to GMTCS with the Office/Interpretational centre construction
23	US \$ 7925	Funds received from Demerara Tobacco as a result of the Global Biodiversity Partnership between BAT and FFI. These funds supported the three workshop deliverables of the Darwin Initiative completed thus far.

- 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 achieved or only partly achieved? Were additional outputs achieved?

Outputs not achieved which were within Project Output Schedule

1. Workshop to develop specific environmental awareness and environmental education materials

The delay to the overall project and consequent shifting of quarter deliverables did not provide time during this workshop. The first month of the Quarter was spent completing follow-up from December national workshop and preparing final report. Workshop instructor could not be scheduled in the Quarter.

2. Workshop to define character and structure of Environmental Trust Fund

The FFI Consultant to conduct this workshop was unavailable for that Quarter. The delay to the overall project and consequent shifting of quarter deliverables did not provide time during this for this workshop. At present EPA and FFI are in discussion on identifying new dates for this workshop since Environmental Trust Fund information and training has been identified by EPA as a priority need.

Additional Outputs Achieved

New contacts have been made, in particular with donor support organisations and NGOs working or having interest in protected areas in Guyana. Principal among them are the World Bank, KfW, WWF.

The Office of the President, which has responsibilities for Environment in Guyana, is keen to work with EPA and GMTCS, especially on Protected Areas. Several forums have taken place to look specifically at the Shell Beach process.

The Darwin Initiative project has provided an opportunity not only to increase capacity through training and institutional strengthening but by acting as a conduit for

improved coordination and collaboration among institutions working in protected areas. In the case of Shell Beach process it has facilitated collaboration between FFI and WWF to ensure complementarity of deliverables and better cooperation and collaboration.

The Darwin Initiative has provided another dimension to the protected areas process in Guyana. In previous instances support was given principally for site-level activities and little attention to capacity building, training and institutional strengthening of the institutions (both local and central level) that have to move the process. As such, in the past movement of the process at the local level has been challenged by the limited capacity at the central level to monitor, oversee and regulate.

The Darwin Initiative has provided the opportunity to ‘bring everyone to the same level’ so the process flows smoothly.

- 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 produced that are currently available for public viewing.

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

Not applicable.

8. Project Expenditure

- Please expand and complete Table 3.

Table 3: Project expenditure during the reporting period

Item	Budget	Expenditure
------	--------	-------------

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

The expenditure is below the income from the budget due to several reasons:

1. Workshop costs have been paid by in nearly full by British American Tobacco's Demerara Tobacco of Guyana, which is very interested in helping fund and promote conservation initiatives in Guyana. As such, recognition has been given to them as well towards workshop support costs. Demerara Tobacco has also covered costs of workshop supplies and printing.

It should be noted that as BAT/Demerara Tobacco covers funds for workshops, we see an opportunity to use more Darwin funds towards staff and management costs for increased capacity building. We will contact Sylvia Smith when these opportunities arise and seek approval.

2. Salaries: With some change in workshop training and the two-month delay in project implementation, some costs have not yet been covered such as the two consultants for the trust fund and environmental awareness. We ask that this money be carried over to next year's tranche when these workshops will be taking place.
3. Office construction has been completed however the office space has not been able to be occupied to do an increase in crime rates at the office location. The worrying situation has resulted in a contingency plan to use the office space as a walk-through interpretational centre (it is situated in the Botanical Gardens and Zoological Park) until the crime rate has stabilised. The facility primarily targets the frequently visiting school children that are keen to learn about marine turtle issues. Only non-valuable displays are used at the moment. As such, money for the use of the office has not been used.
4. EPA and GMTCS have not claimed all the money available for the first Darwin year. Further transfers have been made within the last month that do not show on Expenditure up to the end of March 2003

9. 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 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 (for December workshop see 5.2.3 in Appendix 3. (Analysis of the training workshops is available on request as they have not been completed yet). Furthermore, the perception that in-country partners (EPA and GMTCS) and Amerindian representatives have of the Darwin Initiative is crucial and thus far we have their encouragement through first rounds of successful workshops and FFI feels confident to pursue protected areas establishment at Shell Beach with central level support.

- Are there lessons that you learned from this years work and can you build this learning into future plans?

Lessons learned include:

1. The importance to political neutrality in Amerindian land rights issues. The situation with regards to indigenous groups and their land rights is key because the main Amerindian groups are highly politicised and have challenged the feasibility of protected areas establishment. However, this concern is not as directly applied at Shell Beach as towards initiatives elsewhere in the country. However, clear neutral brokerage on the part of FFI is a key requirement.
2. Turnover for major decisions on project outputs have need to be made quicker. This is largely due to the problem with communication from the EPA already described in the report but can be addressed through explicit statement and review of roles and responsibilities of project personnel within in-country partner organisations as soon as new outputs are addressed and specific staff are hired. This will minimise any unclarities and avoid assumptions. This point has already been reinforced by FFI staff on recent trips and seems to have been taken on board by EPA and GMTCS.
3. Closer monitoring of the claims carried out to ensure that EPA and GMTCS understand expenditure mechanisms in order to maintain project momentum.

10. Author(s) / Date

Kerstin Swahn, FFI Americas Programmes Assistant	May 2, 2003
Shyam Nokta, FFI Guyana Project Officer	May 2, 2003
Evan Bowen-Jones, FFI Americas Regional Director	May 2, 2003