

CEPF Final Project Completion Report

Organization Legal Name:	MARINE CONSERVATION SOCIETY SEYCHELLES
Project Title:	Enabling Protected Area Status for Grand Police on Mahe, Seychelles
Grant Number:	CEPF-108737
CEPF Region:	Madagascar and Indian Ocean Islands
Strategic Direction:	1 Empower local communities to protect and manage biodiversity in priority key biodiversity areas.
Grant Amount:	\$84,365.00
Project Dates:	April 01, 2018 - July 31, 2019
Date of Report:	September 24, 2019

Implementation Partners

List each partner and explain how they were involved in the project

Grand Police Citizens Initiative: Represent local community and concerned stakeholders. Played an active role in all development through Focus groups, stakeholder meetings and in field activities.

Anse Forbans Community Conservation Programme: Neighbouring CSO with concerned stakeholders. Played an active role in all development through Focus groups, stakeholder meetings and in field activities.

Leritaz Takamaka: Local cultural and historical CSO. Played an active role in all development through Focus groups, stakeholder meetings and direct support for cultural aspects and queries.

Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change: Key Governmental partner with responsibility for Protected Area designation. Played an active role in all development in Focus groups, stakeholder meetings and provision of specialists for KBA assessment field activities.

Takamaka District Administration: Local Government body for this district. Played an active role in development process in Focus groups as well as supporting stakeholder meetings.

Conservation Impacts

Summarize the overall impact of your project, describing how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile

The project successfully completed the biodiversity assessment of the mountainous KBA parts of the proposed Protected Area and combined with the previous assessment of the Grand Police Wetland KBA was able to complete and submit the Nomination for Protected Area status as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The project also developed Management and Business plans for the sustainable operation of the PA which also provide direct employment for 9 persons as well as opportunities for provision of services and franchises.

The project actively engaged a significant proportion of the local community throughout its span, through the public and focus group meetings. The project was also successful in increasing awareness on the conservation value of the area on a national level, through 5 articles published in three national newspapers, 2 radio interviews and 44 social media posts.

Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal)

Impact Description	Impact Summary
That at least six members / entities of the local community have the opportunity to benefit directly from the socio-economic sustainable use of PA biodiversity in one of three ways 1) direct employment, 2) provision of services & 3) franchise facilities, as enabled by the Management Policy and Plan and Process Framework for Involuntary Restrictions developed within the 12 months of project implementation (Impact category 2, Human Well being)	Key Impact, Management & Business Plans outline 9 directly paid positions & multiple opportunities for provision of services and franchises within the PA. Final Impact Result, Framework ready for PA designation to enable sustainable running of the PA Action, Awaiting PA designation to enable
That one cooperative management policy and one management plan enabling local community to be directly involved in conservation management of globally significant biodiversity is developed within the 12 months of the project (Impact category 4, Civil Society)	Key Impact, Development of Strategic Framework , Management Plan and Business Plan Final Impact Result, Plans developed and available for implementation on PA designation Action Awaiting PA designation to enable

Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal)

Impact Description	Impact Summary
That a Protected Area nomination file to designate at least 190 Ha incorporating 129 Ha of two un-protected KBA is developed during the 12 months of the project respecting the Process Framework for Environmental Assessment (Impact category 1, Biodiversity).	Key Impact, Submission of Nomination File Final Impact Result, Nomination file submitted to Government on 14th March Action Requested revisions submitted on 23rd June

Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives

The project successfully engaged the local and wider community through media and communication efforts, and achieved far-reaching sensitisation on the value of the area.

The first challenge was that we were unable to formally manage the area until it was designated as PA. However, after dialogue with the Ministry concerned (MEECC) the Army security detachment



reinstated restrictions on the site, prohibiting motorised vehicle access which with our voluntary ranger patrols resolved the situation.

The longer term challenges are the slow pace of the bureaucratic system to move the Nomination file through the Governmental approval process to enable the Protected Area declaration. The other impediment is the Governmental negotiation process with the current owner of this property (who purchased it from the Government) which is not transparent and which we have no feedback from Government on.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

This project and the nomination of this area has been apolitical and purely conservation / evidence based; however, the public consultation process has given a platform for more politically motivated factions to air their views. Currently the country is undertaking a National Truth and Reconciliation Commission looking at some of the incidents which occurred after the inception of the first Republic of Seychelles including the compulsory acquisition of lands. While parts of this proposed Protected Area would figure in such a dialogue they have only been mentioned in external discussions and no complaint has been brought before the commission in this regard.

Project Components and Products/Deliverables

Describe the results from each product/deliverable:

Component		Deliverable		
#	Description	#	Description	Results for Deliverable
1	Interim protection of the area to prevent further deterioration while formal protective status is developed	1.2	Public access patrol reports	Partially achieved: Formal interim access control was not allowed until PA designation; however, discussions with MEECC did result in the Army reinstating security in this area external to the project which effectively prohibited motorised access to the beach and wetland.
2	Assessment of biodiversity in the areas not previously assessed in detail (i.e. those outside the original CEPF project)	2.1	Biodiversity report for the areas external to the wetland	Achieved: See Annex and also Compiled into the Nomination file
3	Development of a Nomination File with draft policy for the use of the area, including Process Frameworks, with a draft management plan for consideration by the Government as and when the area is made available for such protection	3.1	A draft conservation management policy with Process Frameworks for Involuntary Restrictions and Environmental Assessment and in compliance with the physical cultural resources policy	Achieved: Strategic Framework developed with Focus Group (March 2nd) in compliance with safeguards
3	Development of a Nomination File with draft policy for the use	3.2	Draft management plan	Achieved: Plan developed with Focus Group (June 22nd) and presented at PA Nomination public meeting (July 13th)

	of the area, including Process Frameworks, with a draft management plan for consideration by the Government as and when the area is made available for such protection			
3	Development of a Nomination File with draft policy for the use of the area, including Process Frameworks, with a draft management plan for consideration by the Government as and when the area is made available for such protection	3.3	Nomination File	Achieved: PA Nomination presented at public meeting (July 13th)
1	Interim protection of the area to prevent further deterioration while formal protective status is developed	1.1	Interim management system	Partially achieved: Formal interim management was not allowed until PA designation; however MCSS did have staff on site patrolling the beach and wetland so a lower level of management was implemented. Also discussions with MEECC did result in the Army reinstating a security detachment in this area external to the project.
4	Strengthening capacity of MCSS and compliance with CEPF procedures	4.1	Baseline and final civil society tracking and gender tracking tools showing change in institutional	CSST increased from 61.5 in July 2018 to 75 by July 2019 GTT remained the same 2 in July 2018 and 2 by July 2019, gender bias is not an issue in Seychelles with generally more women involved in conservation than men.

			capacity of MCSS over the duration of the project	
4	Strengthening capacity of MCSS and compliance with CEPF procedures	4.2	Semi-annual safeguard monitoring reports documenting compliance with CEPF social and environmental safeguards	Reports updated for project end shows compliance with social and environmental safeguards.
2	Assessment of biodiversity in the areas not previously assessed in detail (i.e. those outside the original CEPF project)	2.2	Members of the local communities are fully aware of the value of the natural resources of the site, as demonstrated by participant lists to events and documents shared	Achieved: Good attendance at public workshops and dedicated participation in focus groups. Strategic Framework, Management Plan and Business Plan shared, Grand Police Nomination Prospectus shared; 44 Social Media posts and 2 videos shared
3	Development of a Nomination File with draft policy for the use of the area, including Process Frameworks, with a draft management plan for consideration by the Government as and when the area is made available for such protection	3.4	Draft Business Plan	Achieved: Plan developed with Focus Group (June 22nd) and presented at PA Nomination public meeting (July 13th)

Please describe and submit any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.

The tools used for the aerial mapping and habitat classifications were provided previously on completion of the first project (Assessment of Grand Police Wetland) and in the associated reports. The steps taken in this project are based on this methodology with the development of a strong collaborative, consultative and inclusive approach with the community in the development of the Strategy, Management Plan and Business Plan so that all stakeholders are included in the process. A national KBA database and associated exploration protocols had been recently developed during the course of the project. The consultant who led the biodiversity assessment is part of the team that developed these tools and methodologies and so trialed and trained the project team on their use throughout explorations. The biodiversity assessment was thus undertaken using the most up-to-date tools and methodologies.

Lessons Learned

Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building.

Consider lessons that would inform:

- Project Design Process (*aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)
- Project Implementation (*aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)
- Describe any other lessons learned relevant to the conservation community


The major challenges the project faced were:

1. The issues of legality of action with respect to the fact that the land is privately owned, despite Presidential decree that it be returned to the State. This effectively blocked both some funding streams and also some of the planned project actions in terms of managing access.
2. The second issue was the slow pace of movement of Government Departments, both in terms of following up on the project's outputs and also with respect to the adoption of the 'new' protected areas legislation (this was approved by Cabinet in May but has still not got to the National Assembly as of this date).

In terms of organisational and capacity building the monitoring tools (METT and CSTT) were of value to the project leaders and the Society in general; we had not had to complete these tools before and assessing the organisations performance this way was a useful exercise for the Leaders and Management.

Sustainability / Replication

Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated, including any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability.



The Challenge to the long-term sustainability of the outcomes of the project (the actual implementation of the Protected Area) is the un-resolved issue of the ownership of the property. The management plan and business plan indicate that once this is resolved and the area declared, the activities within the PA will make it self-sustaining after the first year.

With respect to replicability, the process used of biodiversity assessment, stakeholder engagement and involvement in planning and ultimately management has shown to be an effective way forward and should be straightforward to replicate in other areas considering the development of a Protected Area.

Safeguards

If not listed as a separate Project Component and described above, summarize the implementation of any required action related to social, environmental, or pest management safeguards

Reports updated for project end shows compliance with social and environmental safeguards; no grievances were received and no further actions required.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

Use this space to provide any further comments or recommendations in relation to your project or CEPF

Additional Funding

Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of CEPF investment


Total additional funding (US\$)

\$13,490.00

Type of funding

Please provide a breakdown of additional funding (counterpart funding and in-kind) by source, categorizing each contribution into one of the following categories:

- A Project Co-Financing (other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)*
- B Grantee and Partner Leveraging (other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project)*
- C Regional/Portfolio Leveraging (other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project)*



A \$10490 MCSS Counterpart funding through use of equipment, vehicles, office facilities:
\$2000 1/5 of office facilities
\$4915 1/3 of volunteers accommodation costs
\$1250 1/3 of vehicle depreciation costs
\$ 125 1/5 of third party liability insurance
\$2200 1/5 management staff support costs
A \$3000 (SCR 40,000) MEECC Specialist consultant funding for KBA species verification

Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

1. Please include your full contact details (Name, Organization, Mailing address, Telephone number, E-mail address) below

**Dr. David Rowat Marine Conservation Society Seychelles PO Box 384 Victoria, Mahe, Seychelles.
++248 4248356 info@mcss.sc**