Project Proposals on Management of Key Habitats

CONSERVATION OF BIODIVERSITY THROUGH THE ENHANCEMENT AND OR ESTABLISHMENT OF MARINE PROTECTED AREAS IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

1.   IDENTIFIERS
Project Number: HAB - 1

Project Title: *Conservation of biodiversity through the enhancement and or establishment of Marine Protected Areas in SSA*

Requesting Country (ies):   Nigeria, Mozambique, Seychelles, Ghana, South Africa and Côte D'Ivoire.

**Requesting Regional or
National Organization:**   Ministry of Environmental Affairs of Mozambique
Ministry of Natural Resources, Nigeria
Ministry of Environment of Seychelles
Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism (DEAT), South Africa
Ministry of Environment and Science of Ghana
Ministry of Environment of Côte d'Ivoire

Executing Agencies: Ministry of Environmental Affairs, Department of Conservation Areas
Ministry of Tourism of Mozambique, GTA (Environment Working Group Mozambique NGO), FNP (Forum Natureza em Perigo)
Environmental Protection Agency of Ghana
Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism (DEAT), KwaZulu-Natal Wildlife, South African National Parks, Eastern Cape Nature Conservation, Western Cape Nature Conservation, Northern Cape Nature Conservation, Academic and Research Institutions, South Africa
Conservation Section, Ministry of Environment of Seychelles

**Required National
Partners:**   Ministry of Tourism and Transport, Ministry of Environment, Island Development Company
Marine Parks Authority, Islands Conservation Society of Seychelles (Seychelles)
Departments of Conservation Areas, Ministry of Tourism , Ministry of Environmental Affairs, Mozambique (MICOA)
Department of Wildlife, Department of Fisheries, Universities and Research Institutions in Ghana
South African National Parks, KwaZulu-Natal Wildlife, Eastern Cape, Western Cape and Northern Cape Nature Conservation, South Africa
Federal Ministry of Environment, Abuja, Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Abuja, Nigeria

Priority Issue Addressed: Loss and Modification of Habitats and Ecotones,, unsustainable exploitation of fisheries and other living resources, climate change.
Biodiversity (GEF)

Regional Scope: Eastern and Western Africa.

Project Location: **Mozambique**: Mozambique Island and surroundings, Primeiras and Segundas, Inhaca Island , Ponta do Ouro

Seychelles: Cosmoledo, Mahe, Praslin, La Digue & Other Inner Islands
Nigeria: Lagos, Eket, Ogoni/Bonny, Dodo/Nun; **South Africa**: St. Lucia, Kosi Bay
Ghana: Ada/Anganui Mangrove Complex, Elmina-Eture Lagoon, Princess Town, Cape Three Points, Eastern Sandy Shore (Marine Turtle Nesting Site)
Cote d'Ivoire: Fresco, Grand-Lahou, Assinie in Aby lagoon
South Africa: Groen-Spoeg River, Pondoland, St. Lucia and Kosi Bay, Kunene River (initiative to include Namibia and Angola)

Project Duration: 5 years

**Working Group
of the African Process**   Management of key habitats

2. SUMMARY:

Both East and West African coasts are home to an incredible diversity of coastal environments. Geological features, ocean currents and climate, geographical position, are the main features to make the different sites of the coast to present such diverse systems like swamps, mangroves, coral reef, coastal lagoons, river deltas.

All theses diverse habitats are in different stages of use and quality. In the Eastern African coast, for example, processes carried out by SEACAM, WIOMSA, WWF, IUCN, UNEP, GEMPA, Nairobi Convention, Jakarta Mandate, etc, identified already a few areas where biodiversity is high and the potential for conservation is at his best. It is however, recognised that there is a lack of a representative managed system of protected area.

A number of habitat types are poorly represented within Africa, and for the majority of countries in the region, gaps in protected areas remain. For example, on the marine side, coastal wetlands, mangroves, turtle and bird nesting areas, sand dunes and coral reefs have been identified as needing further protection throughout the continent. This is becoming of paramount importance in the face of industrial and commercial development, pollution and exploitation of marine resources. The efforts of Mauritania in establishing the Banc D'Arguin National Park and of Kenya in some 114,000 ha in the form of marine national parks and reserves, and in proposing that reefs such as Kanamai and Vipingo be included in a large fishing reserve system, are exceptional, not representative of efforts throughout Africa (McNeely et al., 1994)[1] The same way, during the last 12 months, the Government of Mozambique decided to enlarge the area of Bazaruto Archipelago National Park in more than 83,000 ha and to declare more than 150,000 ha of marine area in the newly proclaimed Quirimbas National Park (Pers.com.).

Such areas should encompass to the best examples of all the habitats and systems existent in the continent, being areas of immense biodiversity in one extreme, or areas, not being very diversity, are unique for its endemism.

If it is true that there are areas which should be protected/better managed, there are at the same time areas that were declared and lack any kind of management – the so called "Paper Parks" (meaning those that are legally declared but only implemented to a limited extent on the ground).

Protected areas also represent a management tool for natural resources, benefiting those ones making their living directly from those resources, such as fishermen and collectors. Others beneficiaries are industries like tourism, which depend directly from the quality of environment. More recent trends show an interest by local communities and groups of fishermen for the setting aside of the so-called "nursery" areas, spawning areas for the growth their fish. The same is true for the tourism industry, which is increasingly focused in coastal areas as a good basis for eco-tourism.

---

[1] McNeely, JA, J.Harrison, P.Dinguall. (1994). Protecting Nature: regional Reviews of Areas. IUCN

The more experience is gained in the establishment of better managed areas, the more its success is linked to the involvement of local communities and other interest groups in the process. The exclusion of people from protected areas, as it has happened in the 60 and 70's is becoming less popular. Protected areas should be mainly regarded as contributors to a better managed environment which in turn would support poverty reduction and improvement of local economies.

The general objective of this project is to promote the protection of key habitats with high ecological value and biological diversity for the benefit of present and future generations of local communities, and the economy of the country in general.

Specific objectives and activities would include:

1. Establishing four new MPA's to better protect and manage key habitats where there is a need;
2. Improve the management of four existing MPA's, and include the involvement of the local communities in its management;
3. Establish a representative network of MPA's through the region and countries;
4. Assess the ecological, socio-economy and cultural value of MPA's at all levels of society.

3. COSTS AND FINANCING (MILLION US $)[2]

International & bilateral sources:

	List required financing by potential source	: USD 4,000,000.00
	Subtotal international financing	: USD 4,000,000.00
Co-financing:	Governments in cash & kind	: USD 1,500,000.00
	Subtotal Co-financing	: USD 1,500,000.00
Total Project Cost:		**: USD 5,500,000.00**

4. GOVERNMENT ENDORSEMENT(S)

.
Hon. John Kachamila, Minister of Environmental Affairs of Mozambique
The Honorable Minister, Federal Ministry of Environment, Abuja, Nigeria
Hon. Minister of Environment Affairs and Tourism, South Africa
Mr. Maurice Lousteau-Lalane, Principal Secretary, Ministry of Environment, Seychelles
Hon. Minister of Environment and Science, Ghana
Hon. Minister of Environment of Cote D'Ivoire

5. GOVERNMENT FOCAL POINT(S)

Mozambique: Mr. Evaristo Baquete, Ministry of Environmental Affairs of Mozambique
Seychelles: Mr. John Nevill, Director , Ministry of Environment
South Africa: Director-General, Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT)
Cote D'Ivoire: Ministry of Environment and Way of Life Côte d'Ivoire
Ghana: Environment Protection Agency
Nigeria: The Honorable Minister, Federal Ministry of Environment, Abuja

6. AFRICAN PROCESS WORKING GROUP FOCAL POINT(S)

Dr. António M. Hoguane, Regional Co-ordinator
Dr. A.K. Armah, Expert
Mrs. Helena Motta, Expert

---

[2] This budget is preliminary and has not undergone a full consultation process with the respective countries. Therefore, it does not indicate the actual financial commitment that would be provided by participating countries once the project proposal and its components are finalised.

1.1.1.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Background & Justification

Impacts on the coastal and marine environment originate broadly from development activities carried out by various agencies and entities. This includes governments, regional authorities, private enterprises, informal sector units, households, groups of individuals and individuals for various purposes, including production, consumption, recreation, travel or livelihood within diverse institutional contexts. It is certainly inappropriate to discuss coastal, marine and water-related resource changes and degradation problems independently of the broader pressures brought to bear on the environment by the underlying socio-economic processes involved in production and consumption activities.

Environmental impacts are not an inevitable consequence of development activities but often an outcome of inadequate development policies, policy implementation failures and market failures, culminating in poor or lack of environmental management capacities and the emergence of coastal and marine related environmental impacts. Lack of environmental management capacities is commonly associated with the predominance of development practices which, following market-driven motivations, capitalise on a free use of coastal, marine and water "facilities" disregarding the non-use value of scarce and inter-dependent environmental resources and the options of future generations.

The sub-Saharan region shares large marine ecosystems including migratory species, valuable habitats and fisheries of international economic significance. Changes introduced to the regional marine environment by marine transport activities, oil pollution and an accumulation of urban and industrial discharges affect living marine species common to the regional ecological endowment. Over-exploitation of marine resources in all the countries generate gradual modifications to marine communities which need protection if biodiversity is to retain its regional integrity. Degradation of seagrass beds, coral reefs and mangrove forests, equally pronounced in various parts of the marine environment, puts at risk the regional productive capacity of fisheries, the survival of endangered migratory species, notably the migratory green turtles and the dugong, and a variety of seabirds, and ultimately, the comparative advantage of regional tourism (WWF, 2002)[3]

The prevailing degradation of coastal zone resources appear to display common patterns and may be traced to common impact sources associated with inadequate, sometimes partial or slow implementation of integrated coastal zone management, commonly manifested in land and sea use conflicts, declining tourism potential and biodiversity losses. In other words, there is general consensus that there is a need for better management and conservation a number of sensitive areas.

African nations have created more than 2 million sq. Km of protected areas. However, very little of this is marine (IUCN/EC, 1999)[4]. Even for the existing ones, there is still a long way to go in terms of management. As an example, Mozambique has 2,700 Km of coast, from typical fringing coral coast, to parabolic dunes, swamps and rocky shores. However, so far, only 2% of its marine and coastal environment is under any kind of protection. Seychelles, on the other side, has a large area of its waters under protection, needing extra support for its management.

According to the IUCN definition of MPAs, they "are areas of land/or sea especially dedicated to the protection of biological diversity, and of natural and associated cultural resources, and managed through legal or other effective means" (Kelleher, 1999)[5].

WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature) started a process a few years ago, the Eastern African Marine Ecoregion (EAME), to implement ecoregion conservation. The biological priorities within the EAME have been established through a process of gathering the best available knowledge on the distribution of a number of different aspects of biodiversity. The aspects of biodiversity selected to represent the overall values of the region were coral reefs, seagrass beds, mangroves, wetlands, fish, species of special concern.

---

[3] WWF (2002). Draft Eco-Region Action Programme. Report prepared by WWF on behalf of the Stakeholders of the Eastern African Marine Eco-Region Conservation process 1999-2001.Tanzania.49pp.

[4] IUCN/EC (1999). Parks for Biodiversity. Policy Guidance on Experience in ACP countries. Gland. 118 pp.

[5] Kelleher, G. (1999). Guidelines for marine Protected Areas. IUCN. Gland. UK.107 pp.

The final map of biodiversity priorities in the EAME was created by overlaying the geographical distribution of the important areas identified for the six different habitat and species groups outlined above. Through this amalgamation process a total of twenty-one important marine biodiversity areas were identified along the coast of eastern Africa. Once these amalgamated areas had been identified, they were then ranked in terms of their overall importance for biodiversity conservation. Three levels of importance were recognized, global, ecoregional and subregional. The criteria used to assign areas to these different levels of importance were based on species richness, species of special concern, unique/endemic species /assemblages/associations, intact biotas (including abundant top predators), areas large enough to withstanding natural disturbance, ecological processes, unique physical habitats or habitat features, complete or unique habitat complexes, important sites for feeding, resting, breeding, areas of seasonal migrations and representation (WWF 2002).

Priority areas cover a diverse range of coastal and shallow water marine systems and physical features but, with the exception of Latham Island, do not extend into oceanic waters. Reasons for the assignation of global importance were:

- high levels of diversity giving a high degree of representation of the ecoregion's species richness (e.g. Rufiji-Mafia complex; Mtwara-Quirimbas; Zambezi)

- high levels of endemism (e.g. Lamu Archipelago, Maputo Bay-Michangelo Complex);

- both high diversity and endemism (e.g. Bazaruto Archipelago, Greater St. Lucia Wetland Park);

- importance for critical stages in the life cycle of threatened species (e.g. Zambezi Delta for breeding Humpback Whales and Lamu Archipelago, Maputo Bay-Machangelo Complex and Bazaruto for turtles;

- importance for maintaining ecosystem function (e.g. Mtwara-Quirimbas as a source area as it straddles the divergence of the South Equatorial Current and Zambezi and Rufiji Deltas as nursery grounds and nutrient input).

As a ongoing effort by the World Conservation Union (IUCN), there is a global call for action to have a network of protected areas in every country that is 'representative' of the key habitats for that country. The call for action also highlights the need to move from "paper parks" (meaning those that are legally declared but only implemented to a limited extent on the ground) to fully effective parks. This has been especially important to address the lack of effective coastal-marine areas. In 1994 the IUCN, in partnership with the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority and the World Bank, published a recording of all the known existing and proposed coastal-marine protected areas around the world, as a 'platform' to foster further effectiveness of 'paper parks' and establishment of new areas.

The goal of MPAs, as seen by IUCN is to conserve the biological diversity and productivity (including ecological life support systems) of the oceans (Kelleher, G.,1999). There are two principal reasons for MPAs: to protect habitat and biodiversity, and to maintain viable fisheries. By protecting habitats, MPAs safeguard the vital life-support processes of the sea. The protection of marine habitats in their natural state provides an essential foundation for sustainable, nature based tourism, which is becoming a world industry and provides major benefits to local communities.

MPAs, if partially or entirely closed to fishing, have proved very effective in association with conventional fisheries management in rebuilding damaged fish stocks and in giving all stocks some stability. In several regions, fish stocks have increased rapidly establishment of MPAs (Robers and Hawkins, 2000)[6].

---

[6] Roberts, CM and J.P. Hawkins. 2000. Fully-protected marine reserves: a Guide. WWF Endangered Seas Campaign. UK. 131 pp.

2.   Objective & Expected Results*:*

This project will address the need of the establishment of new protected areas and the support of existing ones. In doing so, the project will support the creation of a representative system of MPAs, both regional and national, and will promote the involvement of local communities in its management. Ultimately, the project will address the needs of local communities and will contribute for their well being

The immediate objective of this project is to promote the protection of key habitats with high ecological value and biological diversity such as nursery and breading grounds, areas of high endemism and of uniqueness nature through the establishment or enhancement of MPA.

The following are the expected outcomes of this project:

1. The establishment of four new MPA's to protect key habitats where there is a need selected on the basis of importance on a representative system of marine protected areas;
2. The improvement of management of four existing MPA's, in the region, selected according to their importance in a network of representative systems of MPAs;
3. Involvement of local communities in all stages, guaranteeing their participation at all levels of decision and also making sure there are beneficiaries;
4. The establish of a representative network of MPA's both at regional and national level;
5. Assess the ecological, socio-economy and cultural importance and value of MPA's

Immediate objective No.1: Establish four new MPA's to protect key habitats, where there is a need and according to the value of its representativeness in a network of MPAs

The activities proposed to address this issue consists of:

1. Identification of marine and coastal areas that require protection and determination of priorities for the implementation of appropriate protection measures. The following criteria could be considered: being natural, biogeographical, ecological, economic, social, scientific, international and national importance, practicality, feasibility of establishing as an MPA;
2. Decide on the establishment of MPA trough a consultation process, specially to those communities affected and all the stakeholders possibly involved, such as the private sector;
3. Carry out a capacity needs assessment for each of the proposed MPAs and then support the provision of training on management and operations and procurement of equipment for new MPA;
4. Develop and implement actions plans for the new MPA. Action plans would need to consider the following issues:

a)   The rationale for site selection
b) The location and description
c) The present and potential uses
d) The action directions
e) The indicative zoning
f) The indicative regulatory needs
g) The indicative MPA operation requirements
h) The financial considerations

Expected outputs:

a)   Mapping of sensitive areas to be protected , going through a participatory process and after gathering the existing base-line information and using the necessary tools such as GIS and other methods, and propose the areas for Government approval ;

b)   MPAs established and gazetted by Governments;

c) MPAs established under the support of this project up running, including the establishment of a monitoring system, law enforcement, participatory management, sustainable financing, etc;

d) Capacity to sustain the MPAs at a longer run in place, including the trained staff (park warden, gamescouts, community officers, social and biological monitors, etc), the proper institutions and the needed financial mechanisms for their sustainability, at least partial;

e) Establish mechanisms for the integration of MPA into the integrated coastal management and planning (for surrounding land impacts upon the integrity and functioning of the MPAs).

Immediate objective No.2: improve the management of four existing MPA's, including the involvement of the local communities in its management

The activities proposed to address this issue consists of:

a) Trough a consultation process decide on four MPAs already existing where management, monitoring and operations need to be supported; the criteria for their selection should be mainly based on their biological and social importance;

b) Support selected activities in this four MPAs, including improvement of law enforcement and improvement of monitoring activities;

c) Establish the mechanisms for the full involvement of local communities/private sector in the management of MPAs;

d) Other activities towards sustainability should be the same as in objective 1 (training of Park staff, establishing mechanisms of financial sustainability, among others)

Expected outputs:

a) Four existing MPAs in the region with a better management in place and showing better quality of its environment through proper assessment;
b) Systems for monitoring, assessment, law enforcement, consultation and decision making are in place in these MPAs and functioning;
c) Local communities, including the private sector, involved in the management of these four selected MPAs.

Immediate objective No.3: Establish a representative network of MPA's both with regional and national importance.

The activities proposed to address this issue consists of:

a) Identify more sensitive and biologically important areas in regions were this process did not take place yet (note: in Eastern Africa, information is already available from the Eastern African Marine Eco-region process);

b) Establish network trough the exchange of information, experts and visits by local communities representatives;

Expected outputs:

a) A network of representative MPAs;

b) Map with the distributions of all coastal species, including appropriate measures of abundance where possible;

c) Map with existing protected areas and other relevant property-rights.

Immediate objective No.4: Assess the ecological, socio-economy and cultural value of MPA's.

The activities proposed to address this issue consists of:

a) Identification of key indicators of effective environmental conservation management within the Marine National Parks system and generation and introduction of standard operational procedures for monitoring and audit".

b) Key Indicators of effective environmental conservation management identified; Standard Operational Procedures generated; Standard Operational Procedures for management, monitoring and audit introduced

c) To review and recommend international standards for reporting on the state of the environment in small island state coastal and marine protected areas with respect to the ICRI Renewed 1998 Call for Action, and the Biodiversity Convention. Biological monitoring (e.g. coral lifeforms, turtle nesting) water quality (e.g. microbiological, chemical), infrastructure (e.g. state of moorings), and use (e.g. ticket sales, violations)

d) Generate electronic driven Standard Operational Procedures for monitoring and reporting

e) Training in use of Standard Operational

Expected outputs:

a) Historical and contemporary information on the physical, chemical, biological and other characteristics of identified sites. Conservation logistics including human resources (managerial) requirements

b) Identified hotspots in terms of biodiversity attributes, and the areas needed to represent 100% of subtropical Africa's coastal biodiversity in protected areas.

3.   Project Components/Activities -

The main activities of this project are already described in the previous chapter and are summaries in the table below. This project will last for five years. The first year of the project will consist of establishing the facilities for the implementation of the project. This would include the setting of project co-ordination and implementation structures at local and regional level; logistic arrangements and selection of the pilot project sites. In the second year, research and studies for helping to shape the future activities of the project will be conducted.

Main activities and time frame.

Activities	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Establishment of the project management structures	■				
Selection of the implementation sites	■	■			
Conduction of studies	■	■	■		
Establishment of new MPAs	■	■	■	■	■
Improve/support Management of Existing ones		■	■	■	■
Establish network		■	■	■	
Formulation/Implementation of management estructures involving local communities/private			■	■	■
Evaluationa nd monitoring of MPAS		■	■	■	■
Seminars and meetings		■	■	■	■

This project is transboundary in its nature as marine protected areas, which are supposed to represent a network of representative ecosystems, are linked throughout the different regions. The currents transport larvae of corals, plants, fish from different areas in the Indo-Pacific and the Atlantic. One of the most important currents – the South Equatorial Current reaches the African continent after passing trough areas such as the Chagos Archipelago, Seychelles and Comoros. In the Western Africa, the Benguela Current and the South Atlantic Circulation play also a role in species larvae transport and productivity. The conservation of areas that are believed to the first deposits of these larvae are very important from the point of view of management and conservation.

4. Linkages to Other National or Regional Activities / Transboundary Aspects-

Initiatives outside the programme of intervention that are linked to the present project include:

- WWF-EAME: In partnership with countries, institutions, NGOs and other stakeholders, implementation of an action plan to reverse the degradation of biodiversity in Eastern African. The process is called Eastern African marine Eco-regions and in its vision, the peoples of the region want a "healthy marine and coastal environment that provides sustainable benefits for present and future generations of both local and international communities who also understand and actively care and maintain its biodiversity and ecological integrity". The establishment of protected areas in the region is an important part of the action plan. Areas already receiving support from WWF include Kiunga Reserve, Quirimbas Archipelago and Bazaruto Archipelago National Park.

- LME – Gulf of Guinea.

- GEF Projects that support the establishment of Protected areas: UNDP linked include Guinea Current LME, Seychelles Environment Programme, Agulhas Current Initiative. WB links includes the Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Project in Mozambique.

5. Demonstrative Value & Replicability:

Most of the activities in this project are pilot and demonstrative. They are intended to be shown as best practices and also to be implemented in a manner that is easily replicable – such as projects that use locally available expertise, materials and simple methods.

Other activities are supposed to be "starters" such as the design of legislation and management plans. As soon as they are done, it is the responsibility of Governments to enforce legislation and implement plans. There will be already enough awareness from the civil society to make also Governments accountable for the activities that they are supposed to implement.

6.   Risks and Sustainability*:*

The present proposal is designed on the basis that financial and necessary logistics will be available. In the absence of these, the implementation of the project might be difficult.

Extreme weather/climate events such as storms, drought and floods could hamper the smooth implementation of the project, since access to the sites can be difficult, people might be displaced from their traditional places, infrastructure may be destroyed. Very little can be done to mitigate these risks.

Political instability might hamper the implementation of project. This issue should be taken into consideration particularly in this case where the project is to be implemented in several Sub-Saharan Africa, involving different governments and states with different political orientation.

Bureaucracy could slowdown the implementation of the project. The project officials should have an easy access to the project implementation sites, the transfer of funds and purchase (import) of equipment have to be facilitated. This is important considering the fact that the project lifetime is only five years. Loss of time in bureaucracy should be reduced to a minimum. One possible way of reducing the waste time in bureaucracy is to involve as much as possible the UN offices and personnel to facilitate the logistics and co-ordination.

Communication and travelling facilities. Travelling within Africa still is a major problem. In most of the countries travelling within country, particularly to access the sites targeted in the project (often are remote) requires major venture. A project of this magnitude that involves several institutions in different countries requires an effective co-ordination mechanism. Hence, effort needs to be made to improve the communication (preferable internet) of the implementation institutions.

Sustainability of the project will be assured by the involvement of local community, local expertise and local institutions in the implementation of the project. The identification of the problems and the designing of the projects to address these problems were driven locally. Local decision-makers, governments and local experts where involved as much as possible. This assured ownership and is a step forward towards sustainability. The implementation of the project should be steered and carried by locals as much as possible.

The sustainability of the project is not a foreseen problem as the project intends to support training, the studies and monitoring activities only for a certain period. After this period, these activities do not need to be continued. People will be trained to join Government and NGOs, with already good qualifications.

7.   Stakeholder Participation*:*

The main stakeholders are:

1. **Government;** In most of the countries, Governments are in charge of protected areas; they are one of the most important stakeholder in this process;
2. **Research Institutions and Universities**: will be called for the research and consultation process facilitation, support the process with the methodology, base line data and resource people
3. **Local NGO's** will play a pivotal role as they will serve as the link between Government and local communities, or between Private and local communities;
4. **Local communities**., specially those ones involved with the protected areas
5. **International organizations** that may be involved in implementation and monitoring such as: ICRAN, ICRI, CORDIO, IUCN, WWF-eco-region;
6. **The Private Sector** which depends on quality of Environment, specially Eco-Tourism

8.   Project Management & Implementation Arrangements*:*

This project should not duplicate institutions, both regional and national, where they already exist. In the first place, at regional level, several institutions have the support of Governments and have a great deal of experience in these areas. Examples are the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Jakarta Mandate, which include the support to revision and assessment of MPAs.

Several other regional organizations have been supporting countries in their activities related to the improvement/setting of MPA: WIOMSA, with training acativities, IUCN with financial support to MPAs and assessments, WWF in its regional approach, to name a few. They can play an important role in supporting this activity.

Finally, institutions at national level should be support to implement the project, thus contributing to its overall capacity. In general, national institutions include the Marine Parks authorities, with different names in different countries: National Directorate for Conservation Areas in Mozambique, Department of Wildlife in Ghana, National Parks Board in South Africa, Marine Parks Authority in Seychelles, to name a few. Universities in the region and specific countries are very fit to carry out the studies. Finally, diferent others local departments can be on board for the consultation and assessment: departments of environment, fisheries, etc.

There should be, however, the support for the creation of a steering committee, which will oversee the activities of this Project. This Steering Committee will be made of Government's representatives, regional bodies involved and local NGOs and communities, including the private sector

The community must be involved from the planning stage of the activities and in the implementation of the project at the local level, particularly in the implementation of the management strategies at the local level. During the research and studies, the community might provide valuable information, particularly regarding the traditional knowledge, which could complement modern sciences. The involvement of local community is an assurance of the ownership and of the sustainability of the results of the project.

9.   Project Financing & Duration:

The project is for five years and the total coast of the project amount to an estimated USD 5,500,000.00. Government and local institutions are expected to contribute in kind. The major components of the project are as follows:

1. **Project management** – this might take about 10% of the budget. It refers to the cost of the management of the project both at the regional and national levels. Includes salaries, overheads, rental of offices and all costs referring to the day-to-day of the management of the project.

2. **Research and studies** – estimated at about 10% of the total budget. Refers to both basic and applied studies required to developing a system to evaluate effectiveness of MPA.

3. **Establishing four (4) new MPAs and implement first activities** – About 30% of the budget. Refers to the activities required to identifying and nomination of new protected areas, the whole process of consultation, as well as to setting basic conditions for their management (i.e. management plans and structures).

4. **Improve the Management of Four (4) MPAs already existing** – About 40% of the budget. Refers to the selection of the areas through a participatory process, implementation of activities in the MPA, improvement of all aspects of management. It includes equipment and infrastructure, training, installation of monitoring, etc. as well as setting management structures and supporting the implementation of management of the habitats with the fully involvement of the local community.

5. **Establishing networks** – about 10% of the total budget. Refers to the establishment and operation of a network of marine protected areas for knowledge sharing.

Table 1.   Component & Activity Financing

	External Source of Funds			National Government		Total
	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3	Cash	In-kind	
Component 1	1,500,000				500,000	2,000,000
Component 2	1,700,000				800,000	2,500,000
Component 3	400,000				100,000	500,000
Component 4	400,000				100,000	500,000
Total	4,000,000				1,500,000	5,500,000

Note: This budget is preliminary and has not undergone a full consultation process with the respective countries. Therefore, does not indicate the actual financial commitment that would be provided by participating countries once the project proposal and its components are finalised.

10.   Monitoring, Evaluation &Dissemination:

The project will have the following process of Monitoring and Evaluations:

A: Quarterly Progress Reports by the Project Executant/Coordinator, which will be identified as being one national organization and/or a regional body;

B. Twice a year, there is a Steering Committee meeting to evaluate progress. The SC will be composed by Government representatives, NGO and local communities' representatives, and private sector. The SC may be established at regional or sub-regional level;

C: By the second year of implementation, evaluation missions nominated by the donor or donors will visit project sites implementation; the evaluation is repeated every two years of project implementation;

D. The indicators are formulated according to the expected out-puts;

11. **Work Plan and Timetable** :

Table 2 : Outline Work Plan and Timetable

1.2 Year[7]	1				2				3				4				5	
1.3 Quarter	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2
Establish project management structure	■	■	■	■														
Component 1 *Establish four new MPAs*					■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Activity 1.1																		
Activity 1.2																		
Activity 1.3																		
Component 2 *Improve management of 4 MPA with comm. Involvement.*					■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Activity 2.1																		
Activity 2.2																		
Activity 2.3																		
Component 3 *Establish Network*						■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Activity 2.1																		
Activity 2.2																		
Component 4 *Conduct Studies to evaluate MPA*						■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Activity 2.1																		
Activity 2.2																		

---

[7] Use as many columns as required to cover the entire period of project activities.

ANNEX

Logframe Matrix (4 pages max.)

2 Summary	Objectively verifiable indicators	Means of Verification (Monitoring Focus)	Critical Assumptions and Risks
Overall goal of the intervention **The main objective** of this project is to promote the protection of key habitats with high ecological value and biological diversity such as nursery and breading grounds, areas of high endemism and of uniqueness nature.	Selected areas have their status of management and conservatin increased	System for effectiveness of MPA in place and showing improved results. Quality of biodiversity in selected areas improved.	Financial capacity is in place. Governments declare new MPAs and agree to improve existing ones. Stakeholders involvement
Objectives of the relevant National Programs and the country, regional strategy. 1. Existing system of MPAs in the country 2. Governments have the necessary monitoring & assessment plan in place	Yearly monitoring results show effectiveness of MPAs	Monitoring data on quality of environment under protection; species and functional systems in the improve.	Government willingness Economic stability; available funding
Outcomes that lead to the achievement of the outlined regional and national objectives. Changes due to intervention (project impact) 1. New MPAs declared; 2. MPAs that were "Paper Parks" with improved management.	MPAS gazetted Results of monitoring and studies show positive results.	Biological and socio-economic data Effectiveness monitored; biodiversity index	Government willingness; Funds available. Government willingness, funding available
Results to be delivered by project which will enable necessary changes (project outputs) 1. Studies that show biodiversity value and quality of areas to be/already protected. 2. A system to assess effectiveness of conservation of existing/new MPAs.	Integrated research conducted Monitoring results are in place. Research and	Technical reports produced Reports	One of risk is the lack of well trained personnel and effective management Resources and funds available to carry research and studies Resources and funds

	studies conducted	3	available to carry research and studies
Components/Activities to be implemented in order to obtain planned results (Project components) 1. Establishing four new MPA's to protect key habitats, where there is a need and do not exist; 2. improve the management of four existing MPA's, including the involvement of the local communities in its management; 3. establish a network of MPA's; 4. conduct studies to assess the ecological, socio-economy and cultural value of MPA's	Research conducted 4 Pilot and Conservation/demonst ration projects Research and evaluation as well as monitoring programme in place and being implemented Programmes on TV radio, newspaper, campaigns, etc.	Technical reports produced Reports Reports Reports	Resources and funds available to carry research and studies Resources and funds available to carry research and studies Resources and funds available to establish and run the programmes Resources and funds available