



**SGP** The GEF  
Small Grants  
Programme



# SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME RESULTS REPORT (FY 2017-2022)

---

## GUYANA



## COUNTRY REPORT CARD FY 2017 - 2022

Country Programme Name	<b>Guyana</b>						
Year Started	2013						
<b>Portfolio Profile</b>	<b>GEF</b>	<b>Non-GEF</b>	<b>Total</b>				
Number of projects	23	3	26				
Grant amount committed	841,858	115,982	957,840				
Project level co-financing in cash	191,105	24,131	215,236				
Project level co-financing in kind	702,861	77,243	780,104				
Total co-financing *	<b>1,111,322</b>						
<p><b>Source: SGP database as of July 2022</b></p> <p>* Total co-financing = Total project level co-financing (in cash and in kind) + Non-GEF grant amount committed</p>							
	July 2016 - June 2017	July 2017 - June 2018	July 2018 - June 2019	July 2019 - June 2020	July 2020 - June 2021	July 2021 - June 2022	Total Value 2016 - 2022
<b>Focal Area Distribution (by completed projects)</b>							
Biodiversity	-	-	1	-	-	1	2
<b>Total Projects Completed</b>	-	-	1	-	-	1	2

Source: Reporting by Country Programme as part of Annual Monitoring Process (2016-2022)


	July 2016 - June 2017	July 2017 - June 2018	July 2018 - June 2019	July 2019 - June 2020	July 2020 - June 2021	July 2021 - June 2022	Total Value 2016 - 2022 **
** Kindly note figures in column "Total Value 2016-2022" have undergone comprehensive quality assurance that supports aggregation of results over time. This includes removal of duplicative data over time and/or inclusion of more results based on verification by SGP country teams.							
<b>PROGRESS TOWARDS FOCAL AREA OBJECTIVES</b>							
<b>Biodiversity</b>							
Number of biodiversity projects completed	-	-	1	-	-	1	2
Number of Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas and Territories (ICCAs) positively influenced	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Hectares of ICCAs	-	-	-	-	-	17,611	17,611
Number of significant species conserved	-	-	1	-	-	1	2
Number of target landscapes/seascapes under improved community conservation and sustainable use	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Hectares of target landscapes/seascapes under improved community conservation and sustainable use	-	-	-	-	-	17,611	17,611
<b>GRANTMAKER PLUS</b>							
<b>CSO-Government Dialogue</b>							
Number of CSO-government dialogues supported	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Number of CSO/CBO representatives involved in the dialogues	-	-	-	-	-	5	5
<b>Gender</b>							
Number of gender responsive completed projects	-	-	1	-	-	1	2
Number of completed projects led by women	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Programme Management: NSC gender focal point (yes/no)	No	-	No	No	-	Yes	1
<b>Indigenous Peoples</b>							
Number of completed projects that included indigenous peoples	-	-	1	-	-	1	2

	July 2016 - June 2017	July 2017 - June 2018	July 2018 - June 2019	July 2019 - June 2020	July 2020 - June 2021	July 2021 - June 2022	Total Value 2016 - 2022 **
Number of indigenous leaders with improved capacities	-	-	31	-	-	2	33
Programme Management: NSC IP focal point (yes/no)	No	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	4
<b>Ways to encourage IP projects</b>							
Involved indigenous peoples in NSC and/or TAG (yes/no)	No	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	4
Enhanced outreach and networking with indigenous people's groups (yes/no)	No	-	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	3
<b>Youth</b>							
Number of completed projects that included youth	-	-	19	-	-	1	20
Programme Management: NSC youth focal point (yes/no)	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	4
<b>BROADER ADOPTION (Scaling up, Replication, Policy Influence, Improving Livelihoods)</b>							
Projects with policy influence	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Projects improving livelihoods of communities	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
<b>PROGRAMME EFFECTIVENESS</b>							
Peer-to-peer exchanges conducted	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Number of projects monitored through field visits	2	-	1	2	-	3	8
<b>PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT</b>							
<b>National Steering Committee</b>							
Number of NSC meetings occurred during the reporting period	-	-	-	3	2	13	18
Average number of NSC members that participated in each NSC meeting	-	-	-	8	6	6	4
Average time in days needed to replace NSC member	-	-	-	2	-	30	8

## GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION OF KEY RESULTS

Interpreting the Green Bars in Graphs: The presence of green bars indicates the number of years that the country programme has achieved specific results. If a green bar is absent, it signifies that while the associated result is not observed in the country programme, it is still evident in the overall aggregated SGP portfolio.

### Number of Years Country Programme Deployed Capacity Development Strategies (Over 6-year reporting period from 2017-2022)



Source: Annual Monitoring Report 2017-2022

**Number of Years Country Programme Deployed Gender Mainstreaming Strategies  
(Over 6-year reporting period from 2017-2022)**




Source: Annual Monitoring Report 2017-2022

**Number of Years Country Programme Deployed Strategies to Improve Community Livelihoods and Quality of Life  
(Over 6-year reporting period from 2017-2022)**



Source: Annual Monitoring Report 2017-2022

**Number of Years Country Programme Deployed Market-based and Financial Mechanisms to Improve Community Livelihoods  
(Over 6-year reporting period from 2017-2022)**



Source: Annual Monitoring Report 2017-2022

**Number of Years Country Programme Addressed Sustainable Development Goals  
(Over 6-year reporting period from 2017-2022)**



## EXAMPLES OF PROJECT RESULTS

### Biodiversity

In partnership with the Conservation Leadership Programme, an SGP project in **Guyana** implemented by the *South Rupununi Conservation Society* (SRCS) trained indigenous Wapichan “ranger-researchers” from eight villages in the protection of endangered Red Siskins. The indigenous rangers were trained in the handling, trapping, and scientific observation techniques necessary for the study of birds. The presence of the rangers at the field sites has discouraged the capture of birds by outsiders, hunting of other protected animals, and burning of land. Moreover, the indigenous rangers were trained in interpretive guiding and ecotourism, which enabled them to make regular visits to primary and secondary schools in the area to take pupils birdwatching. As part of the outreach, SRCS published a booklet of one hundred most common birds in the Rupununi featuring high quality photographs. The booklet included the birds’ IUCN Relist Statuses, identification guides, and habitat descriptions, with bird names listed in the indigenous language (*wapishana*), English and scientific forms. Rangers now receive increasing support from villages in the area to protect their lands from internal and external threats. Many of the rangers trained under the project now hold positions of responsibility within their communities: two are chiefs (*toshaos*), many are village councilors, or have been invited to take part in the government Wapichan Land Titling Project. **(Source: Annual Monitoring Report, 2018-2019)**

### Social Inclusion – Indigenous Peoples

In **Guyana**, the South Rupununi Conservation Society implemented a project focused on the research and protection of giant anteaters in three indigenous communities in the South Rupununi. The project built the capacity of indigenous peoples to collect, monitor, and analyze data on giant anteater activities and threats to their survival. The information aided and informed decision-making at the local, regional, and national levels. During the project, training workshops were held on the methodology and use of equipment required as well as initial training of tour guides for nature tourism. Two rangers were connected to the Guyana Tourism Authority and registered as tour guides. Surveys were conducted to estimate the number of giant anteaters living in the study areas. “Anteater boards” were set up for community members to record sightings and other observations of anteaters. Camera traps were placed to track the activities of anteaters. The data collected was then analyzed to generate a report. As a result of the project, a giant anteater conservation zone was established in one of the communities, managed by indigenous people. A ranger and research station was built for anteater conservation and research. The project also promoted the development and enforcement of community rules for giant anteater protection, which was led and implemented by indigenous peoples. **(Source: Annual Monitoring Report, 2021-2022)**

## METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

All results are aggregated reflecting projects completed and are consistent with SGP results generated in past years.

With SGP's rolling modality, results reflect all ongoing operational phases during the indicated period. Please refer to the total projects completed on the first page for information in this regard.

The source of reported results is the annual monitoring process, which is part of the annual monitoring requirements for each country programme. Additionally, evaluative evidence sources have also been leveraged, if available for the country programme.

This results report benefits from extensive quality assurance. All information across all countries in the portfolio is harmonized, verified, and evidenced before being reported. Several layers of this quality assurance have been implemented in the generation of this report, and there are no result duplications across years. This point is important not only for the specific unit of measurement (i.e., indicator selected) but also for results aggregation across years in a given operational phase. Results reported across all countries have been treated uniformly to ensure overall standardization and methodological soundness.

Reported results include both direct and indirect global-environmental and socio-economic benefits. This is due to SGP's work in two key areas:

- **SGP works towards behavioral change at individual, organizational, and community levels.** Social determinants that shape human interaction with the environment play an important role, especially at the community level, as sustainability and the continuation of environmental gains often depend on them. These factors include positive shifts in knowledge, attitudes, practices, social and cultural norms, and conventions. Such interventions shape not only demand but also communication between community leaders and other influencers in promoting the adoption of environmentally friendly behaviors and practices. Often, SGP projects have ripple effects that go well beyond the direct scope of the project, emphasizing the importance of measuring indirect impact.
- **Encouraging Community Action for Environmental Change.** For many years, SGP has focused on promoting and supporting local community groups to bring about broader and sustainable environmental change. This approach is a key aspect of SGP's work and recognizes the power of motivated community groups to create significant impact and drive positive transformation. Community group action refers to informal gatherings of individuals and organizations in the community who share a common belief and purpose. It involves taking practical steps over time to address environmental and socioeconomic challenges and creating positive change. This grassroots-level approach relies on the active involvement and empowerment of the community, with the initial efforts acting as a catalyst for further mobilization. By encouraging self-governance and involving those most affected by the issues, community action can extend its influence to more people in the community, underscoring the importance of measuring indirect impact.