

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Association FANAMBY
Project Title:	Building a knowledge base for local and regional stakeholders in managing Managed Resources Protected Areas in Madagascar
Date of Report:	May 31 st , 2011
Report Author and Contact Information	Tiana Andriamanana t.andriamanana@fanamby.org.mg

CEPF Region: Madagascar

Strategic Direction: SD 7-Consolidation

Grant Amount: \$179,392

Project Dates: August 1st, 2009-March 30th, 2011

Implementation Partners for this Project

ASITY, Bird Conservation Malagasy Group (ex-Birdlife Madagascar branch) support Fanamby in profiling bird communities in each of the MRPA, highlighting the importance of each site with respect to national conservation priorities. It also provided the management and land use plan of the Mahavavy Kinkony region where they have been implemented for years. This plan summarizes conservation and sustainable development priorities for this MRPA, and sets out a zoning plan, objectives, indicators and strategies.

MBG, Missouri Botanical Garden worked on a report entitled "Floristic profiles of targeted MRPA with respect to national conservation priorities». This report profiles targeted MRPA and summarizes their importance based on flora national conservation priorities. It also identifies within-site conservation priorities as well as additional information on culture, society and economic activities.

SAVAIVO, Local Environment & Development Malagasy Consulting Company, have done researches and studies, and provided reports on the environmental impact study of the MRPA. The later is necessary for the implementation of the final status of the Category V of IUCN Protected areas.

The regional directorates of the Ministry of Environment, Forests & Tourism are one of the stakeholders in the project. They are mainly involved in the environmental oversight of the MRPA sites.

Land-Use Management & Decentralization Regional Directions & Ministry will help decentralizing the land use management plan within other protected areas.

Conservation Impacts

Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile.

Madagascar's biodiversity constitutes an essential resource for its people but its potential values are as yet largely untapped. Some 80% of the country's population is entirely dependent on natural habitats for traditional medicines for which there are many hundreds of species utilized and a plethora of treatment applications. Rural communities in particular are dependent on other ecological goods and services such as clean water, and are beginning to benefit from nature-based tourism.

The project contributes to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile for Madagascar. The looming crisis has proven that there is clearly a need to adapt conservation and sustainable natural resource management initiatives so that they are more resilient to the negative impacts of unrest on biodiversity and Protected Areas. The project aims to alleviate the main barriers to the development of a network of Managed Resources PA by identifying existing experiences, sharing one amongst other approaches and contributing to reviewing legal texts regarding protected area management.

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.

The project support the implementation of the protected areas network in defining the management plan of the MRPA through participatory mapping; identifying the different partners, stakeholders and co-financiers; and in supporting local and decentralized services through capacity building.

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

Establish an effectively-managed and well adapted MRPA sub-network that demonstrably contributes to biodiversity representation and conservation. At the same time, it must also be able to demonstrate that the underlying philosophy of integrating biodiversity conservation, poverty reduction and sustained economic development is indeed an apt and effective means of mainstreaming biodiversity in national development policies and strategies.

Actual Progress toward Long-term Impacts at Completion:

An effectively-managed and well adapted MRPA sub-network is established to contribute to biodiversity representation and conservation. It is based on the philosophy that sustained economic development and proper information/training is a mean of mainstreaming biodiversity in national development policies and strategies.

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

Managed resources PA will be extended by developing a sub-network of managed resource protected areas in under represented ecological landscapes, co-managed by local government and communities and integrated into regional development frameworks and needed funds will be sought through innovative funding options (including sustainable tourism, organic and fair-trade products, public-private partnership...).

Actual Progress toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:

Co-management of the sub-network of managed resource protected areas in under represented ecological landscapes is still ongoing. Innovative fund seeking has begun through the implementation of sustainable tourism in some of the MRPA's, and organic and fair trade product from local communities. Public-private partnership has been engaged and is still in progress.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: 1,527,151 ha

Species Conserved:

1. *Haliaetus vociferoides*
2. *Ardea humbloti*
3. *Arius madagascariensis*
4. *Pellonulops madagascariensis*
5. *Paretroplus petiti* or Kotso
6. *Paratroplus kieneri*
7. *Pachypanchax omalonotus*
8. *Anas bernieri*
9. *Eulemur rubriventer*
10. *Threskiornis bernieri*
11. *Eulemur macaco*
12. *Sterna fuscata*
13. *Ardeolla idea*
14. *Amaurornis olivieri*
15. *Lepilemur aeeclis*
16. *Lepilemur ahmansoni*
17. *Lepilemur milanoi*
18. *Cryptoprocta ferox*
19. *Adansonia perrieri*
20. *Erymnochelys madagascariensis*
21. *Mungotictis decemlineata*
22. *Hypogeomys antimena*
23. *Pyxis planicauda*
24. *Microcebus berthae*
25. *Propithecus candidus* ;
26. *Propithecus tattersalli*
27. *Plethodontohyla guentherpeters* ;
28. *Platypelis mavomavo* ;
29. *Platypelis tetra* ;
30. *Brachytarsomys villosa* ;
31. *Microgale monticola*
32. *Sarothrura watersi* ;
33. *Voalavo gymnocaudus* ;
34. *microgale cowani* ;
35. *Nesomys rufus* ;
36. *Pteropus rufus*
37. *Mimusops sambiranensis*
38. *Platypelis tsaratananaensis* ;
39. *Plethodontohyla serratopalpebr* ;
40. *Plethodontohyla guentherpeters*;
41. *Mantidactylus salegy* ;
42. *Microgale monticola* ;

- 43. *Eulemur rubriventer* ;
- 44. *Platypelis alticola* ;
- 45. *Platypelis milloti* ;
- 46. *Boophis blommersae* ;
- 47. *Mantidactylus massi* ;
- 48. *Mantidactylus ambohitra*
- 49. *Mantidactylus salegy*;
- 50. *Eulemur macaco* ;
- 51. *Lepilemur dorsalis*.

Corridors Created:

Following meetings with the Ministry of Forests and Environment, and other conservation entities, the list of the established protected areas network is modified. It now includes:

- Galoko- Kalabenono
- Menabe Antimena
- Complex Mahavavy Kinkony wetlands
- Complex marine protected areas: Nosy Iranja, Baie Russe, Ankazoberavina and Ampasindava
- Loky Manambato complex
- Marivorahona-Marojejy-Ambohimirahavavy-Tsaratana complex

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

The partnership's agreement with stakeholders including the communities within MRPA, NGO promoters, private sectors are signed to create a business partnership for sustainable financing and sustainable use management. A consolidated database is available, including collected baseline data (complete threats assessment, scope mitigation action, complete management effectiveness tracking tool (METT)). Participatory mapping sessions/workshops were undertaken to define the protected areas boundaries, zoning, uses, biodiversity and habitats. Co-financing and engagement letters were obtained from institutions-partners that have the capacities to support MRPA management. Capacity building workshops took place in the MRPA to strengthen the decision making capabilities of the local associations/producers/communities.

In Menabe Antimena and Loky Manambato MRPA, Fanamby replicated an ecotourism approach involving a "win-win" process since part of the profits will be returned to MRPA management costs. Meetings with the oil, gas and mining companies helped us know more about the situation in the field regarding block mining. These later were involved in participatory mapping of the MRPA. A visit exchange was undertaken by the team of Fanamby in Tanzania to learn more about model developed on biodiversity participatory management. During the visit, the Tanzania Forest Conservation Group (TFCG) shared experiences and projects involving legal and policy framework, promotion of gender equality, the village community bank (VICOPA), etc

There is a lack of official clarification on the management tools for the category V and VI of IUCN. The incomplete policy and legal frameworks unable the completion of the analysis of the institutional frameworks concerning the implementation of the various MRPA sites, which also

lead to the unclear role of MRPA in conserving biodiversity and sustainable development amongst local and regional communities.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

The donors' withdrawal and current political situation is unfavorable to establish an agreement with the main operators/companies in term of eco-tourism and mining. The crisis leads the government to cut back sharply on budget allocations and reduce activities such as environmental protection. This has caused massive upsurge in illegal logging and hunting of lemurs in the northern forests, including two national parks within a world heritage site cluster representing the eastern humid forests.

Project Components

Project Components: *Please report on results by project component. Reporting should reference specific products/deliverables from the approved project design and other relevant information.*

Component 1 Planned: Baseline assessment of PA effectiveness established for pre-selected sites (Point of reference for effectiveness and strategy for the creation of a MRPA sub system)

Component 1 Actual at Completion:

Baseline assessment information's were integrated as Database tools into GIS. They include maps and geo-referencing of the MRPA sites, maps of the oil distribution and the different mining blocks, the frequency of slash and burn in all sites and the land management (block permits, PA coverage, targeted MRPA coverage, land grabbing regions...etc), a socio-cultural and economic baseline studies of the main actors, conflicts and tendencies of each MRPA, the risks and barriers of land degradation and the opportunities for sustainable management , the land tenure situation and trends, and the index of poverty for each sites. The impacts of climate change have also been considerate as a key factor affecting viability of MRPAs in the future. Few outcomes of this threat are predictable such as: i) larger, relatively intact blocks of forest are more likely to be resilient than isolated or fragmented blocks; (ii) there will be changes in species ranges as climate changes locally; and (iii) altitude-dependent species ranges are expected to change. Participatory land-use & spatial units' management mapping workshops were undertaken for most of the villages of the MRPAs. A PRODOC regarding MRPAs implementation is available with all baseline studies and maps related to MRPA sites.

The different stakeholders for sustainable land management are identified and a financial plan is available for five years. The monitoring and management of reforestation are evaluated and included in the final document. The boundaries of the MRPAs will be refined through participatory mapping workshop of all the fokontany. A long-term plan for future MRPAs expansions is completed (ecoregions, habitats, biodiversity, areas). .

Component 2 Planned: Institutional Framework: A three-tier management model linked with a capacity-strengthening strategy for MRPAS is established

Component 2 Actual at Completion:

The legal and policy frameworks that could support the MRPA management are identified and applied to the proposal, including the Protected Areas Code (COAP). The creation of National and Regional landscape management (SNAT and SRAT) through the creation of the Landscape Management National Policy (PNAT) underline the need to ensure wise environmental management and the protection of ecologically sensitive natural areas.

The filled Capacity Development and Protected Area Financial Scorecards are also included in the proposal. The existing/potential management tools & plans to support MRPA management are implemented in some MRPA.

The regional tourism offices, the Ministry of Mine and Oil, and the other administration branches were informed of the approach and activities of the MRPA. Fanamby identified partners and stakeholders willing to co-finance or engage themselves in the MRPA project. Eleven co-financing letters were obtained from other institutions.

Local institutions and association/communities receive basic trainings and information's concerning the MRPA approach and are in partnership with private sector in improving their decision making capabilities and financial and human resource management. Some environmental NGOs working with decentralized institutions operating at the regional level and more locally are involved in the creation and development of the main bulk of the MRPA. However, they are limited to supporting communities in establishing management transfers (GELOSE and GCF¹) aimed at ensuring conservation and sustainable utilization of key biodiversity areas. The stakeholders involved in the MRPA not only include representatives from local communities as in the majority of COGES², but extend to the regional administration and its line ministry representatives and private sector operators. Workshops and visits with local population are done to implicate the local communities in the change and the implementation of the MRPA. Local associations are trained to implement the organic and fair trade products. A capacity building session is engaged for partners/stakeholders and local communities.

A business plan is available for each potential product. Labels certifications were obtained in 2010 for the some organic and fair trade products, which give an added value to this economic alternative.

The OPCI promotes the interests of MRPA under their jurisdiction best when it is enabled and motivated to develop multi-sectoral plans including infrastructures, social services and environmental management as part of broad development plan that corresponds to their perceived priorities. Local communities, the OPCIs, the communes, and the MRPA executive management body are either permanently presents (communities and executive body) or elected by local people (communes and OPCIs). They should provide a degree of resilience during times of political instability. National and regional governments may change during such events, but communes and communities are generally stable.

A visit exchange was organized in Tanzania to see programs of Tanzania Forest Conservation Group (TFCG). The team learned from the local participatory management projects that involve rural communities in the region of Morogoro.

¹ These two forms of management transfer enable local communities to sign a contract with the GOM for the right to manage natural resources in a well-defined area. The approaches were widely tested during EP II and EP III. All such areas must have a clear conservation function. NGOs have often supported management transfers in environmentally important areas in order to encourage conservation and sustainable resource use. The acronyms for GELOSE and GCF translate as 'Secure Local Management' and 'Community Forest Management,' respectively.

² Comité de Gestion or management committee (COGES)

Component 3 Planned: Sustainable Financing: A long term cost profile for the MRPA sub system is designed and PPP funding options identified

Component 3 Actual at Completion:

The recently created Madagascar Foundation for Protected Areas and Biodiversity (Fondation pour les Aires Protégées et la Biodiversité de Madagascar or FAPBM) agreed to co-finance the implementation of the MRPA for the next five years. Other institutions agreed to co-finance the project at their level. Some companies agreed with the rural communities to establish a market for agricultural products (such as essential oils, cashew...) and ecotourism.

In 4 out of the 9, institutions involved in tourism agreed to work with MRPA such as KUDETA, a local private restaurant. This later agreed to provide professional training to local population in hotel business. Other companies such as Oceane Aventures, Go To Madagascar, MNP through eco tourism and VAHINY SARL also agreed to support MRPA activities.

Potential revenue streams from sustainable tourism and Organic and fair trade platform, Sahanala, were created for stakeholders to join and assure an above-market price for producers

The Madagascar Oil SA Company, working in a mining block that overlaps with MRPA signed an engagement letter for the project. Agreements were also signed between Fanamby, the private sectors and the local communities/associations living within and surrounding the MRPA.

The National Airline Company, Air Madagascar, signed an agreement with Sahanala to buy cashew nuts for in-flight use.

Component 4 Planned: Sustainable Use Management: A clear strategy for engendering sustainable use of resources is established

Component 4 Actual at Completion:

The local communities living within MRPA understand the stakes of natural resources sustainability. They are supported by the MRPA promoters and the stakeholders in legalizing their paperwork. Reforestation activities have been undertaken to counterbalance the slash and burn of the past years. Management tools are used to develop a high quality land use management plans (PAGs), prerequisites for final protection status.

A specialist in organic and fair trade products identified the high value products for each MRPA and established a list of the national and international markets that are environmentally friendly.

Certified products provided by local farmers neighboring MRPA are promoted by the organic and fair trade platform, Sahanala.

MRPA internal zoning or land use management planning parallel those of the regional plans insofar as they have essentially the same goals: sustainable development and protection of the natural heritage.

A tourism development strategy has been established. The infrastructures are being implemented and, the stakeholders and potential partners are engaged in supporting the MRPA project. The potential markets for sustainable tourism have been established.

Were any components unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?

In 2010, the donors' withdrawal had a considerable impact on component 3. The private sector is going through a hard time with the degradation of the socio-economic situation. Despite the current situation, some companies decided to support the project and co-finance its realization.

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

Lessons Learned

The implementation of MRPA network play an important role in the mentality change needed for the local communities. They will make the communities feel the ownership of their land and the uniqueness of their biodiversity/forests. By empowering the local population with the choice to understand and use natural resources in a sustainable way, the sense of conservation comes naturally to the local communities. The potential for fair trade markets and their consequent added incomes for farmers clearly constitute a major economic opportunity. The direct links between fair trade for producers and contributing more or less directly to biodiversity conservations are quite obvious and could be a very effective marketing strategy.

The agreements between private sectors and local communities increased revenues of the communities significantly and is source of alternative financing as communities agreed to share different percentages of the revenues to MPRA management, common community needs such as infrastructures, and a micro-credit facilities in support of entrepreneurial activities.

The current crisis has proven the lack of decentralization of authorities, responsibilities and information: one of the problems the MRPA implementation will resolve.

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 the CEPF investment in this project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount USD	Notes
GEF	A	144 390	
UNDP	A	150 700	
CEPF	A	179 392	
MIARO	A	25 025	(CAG, Conservation Action Grant)

****Additional funding should be reported using 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.)*

Sustainability/Replicability

Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.

This Project significantly contributed to MRPA promotion and establishment amongst regional and local stakeholders. According to Project results, the GEF NMRPA Project will be adapted and implemented during 6 years settling management ability, institutional capacity and funding

opportunities for sustainable MNRPA management and efficiency in part of Madagascar terrestrial, littoral and highlands areas. The GEF MRPA project implementation is still ongoing for approval and the current situation in the country is slowing this process. In a socio-economic context, the economic alternative will provide a better economic stability for the local areas. By involving, strengthening and securing the most concerned stakeholders, communities and people, the MNRPA is more than likely to have a long-term impact for biodiversity conservation as well sustainable development.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

The sustainable financing including Carbon storage, ecotourism as well as the engagement of extractive industries to respect the environment within the protected areas were considered as one of the potentially valuable sources of long term financing for MRPA. Land use barriers may be overcome by a combination of demonstratively effective land use management planning within the MRPA and well-formulated lobbying at the regional level. Internal land use management planning in MRPA is indeed a priority strategy within the present project, and will be accompanied by lobbying for broader MRPA integration.

The SAPM commissions, stakeholder in the public sector, did identify some 6 million ha of remaining terrestrial habitats as priorities but it became evident that there were insufficient promoters or financial resources to bring them into new Pas. The political instability is also an important risk that needed to be taken into account in the future.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.

Environmental and social safeguard policies will be achieved through the strengthening role of the civil society in defending biodiversity. Many international Non Governmental Organizations and donors are rallying to support the alliance of Malagasy environmental NGOs -Voahary Gasy- and humanitarian Civil Society Organizations or CSOs. These policies should be accompanied by economic alternative and reforestation sessions. The local communities should be involved in the process of conservation (participatory mapping, local tree nurseries, etc).

Additional Comments/Recommendations

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.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Serge Rajaobelina

Organization name: Association Fanamby

Mailing address: Lot II K 39 bis Ankadivato, 101 Antananarivo, Madagascar

Tel: +261202263661

E-mail: s.rajaobelina@fanamby.org.mg

*****If your grant has an end date other than JUNE 30, please complete the tables on the following pages*****

Performance Tracking Report Addendum

CEPF Global Targets				
Project Results	Is this question relevant?	If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.	Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.	Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. (Attach annexes if necessary)
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	The project strengthen mainly the implementation of the final status of the protected areas for a better management of natural resources	Management was strengthen in two protected areas	467713	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Menabe-antimena: 219 304 - Loky manambato: 248 409
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?			1 527 151 Inter-departmental Decree in Annex A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Menabe-antimena: 219 304 - Mahavavy Kinkony: 278 642 - Loky manambato: 248 409 - Ampasindava & Galoko Kalabenono: 187 305 - Ambohimirahavavy-Marivorahona: 593 491
3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares.		The protected areas included in the network respond to the CEPF ecosystem	1 527 151	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Menabe-antimena (west Malagasy dry forests) : 219 304 - Mahavavy Kinkony wetlands: 278 642 - Loky manambato North east transitional zone : 248 409 - Ampasindava peninsula & Galoko Kalabenono forests chain: 187 305 - Ambohimirahavavy-Marivorahona forests corridor: 593 491
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	NA			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.			933660	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Menabe-antimena: 3 associations - Mahavavy Kinkony : 30 associations - Loky manambato: 238 producers beneficiaries - Ampasindava peninsula & Galoko Kalabenono : 5 environmental organisations

If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table

