

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Name: TRAFFIC International

Project Title: Increasing Knowledge-Decreasing Detriment: Improving the Monitoring and Management of Madagascar's Wildlife Trade

Project Dates: March 2002-December 2003

Date of Report: April 14, 2004

II. OPENING REMARKS

Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this report.

As noted in the performance tracking system and in the final M&E report, implementation of the project was delayed by the political upheavals in Madagascar in 2002. However, the associated regime change undoubtedly also created new opportunities in project implementation, as the new government currently shows an increased willingness to engage with outside processes, and a commitment to reducing corruption. The final M&E report (output 4.2), submitted with this, provides a narrative summary of the project and in particular of lessons learned in design and implementation. This information is not repeated here.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: *Individuals and institutions concerned with the harvest and trade of Malagasy wildlife (other than non-live fisheries) are both better able and motivated to ensure that harvests are maintained at or below levels that would negatively impact on the status of the target species or the ecosystems in which they occur.*

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	
1. Malagasy CITES implementing authorities set and implement harvest and export quotas for CITES-listed species at levels that, based on the best available evidence, will not be detrimental to the species or the ecosystems in which they occur by July 2003	As of Dec 2003 Malagasy authorities have agreed to implement action plan, which includes implementation of an agreed, transparent quota setting system. CITES Animals Committee has set deadline of October 2004 for implementation of this.
2. Government wildlife managers identify and agree to adopt remedial measures to ensure the conservation of non-CITES species for which harvest for trade appears to be negatively impacting on the species or the surrounding ecosystem by July 2003	Quota setting system includes provision for zero export quotas where relevant.
3. Representatives from trader associations and trading communities formally endorse the principle of maintaining harvests at or below sustainable levels	Representatives from trader associations have formally endorsed action plan, which includes provision for maintaining harvests at or below

	sustainable levels.
4. <i>Representatives from government, academic, NGO, trade and other constituencies with knowledge of and/or an interest in Malagasy wildlife species in trade collaborate in establishing a network for information sharing and trade monitoring.</i>	Representatives from all these constituencies have collaborated in the preparation of the action plan and are implicated as actors in its implementation. Action plan includes mechanisms for information sharing (chiefly mediated through the Scientific Authority) and trade monitoring.
5. <i>Implementation of a model system for managing Madagascar's wildlife trade is initiated by July 2003 and is fully operational by July 2005</i>	Action plan for managing Madagascar's wildlife trade adopted in October 2003. Implementation will start in 2004 although it is unlikely that all elements of the plan will be fully operational by mid-2005.

Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators.

The project has undoubtedly made significant progress toward meeting its stated purpose. However, it was over-optimistic to expect the Malagasy authorities to be in a position to establish and implement a functioning quota-setting and control system by the end of the project period – it is clear that a considerably longer period of capacity building and support will be required.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

Bringing together the different stakeholders, notably at the workshop and at the subsequent smaller meetings to review the draft action plan, apparently helped a number of them begin to understand the perspectives of others. In this way the project may have helped to break down some barriers within Madagascar between those with widely opposing views on wildlife trade.

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs: Enter the project outputs from the Logical Framework for the project

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: Briefing documents identifying priority animal (other than food fish) and non-CITES plant species and groups of species in trade, summarising available baseline information regarding their status in the wild, trade volumes, management measures, and, where possible, current production systems and economic values of the trade, and indicating known or likely impacts of trade and actual or potential benefits from trade.	Briefing documents were prepared as specified for a stakeholder workshop in May 2003.
<i>1.1 Available baseline information on these species is compiled and the results produced in the form of a project briefing document in English and French, including status, trade, and, where available, production systems and economic values.</i>	Summary briefing document was prepared along with a more detailed database on animal species in trade (a database on plant species in trade was prepared by the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, in a parallel project).
<i>1.2 Project briefing documents are presented to a stakeholders workshop in July 2002.</i>	Stakeholders' workshop was held in May 2003.
<i>1.3 Priority animal and non-CITES plant species and</i>	Animal and non-CITES plant species in commercial

<i>groups of species are identified.</i>	trade were identified.
<i>1.4 Existing wildlife harvest and trade management regimes are evaluated and the results produced in the form of a project briefing document in English and French.</i>	Briefing document as specified prepared for the stakeholders' workshop in May 2003.
Output 2: Specifications for and proposed modus operandi of an integrated wildlife trade monitoring and management system that will link information on the status of species of concern with data on harvest, trade and use, and allow for the development of appropriate management measures.	Result of the workshop was an Action Plan for the Reform of Madagascar's Wildlife Export Trade, endorsed by the workshop attendees and adopted by the Malagasy authorities.
<i>2.1 A strategy for further development and long-term sustainability of the system is produced.</i>	Funding development document has been prepared with some implementation of the strategy currently being undertaken.
<i>2.2 Specifications for a monitoring system integrated with a functional management model are produced.</i>	Monitoring system is an integral part of the Action Plan, but detailed specifications have not yet been produced.
Output 3: Representatives from key stakeholder groups (e.g. government, trade, universities and NGOs) are actively encouraged to participate in development of the monitoring and management system specified in Output 2.	Representatives of key stakeholder groups were actively engaged in the preparations of the workshop and played a full part in the workshop and in the development of the action plan..
<i>3.1 Representatives from key stakeholder groups are identified and consulted in the preparation of project research documents and the monitoring and management model and modus operandi.</i>	See above
<i>3.2 Representatives from key stakeholder groups are invited and encouraged to participate in a workshop to assess and discuss the model monitoring and management system developed, and to make recommendations for its further development.</i>	See above.
Output 4: A monitoring and evaluation system is integrated within the project implementation plan to assess progress toward achieving the project outputs and meeting the overall project purpose. The monitoring and evaluation system will include an analysis of the likely socioeconomic impacts of implementation of any recommendations of the project along with recommendations for mitigating any possible impacts on local livelihoods.	See attached M&E report.
<i>4.1 Project performance is compared with expected results as articulated in the Performance Tracking Worksheet.</i>	
<i>4.2 A final M&E report assessing strengths and weaknesses of project design and implementation.</i>	

Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.

Outputs were in general delivered as intended. As noted in the final M&E report, it was decided that it would be premature to identify a subset of exported species as high priority. Instead, the project concentrated on gathering baseline information on a wide range of species known to be in commercial trade.

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

Outputs were in general all realized.

V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

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

An assessment of socioeconomic impacts of any changes in trade regimes is built into the action plan. Such an assessment will make detailed recommendations of any mitigation measures that might conceivably be needed in the event of radical changes in the existing trade regime. The action plan itself is designed to ensure that wildlife trade does not have negative environmental impacts.

VI. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT

Describe any lessons learned during the various phases of the project. Consider lessons both for future projects, as well as for CEPF's future performance.

Lessons learned in both design and execution are fully covered in the final M&E report.

Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/failure)

Project Execution: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/failure)

VII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To reiterate the final M&E report, the most important lesson learned from the project is that producing permanent changes in human behaviour, which is what this project was about (as are most conservation projects), is essentially a long-term process. It is thus not particularly conducive to being achieved in a tightly bounded timeframe. Without continuing input to provide financial and technical support and, as important, motivation, gains made by the project are likely to be dissipated quite rapidly.

Monitoring & Evaluation, supplemental report

Output 4: Indicator 2

An evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of project design and implementation

Although subject to delay, owing to the political upheavals in Madagascar in 2002, the project appears to have succeeded in its main purpose – that is that individuals and institutions concerned with the harvest and trade in Malagasy wildlife (other than non-live fisheries) are both better able and motivated to ensure that harvests are maintained at or below levels that would negatively impact on the status of the target species or the ecosystems in which they occur. It has done this by producing as its main concrete output a comprehensive plan for the reform of Madagascar's wildlife export trade that has been adopted by the Malagasy authorities. The project succeeded in bringing together a wide range of stakeholders, who do not normally interact particularly constructively. It seems that the great majority of these stakeholders felt that they had been actively involved in the production of the action plan and therefore have some sense of ownership in it.

Although, as with any process of this nature, the benefit of hindsight indicates that some parts of the project could probably have been executed more efficiently (see below), it is hard to see how any major modifications of design and implementation could have improved matters significantly. The instigation of the project during a time of major political upheaval provided valuable lessons, not least the importance of remaining engaged during such periods of change if this is possible (that is without jeopardising safety) – it is clear that it is just times like these that often provide important opportunities to influence future developments. However, in this case the inevitable delays in implementation and the need to be able to respond adaptively to changing circumstances were a significant drain on resources. This was at least partially mitigated by small amounts of additional funding from the other project donor. Any longer delays would have seriously hampered implementation.

Political instability was recognised as a potential external risk in project design. It is however difficult to know how to plan financially for such uncertainty – inclusion of a substantial contingency fund in the budget would have inflated the latter perhaps beyond acceptable limits and may in the end not have been needed. This highlights a weakness, not necessarily of this project in particular, but of the project planning and application process more generically. It is simply not possible to predict at the start of this kind of work precisely how much it will cost to do the job adequately, nor exactly what the money will need to be spent on – budgets and budget lines can only be at best indicative.

Initial project design probably overestimated the need for detailed information on individual species and on socioeconomic impacts of the trade – it became clear during implementation that significant capacity building was required before such information could be made real use of in Madagascar. The project therefore emphasised the latter. It was decided early on that concentrating on 10 priority species (as suggested by project output 5 in the project document) was not a useful way to proceed: any actions envisaged should be applicable to all commercially exported species. It was also clear that it would not be possible, nor in any event meaningful, to come up with assessments of changes in status of species over the project period. Even if it were possible to gather such information with the very limited resources available in the project (which it was not), the project period was far too short to detect meaningful changes in status. This is particularly true in the case of assessing impacts of changes in collection and export controls. In the first instance, it may take time (one or two collecting seasons) for changes in export controls to filter down the supply chain to the point at which they affect wild collection and therefore wild populations.

Secondly, changes in controls were envisaged to be an output of the project, that is to come into effect at or towards the end of the project period. Even if their impact were to be rapidly transmitted down the supply chain, they could only possibly have an impact on wild populations at the very end of the project period, or much more likely after the project has finished. In any event the period of project implementation was an abnormal one for the export trade, because of a self-imposed moratorium in 2002 and because the political crisis hampered all import and export trade – it would have been impossible to separate any changes in collection intensity resulting from the project from those resulting from these. However, instigation of such studies – and of the socio-economic impacts of various trade scenarios – are included as activities to be undertaken under the action plan.

While we judge the project to have been successful in its purpose, or short-term impact, it became clear during implementation that without further input it is unlikely to achieve its long-term goals or targeted conservation outcomes. That is, as noted above, the project has ensured that individuals and institutions are better able and, to some extent, better motivated to modify their behaviour with respect to wildlife trade. But it in itself has not been able to make those change in behaviour actually happen. This is highlighted by what was probably the weakest phase in implementation – the period immediately following the May stakeholder workshop. Although, again as noted above, we believe that the workshop did create a sense of shared ownership in the process of producing a wildlife trade action plan, it did not succeed in transferring ownership of the process to the Malagasy. The project implementers were not proactive in the period following the workshop, hoping that the Malagasy authorities would themselves move the process on. This proved optimistic. The situation may have been improved if the project coordinator had set out a clear set of follow-up actions, with identified actors and timetable after the workshop, which he did not do. This resulted in

everyone waiting for everyone else to take the initiative. There was no sense, however, that the Malagasy would themselves at any point take the initiative. Matters moved swiftly on when the project implementers then took on the responsibility of drafting the action plan and organising further stakeholder consultations.

At the end of the project period some of the same issues apply: the action plan has been agreed by the stakeholders and adopted by the Malagasy authorities, but it is unlikely that serious efforts at implementation will take place without continuing external input. This is particularly the case now that one of the key figures in the Management Authority who played an important role in the project process has been removed (a continuing risk in this as in any other process involving government authorities). This again underscores one of the main generic weaknesses in the project system: changes of the kind that are the goal of projects such as these cannot actually be achieved within the framework of short-term projects – they require long-term engagement (both financial and in provision of human resources). This was anticipated and is addressed in the long-term sustainability section of the original project document. Project implementers themselves are in the process of setting out a longer-term funding and implementation strategy.

For more information about this project, please contact:

Teresa Mulliken
Research and Policy Coordinator
TRAFFIC International
219c Huntingdon Road
Cambridge CB3 0DL, United Kingdom
Tel:(44) 1223 277 427
Fax: 44) 1223 277 237
E-mail: teresa.mulliken@trafficient.org
<http://www.traffic.org/>