

# FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Name:** Conservation International- Madagascar

**Project Title:** Forested Corridor Management

**Project Dates:** January 1, 2001 – December 31, 2004

**Date of Report:** March 22, 2005

## II. OPENING REMARKS

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

The project that this report describes is one that has evolved considerably since initiation. The original idea was to support local actors in a consensus of how to manage one of the largest remaining forest areas in Madagascar. That this became a process well beyond the immediate scope of the actors supported by CEPF is a testament to the collaborative spirit in which the project was implemented as well as evidence of the complexity of the situation. However the contribution of the CEPF support to the establishment of enabling conditions for consensus is substantial. Now, at the end of the project, regional actors working through Development Committees and in collaboration with new Regional Heads (Chef de Region) are having substantive discussions and making decisions on the basis of opportunities and analyses that the CEPF funding was instrumental in providing.

d

## III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

***Project Purpose:*** Biodiversity corridor management plans become effective in two corridors involving the main parties (MEF, ANGAP, Ministry of Environment, Regional administration, local operators, local NGOs)

### Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Purpose-level:</b>	
1.1 the management plan with M&E system established and put into operation in the Mantadia-Zahamena corridor is continued by partner organizations and other groups and the model is replicated by stakeholders in forested corridors	A Vision for the Conservation of the Mantadia-Zahamena corridor was developed in collaboration with local authorities and agreed at the regional level in early 2005. This was based on consultation and research over the last three years in collaboration with a wide range of local and regional actors including the regional development committees, local and national scientists, and decentralized government authority. The same process has also been implemented in the Ranomafana-Andringtra corridor, with an agreed vision and workplan for implementation under way.
1.2 The coordination platform/network facilitating management and monitoring in the corridor is maintained and replicated in others corridors by	The Platform for the corridor Zahamena Mantadia consists of members from each of four Regional Development Committees around the corridor plus

<p><i>stakeholders</i></p>	<p>provincial authorities and NGO contributors including CI. It has been attached the greatest importance by the stakeholders on account of its proven usefulness, and in addition it makes up a base for the PE III program. It was established by provincial decreet represents the central authority for coordinating all the corridor activities. The Multi-local Planning Committee in the Ranomafana-Andringitra corridor is a highly organized and robust planning authority that works in collaboration with the new Regional Chiefs to implement regional development plans that include the vision for the conservation of the corridor. In Morondava, the Regional Development Committee has just agreed a Steering Committee for the Menabe Forest Conservation Plan, initiated with separate CEPF funding through Fanamby in 2002. Other forest corridors that have benefited from the Regional Development Committee/ Forest management plan approach include Bongolava and Andavakoera, two important CI intervention sites.</p>
----------------------------	---

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

The major contribution of CEPF funding to the success of the Corridor Management Plan/Regional Development Committee process has been the use of biodiversity and environmental data as the basis for planning in the two focal areas (Zahamena-Mantadia and Ranomafana-Andringitra). The impact of the recognition of environmental contributions to the regions cannot be overstated, and while the regional development plans for the two core areas where CEPF support has been mostly deployed have not yet been finalized, they recognize that economic development in the region depends on the maintenance of biodiversity and environmental function in the forests. This central theme underlies the very existence of the Committees- in both focal areas; the local planning committees take their structure and area of influence from the existence of the forested corridors. This effect is also very evident in the case of the Menabe forests and in Bongolava, where regional authorities, NGOs, civil society and the private sector are united in their desire to plan sound management of forests.

***Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?***

The success of the Regional Development Committee/Corridor Management Plan concept as laid out by the initial CEPF proposal has led to this concept being deployed in areas outside the influence of CEPF or even CI in Madagascar, such as in the south-eastern Anosy region and in the Mikea.

**IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS**

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

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<p><b>Output 1: regional priority-setting workshop conducted in 2001 for Z-M corridor and its recommendations are used in the management and monitoring plan</b></p>	
<p><i>1.1 The Zahamena-Mantadia Corridor Management Plan fed on Knowledge about corridor biodiversity</i></p>	<p>Biodiversity RAP studies conducted in the corridor (funded by CEPF Biodiversity Knowledge Gathering) were used in the 2001 Biodiversity Priority-setting workshop and the 2003 Conservation Vision Workshop</p> <p>All the actors within the Z-M corridor attended the workshop. Prioritisation of criteria was established (biological, social, economic) and makes up a base for the current activities including the process of forest zoning, the planning processes, delineation of the conservation sites...</p> <p>Sylvicultural research results on native forest species growing &amp; multiplication in Ankeniheny will be used in the implementation of a World Bank Biocarbon project to restore the corridor between Mantadia and Analamazaotra where the link has been broken.</p> <p>Alaotra Lake was declared a RAMSAR site in 2003, and a conservation zoning map of Alaotra is under negotiation..</p>
<p><b>Output 2: Corridor Monitoring program designed and operational in Z-M corridor and replicated in Fianarantsoa</b></p>	
<p><i>2.1 Biological and socio-economic report produced for Zahamena-Mantadia corridor by the end of 2001</i></p>	<p>During the CEPF project period, a tremendous amount of socio-economic and biological data has been gathered and made available to decision-makers in the corridor. Of the most important have been”</p> <p>Report of socio-economic situation in the Mantadia-Zahamena corridor is available</p> <p>2002: Forest cover Map (from CI) was incorporated in Economic and sociologic data base.</p> <p>2004 : The forest cover map is used as a reference tool for socio-economical context and deforestation rate database A map including management transfer sites and actors distribution is established.</p> <p>Socio-economical and biological evaluations for secondary forests within Zahamena-Mantadia corridor were realized in 2003. Data base on threatened and restricted range species of the corridor available through CABS's KMS database was established in 2004.</p> <p>5 Workshops for Priority conservation sites held in 5 regions (Moramanga, Ambatondrazaka, Vavatenina, Brickaville, Toamasina II. )</p> <p>Economical and sociological report disseminated and feed back from partners are available and incorporated. Studies on watershed economics (value of non-timber forest products, cost-benefit analyses of tavy, erosion avoidance and water provision benefits) in sample</p>

	<p>watersheds were made.</p> <p>The CEPF project enabled the leveraged investment of the USAID Health Population and Environment program, with focus on reproductive health and environmental health, to be implemented from 2004.</p>
<p>2.2 <i>Monitoring strategy and methods, based on Z-M corridor, produced and approved by partners by July of 2001</i></p>	<p>Monitoring of the environmental status of the two main project corridors has been ongoing for several years. The main environmental parameter is the status of forest cover, which was measured in the 2002 Madagascar forest cover map and by several other actors. This has led to a more comprehensive monitoring plan developed under the auspices of the USAID alliance that will be refined over the early part of 2005.</p>
<p>2.3 <i>A monitoring plan established for Z-M corridor in 2002 and used by stakeholders</i></p>	<p>A monitoring plan established for Z-M corridor linked to the activity above. The key analysis is the impact of project interventions on forest conservation, and this is ongoing. A study of impacts in the main corridor intervention zones showed that forest conservation was more effective inside these zones than in control zones.</p>
<p>2.4 <i>Monitoring plan facilitated</i></p>	<p>A monitoring plan for Ranomafana corridor is established and approved by the “ Plate-forme de Suivi et evaluation de la biodiversite”.</p> <p>Experiences within the corridor built up in collaboration with PACT and the CMP (Multi-local Planning Committee) in 2003</p>
<p><b>Output 3: Development and initial implementation of corridors management plans together with local partners</b></p>	
<p>3.1 <i>Development of Z-M Corridor management plan by end of 2001 and its implementation initiated in 2002 to be handled off to local partners by end of CEPF</i></p>	<p>The development of the corridor management plan was a process of negotiation that involved many partners, many of which changed with time. For instance, at the start of the CEPF project, the main planning authorities were the Province and the Commune Development Plans. Through CPEF support, amongst others, the Regional Development Committees have become the platform by which consultation on regional planning has been based. Even more recently, the provincial authorities role has been supplanted by the Regional Chiefs, who are now in the process of taking over the Regional Development Committees and ensuring that the Corridor Management Plans are implemented. The support structure developed by the CEPF project has ensured that all of these organizations and levels have been kept well informed with biodiversity and environmental information.</p> <p>At communal level, Guidelines of Communal Development Plan within the corridor Zahamena-Mantadia were developed by the CEPF project, in collaboration with “Direction Générale du Plan »</p> <p>A MOU with PDS (President of Special delegation) of Tamatave for Corridor Management Plan approved.</p> <p>A MOU with Moramanga CRD for Corridor Management Plan approved.</p> <p>Plate form is operational and involved in the coordination of partners' activity within the corridor. The corridor</p>

	<p>management plan needs to be refined.</p> <p>NGOs working in the six regions of Z-M corridor listed and their needs on capacity building are identified.</p> <p>Regional Water and Forest department supported in forest control activities (especially for slash and burn) in Toamasina II</p>
<p>3.2 Fianarantsoa corridor plan developed in partnership with NGO's and local groups by the end of 2002 and its implementation facilitated in 2003 to be handled off to local partners by the end of CEPF</p>	<p>A similar evolution in institutional responsibilities has been seen in the Ranomafana-Andringitra corridor. In this case, the Regional Development Committee (CMP) was developed earlier, so corridor planning has been integrated into their workplans from the first. The corridor management planning process has nevertheless required substantial effort and coordination, and CEPF support has been essential in ensuring that basic information such as corridor health, forest cover, management transfer, monitoring of logging permits and other issues has been up to date and used for management decisions.</p> <p>A first draft of the Ranomafana- Andringitra corridor plan developed in partnership with NGOs in 2002: This document highlighted the functionalities of the corridor and the threats to face, the planning process and the strategic regions for its management. It has to be completed by integrating the biological aspects, such as the biological priority setting exercises for the establishment of the future " site de conservation"</p> <p>In 2003 was implemented the Regional Zoning Process. Maps of the priority areas for conservation is now available</p>
<p><b>Output 4: Project management system installed &amp; operational (administration &amp; financial management, monitoring &amp;reporting, logistical &amp; technical support)</b></p>	
<p>4.1 Project management system developed &amp; operational in Tana</p>	<p>Gradually, over the period of CEPF support, project management has been increasingly delegated to the field offices. From the start the Mantadia-Zahamena corridor office in Moramanga was responsible for day-to-day project operations and supervision, but as responsibility increased and the role of other partners became greater, particularly those linked to USAID in the Alliance, the principal project office was moved to Tamatave to be closer to the center of decision-making. In the same way, the role of the office in Fianarantsoa has changed from one providing GIS support to a central partner in developing and supporting the implementation of the conservation vision of the corridor, through development of partnerships.</p>
<p>4.2 Management system installed &amp; operational in Moramanga</p>	<p>The responsibilities of the regional offices include data analysis, project supervision, and some project implementation (for instance silvicultural experiments) The latter pieces have largely been passed over to our local partners, as CI becomes more of a project partner than an implementer. The management system is therefore integrated into partner capacities rather than being removed when CI personnel move on.</p>

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

At the end of project activities, the situation is that the definition and implementation of a vision for the conservation of the biodiversity of the two priority corridors has been taken up by regional decision-making bodies and will be implemented through support from a wide range of actors, notably USAID and the many field partners. This success can be attributed to several factors- a focus on science as the basis for a conservation vision, a willingness to be flexible and inclusive in sharing information and resources, and above all a recognition that the ultimate success of conservation in the corridors depends on the actions of a set of motivated, clear-thinking and well-resourced local partners, who operate in collaboration via a democratic platform of consultation. These are all conditions that the CEPF project was fundamental in creating.

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

The part of the project that has had least progress is the implementation of a successful monitoring and evaluation plan. This is partly due to the difficulty of identifying viable indicators for biodiversity conservation success, which have only recently been the subject of agreement through the Conservation Measures Group. However the most important part of a monitoring and evaluation program for any area of forest in Madagascar is the forest cover change analysis, and this was used as a key part of the orientation of project activities through the life of the project.

## V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

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

A central principle of CI investment in conservation is that it must also contribute to improved living conditions. During this project numerous cost-benefit analyses showed that forest conservation was a better economic option than forest destruction. However those who receive benefits from forest conservation, at the regional scale, are not the same as those who pay the price. Therefore one theme of CPEF support was to ensure that benefits from good environmental management are dispersed to as wide a range of stakeholders as possible.

A fundamental principle of benefit-sharing is that it must be done transparently. In this project the role of and very existence of the regional development committees, as the central authorities for the regional development plans and the corridor management plans, is to ensure equitable sharing of information. In this respect transparency has been well served by the project.

## 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.***

- Project design is not a formula, and changing political and social situations require new solutions.

- Opportunities for success must be seized, in particular with new partners and funding sources- the USAID Alliance is an excellent example of this, where new language and priorities were not a brake in integrating the CEPF project into the USAID context
- Increasing the transparency of environmental decision-making is essential if collective benefits are to be realized, as these collective benefits are often greater than the sum of individual benefits taken in a non-transparent situation
- Biodiversity information is a critical piece of the conservation planning equation but is complex to acquire, analyse and particularly present, so that a lot of effort in explanation is required, over years if necessary

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

The pillars of success were:

- focus on good scientific information, and free access to it, in biodiversity, socio-economics and resource use
- Emphasis on partnership and flexibility
- Recognition of the need to compromise and be innovative

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

The organizational landscape in the two project areas was very complex. We could not afford to focus on one area or one theme in order to achieve the project goal. We had to ensure that we had experience at all levels, from direct interventions at the community level to integrating the regional vision into the national policy framework, at all times maintaining the principles expressed above. The key to success has been the recognition of opportunity, and the transformation of that opportunity into action, undertaken in partnership with local and regional actors who will be the long-term beneficiaries of good environmental management in the two regions.

**VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING**

**Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.**

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
USAID/MIRAY Project	B	\$ 164,957.15	
Moore	B	\$ 120,614.95	

**\*Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:**

- A** Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)
- B** Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF project)
- C** Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)

**D** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.

<b>VII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
---