

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Conservation International - Madagascar
Project Title:	Consolidating the Node Small Grants Program to Engage Local Actors in Biodiversity Conservation in Madagascar
Date of Report:	28 February, 2013
Report Author and Contact Information	Author: Soloson Ramanahadray, CI Madagascar Program; sramanahadray@conservation.org

CEPF Region: Madagascar

Strategic Direction: 7. Consolidation

Grant Amount: US\$749,837

Project Dates: 1 August, 2008 to 31 December, 2012

Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner):

National NGOs called *Node partners*: Acting as decentralized and intermediate structures within this Node Small grants project, these NGOs awarded and managed small grants at the local scale for the benefit of communities based on locally expressed needs. In addition, these Node NGOs provided technical support on the projects for which grants were provided to ensure their successful completion. The Nodes also provided financial guidance and organizational support to recipient community associations.

Local associations and community-based organizations were involved in participatory natural resource management. They implemented small projects to address their livelihood needs as an accompaniment to sustainable use of natural resources in and around new protected areas. The livelihood projects acted as an encouragement and improved their commitment to natural resource conservation.

Local authorities (commune and fokontany administrative levels) are key stakeholders. Node partners keep them informed of every decision made concerning small projects in their localities.

Ministry of Forest through its local administration (DREF & CIREF) received reports from communities about criminal activities related to natural resource management and are responsible for law enforcement.

Conservation Impacts

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

The Node Small Grants Program responded directly to CEPF's strategy 5: Biodiversity Action Fund. The Node program was a flexible mechanism to ensure conservation action in the face of unforeseen circumstances that may have negatively affected biodiversity. In addition, the Node Program facilitated inter-institutional coordination, not only between CI Madagascar and Node organizations, but among Node organizations as well. The Node Program supported small-scale capacity building at the level of individual Node organizations, the collective group of Node organizations, and community based organization grantees. Finally, the Node Program represented an opportunity to multiply the effects of previous CEPF investment that had gone into supporting the development of new protected areas in Madagascar. CEPF investment in livelihood activities around new protected areas highlighted the need to fund such activities and led to replication by other donors as well as leveraging of additional resources for livelihood support.

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.

The Node program funded 399 micro-projects for 236 beneficiary community associations. Over 6,120 households benefitted from the program and through independent evaluations, the majority of households sampled report that their livelihoods have been improved through the project. Of these households, the most important improvements reported were increases in food security, health and household revenues.

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

- Decreased deforestation and resource degradation in the project sites
- Increased household-level income in the project sites
- Strong Node partners with a diverse portfolio of funding sources

Actual Progress Toward Long-term Impacts at Completion:

An independent assessment of the NODE program was carried out in February 2012 by BEST (Bureau d'Expertise Sociale et de Diffusion Technique). Progress towards the long term impacts is reported in relation to this report. Nevertheless, it should be noted that long term benefits need to be measured a long time after the project. At this stage it is only possible to report on the impacts noted to date. The great majority of the livelihood activities that have been supported through the Node program have been designed to be self perpetuating and the benefits should build up over time.

An independent external evaluation of the NODE program reported that people have the perception of decreasing pressure on natural resources because of less frequentation in the protected areas, improved commitment to conservation because of perceived benefits from alternative livelihood activities and rising awareness of conservation. Through this external evaluation, surveys were carried out with 359 persons. Nevertheless, threats to protected areas remain severe and the Node program has also been ongoing during a period of political instability that has been characterized by poor natural resource governance (as demonstrated by problems with illegal forestry, illegal mining and increased wildlife trade).

In addition to the monitoring of perceptions about pressure on natural resources as measured through the independent evaluation, CI and partners are also updating national deforestation analyses for 2010 through a separate project. These analyses based on detection of deforestation from satellite images will provide detailed statistics along comparison of deforestation rates in areas that have and have not received livelihood support from the Node small grant program. These analyses are expected to be available in the second half of 2013.

According to the BEST assessment, many of the beneficiaries of small grants reported that the activities supported had already led to improvements in incomes that allowed people to do things such as invest in a small business, repair a house, or to pay school fees for their children. According to the evaluation, 43% of Node beneficiary households surveyed felt that the projects had already significantly improved their standard of living just 1-2 years after the project. Of these households, the most important improvements were made in food security, health and revenues:

- 94% declared a qualitative and quantitative improvement in terms of food and nutrition
- 93% acknowledged an improvement of their family health conditions
- 97% felt that they were better able to face family and community financial obligations like school fees or cost of medical care.

This result demonstrates that further support is needed for the communities and reflects the fact that the existing projects are part of longer term strategies to deliver livelihood improvements. The proportion of people reporting significant improvements should increase over time, particularly for projects for which revenues are only projected after several years (e.g. investments in tree crops such as Ravintsara).

During the course of this phase of the Node program, some Node partners developed proposals and obtained funding from additional sources : \$45,000 from World Bank for ANAE in Ankeniheny-Zahamena, \$20,000 from Better U Foundation and \$112,100 from the Helmsley Charitable Trust for ANAE in Ankeniheny-Zahamena, \$26,000 from JOAC (Jersey Overseas Aid Committee) for Durrell in Nosivolo and €32,000 from FFEM and \$145,000 from the "Fondation pour la Biodiversité" for ASITY in Mahavavy-Kinkony.

In addition, the Nodes model has been integrated into the long term plans for CI's REDD+ projects in the Ankeniheny-Zahamena Corridor (CAZ) and the Ambositra-Vondrozo Forest Corridor (COFAV). In both cases, future carbon revenues are expected to provide sufficient funding to maintain livelihood activities for the communities surrounding the corridors (e.g. in the case of CAZ carbon revenues are expected to provide \$394,000 per year and in the case of COFAV advance carbon payments have already contributed \$401,769 to the Nodes program). In addition, the Nodes model has been important in demonstrating that small grants targeted carefully at community organizations around protected areas can be effective at building local support for new protected areas while encouraging activities that should reduce pressures long term. The inclusion of \$134,400 for such activities in the Government of Madagascar's extension to its environment program was largely inspired by the Nodes program although for contractual reasons it will not be implemented through a small grant mechanism.

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

- Increased awareness of the importance of conservation and sustainable natural resources management
- Increased number of households with access to funding for conservation-related projects and activities
- Well-established Node partners with the ability to issue, manage, monitor, and evaluate grants effectively and efficiently

Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:

The community awareness of the importance of conservation and sustainable resources management has increased gradually throughout the project implementation. Community organizations have begun to implement conservation activities alongside livelihood projects and there is greater adherence of rules related to the management of protected areas. For example at Ankeniheny-Zahamena, the community groups benefiting from the Nodes program are active participants in the monthly protected area management meetings held by Federations of the community forest management bodies. At Nosivolo, 84 new villages take actions and respect the fishery closure in order to protect endemic species in Nosivolo River. In Mahavavy-Kinkony Complex, communities perform restoration of aquatic habitats and do ecological monitoring.

Further, households have begun to have access to funding for conservation-related projects: through SGP/GEF (Small Grant program of GEF) and World Bank funding in Ankeniheny-Zahamena, through JOAC in Nosivolo, and through FFEM and the "Fondation pour la Biodiversité" in Mahavavy-Kinkony. Where it is possible, community associations have begun to open deposit accounts to establish revolving funds to help assure the sustainability of their activities. Currently 33% of households benefiting from NODE funding are affiliated to rural savings and loan associations whereas almost none were at the beginning of the project. Node partners are now fairly well established and are able to issue, manage, monitor and evaluate grants. As already noted, several have been able to attract funding directly from donors. Nevertheless, capacity building is an ongoing process to enable partners to get better.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: 276,836Ha (Mahavavy-Kinkony Complex), 5,993Ha (Nosivolo), 70,837Ha (Daraina-Loky-Manambato), 195,000Ha (Menabe), 371,000Ha (CAZ)

Species Conserved:

Mahavavy-Kinkony

Birds : *Amaurornis olivieri*, *Anas bernieri*, *Anas melleri*, *Ardea humbloti*, *Ardeola idae*, *Threskiornis bernieri*, *Haliaeetus vociferoides*, *Xenopirostris damii*, *Glareola ocularis*, *Circus macroscelus*, *Charadrius thoracicus*, *Tachybaptus pelzelni*

Mammals : *Pteropus rufus*, *Myzopoda sp.nov.*, *Scotophilus marovaza*, *Rousettus madagascariensis*, *Triaenops furculus*, *Eulemur mongoz*, *Propithecus deckenii*, *Hapalemur occidentalis*, *Propithecus coronatus*, *Propithecus verreauxi*

Fish : *Paretroplus dambabe*, *Paretroplus kieneri*, *Panchypanchax sp. nov.*, *Paratilapia polleni*,

Reptiles : *Erymnochelys madagascariensis*, *Sanzinia madagascariensis*, *Acrantophis dumerili*, *Acrantophis madagascariensis*

Plants : *Avicennia sp.*, *Rhizophora sp.*, *Dalbergia chlorocarpa*, *Dalbergia glaberrima*, *Dalbergia madagascariensis*, *Commiphora*, *Erythrophleum couminga*, *Borassus madagascariensis*

Nosivolo

Fish : *Oxylapia polli*, *Rheocles wrightae*, *Katria katria*, *Paratilapia fony*, *Bedotia sp.* *Nosivolo*, *Rheocles sikorae*, *Paretroplus polyactis*, *Agonostomus telfairi*, *Mesopristes elongatus*, *Ancharius brevibarbus*, *Ancharius fuscus*

Birds : *Anas melleri*, *Glareola ocularis*, *Rallus madagascariensis*, *Neodrepanis hypoxantha*, *Brachypteracias leptosomus*

Mammifera : *Daubentonia madagascariensis*, *Eulemur rubiventer*, *Hapalemur griseus griseus*, *Prolemur simus*, *Propithecus diadema edwardsi*, *Varecia variegata variegata*, *Pteropus rufus*, *Avahi laniger*, *Cheirogalus major*

CAZ

Mammifera : *Indri indri*; *Propithecus diadema*; *Varecia variegata* ; *Eulemur fulvus* ; *Eulemur rubriventer* ; *Hapalemur griseus* ; *Prolemur simus* ; *Daubentonia madagascariensis* , *Microcebus lehilahytsara*, *Allocebus trichotis*, *Prolemur simus*, *Cheirogaleus crossleyi*.

Birds: *Lophotibis cristata*, *Aviceda madagascariensis*, *Atelornis pittoïdes*, *Pseudobias wardi*, *Monticola sharpei*, *Dromaeocercus brunneus*, *Hartertula flavoviridis*, *Randia pseudozosterops*, *Sarothrura watersi*

Amphibians and Reptiles : *Mantella mylotympanum*, *Paroedura masobe*, *Scaphiophryne boribory*, *Mantella crocea*, *Mantella aurantiaca*

Flora : 5 endemic families, 72 endemic genders, 1585 endemic species

Corridors Created: *The Ankeniheny-Zahamena Corridor (CAZ) is now under temporary protection*

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

The project reached very remote localities where even big donor programs and projects have not been delivering support

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

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:

Renegotiation and finalization of grant agreements with six Node partners

Component 1 Actual at Completion:

8 agreements were signed with six partners. Those six partners are

- ✓ Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust which implemented the Node project in Nosivolo,
- ✓ Asity Madagascar which implemented the Node project for Mahavavy-Kinkony
- ✓ Fanamby which implemented two NODE Projects: in Daraina-Loky- Manambato and Menabe. A 3rd bloc grant was developed for FANAMBY in Menabe.
- ✓ MATEZA which implemented the Node project for the northern part of Ankeniheny- Zahamena Corridor
- ✓ ANAE which implemented the Node project for the southern part of Ankeniheny- Zahamena Corridor. The initial partner (RINDRA) was replaced by ANAE because of its low capacity.
- ✓ ODDIT which implemented the Node project for the east part of Ankeniheny- Zahamena Corridor.

Although initially determined, ASOS was dismissed because of bad governance observed. After a thorough investigation, the new organization called ODDIT (Organe de Développement du Diocèse de Toamasina) was identified to implement the Node Program.

In order to acquire more results and better deliverables, Nosivolo and Mahavavy-Kinkony's agreements were extended respectively to April 2012 and September 2012.

51 quarterly financial reports and 8 final financial reports were received and approved for 5 sites : Mahavavy-Kinkony (Asity), CAZ (ANAE, Mateza and ODDIT), Nosivolo (Durrell), Menabe (Fanamby) and Daraina-Loky-Manambato (Fanamby).

17 semi-annual technical reports and 8 final technical reports were received and approved from those 5 sites.

At the project completion, 399 small grant agreements were signed between Node partners and community-based organizations or other local actors (102 in CAZ, 5 in Daraina-Loky-Manambato, 219 for Nosivolo, 66 in Mahavavy Kinkony and 7 in Menabe).

Approximately, a bimonthly field visit was performed by the Node manager, a CI Madagascar staff member fully in charge of the NODE program management. A technician from CI staff based in Toamasina supported him to oversee field-level activities by Node partners and community-level grant recipients at CAZ. Priority was accorded to the site where partners needed more guidance and advice. Sometimes, Node partners asked for assistance but usually CI identified the critical moment to perform site visits.

Component 2 Planned:

Reinforce Node partners to (1) manage grants, (2) coach community-level grant recipients in implementing and reporting on grant activities, (3) monitor impacts of Node grants, and (4) secure funds from new financial sources

Component 2 Actual at Completion:

In order to reinforce Node partners and improve their capacities, the Node manager conducted capacity needs assessment for some of them.

A capacity building operational action plan was set up for CAZ, Nosivolo and Mahavavy Kinkony. The planned actions refer to financial training, value chain analysis, grants management, reporting and data collection.

At Ankeniheny- Zahamena. 3 Node partners, 2 PCV (Peace Corps Volunteer) and 'Fédérations' delegates in this site benefited from financial and value chain analysis trainings. As a new partner of CI Madagascar, ODDIT has received an initial financial and administrative training. All NODE partners were trained in collecting data using SMS system during the NODE Program assembly in January 2011.

Report on capacity building activities at Nosivolo was also available after 2 trainings (Value chain analysis and organizational development for associations). Unplanned capacity building actions were also performed during project identification and proposal writing for the new Node in the CAZ. Communities also received support to setup proposals (programmatic & budget) for microprojects.

Besides those planned actions, supervisory missions were also an opportunity to deliver capacity building. Mentoring and advice were shared with the Node partners and with community based organizations during those field visits.

An external evaluator was hired to perform an assessment of the NODE Program. This organization collected and analyzed data at CAZ, Nosivolo and CMK. The same tasks were also done at Ambositra – Vondrozo Corridor using another funding source. The external evaluation results of the NODE Program were shared during the annual meeting of Node implementing partners (ANAE, MATEZA, ODDIT, HAONASOA, NY TANINTSIKA, FANAMBY, DURRELL and ASITY). This report was also disseminated and shared with Ministry of forest. The additional funding (related to Environmental Program 3) from World Bank was negotiated largely based on the Node model.

Annual data on households and micro-grants for CAZ, CMK, Menabe and Nosivolo were compiled.

Two meetings were organized to share news on the Node program and to convince potential donors to adopt Node concept. Information and news from Node Program were reported in a CI quarterly newspaper called Songadina. Another meeting with a potential donor (Better U Foundation) was held to share news on the Node program and on its approaches and success. After negotiation with CI, Better U Foundation granted \$20,000 to ANAE for implementing Node Approach in intensive riziculture technique (SRI).

Marketing tools of the NODE Program were created. The new version of the Node factsheet that was edited, printed and served as supporting document for proposals. Some NODE success stories were gathered to make a 28 pages calendar (2013). This booklet was shared with partners (donors, international NGOs, national NGOs and associations, projects and programs, mining companies, ministries, communities, and universities).

NODE concept note and proposal were developed and were submitted to Helmsley Charitable Trust and the Swift Family Foundation. The results of the external evaluation were used to design these proposals. As a result of these actions, CAZ was chosen to benefit funds from Helmsley Charitable Trust.

Component 3 Planned:

Build a network of small grant making institutions (i.e., Node partners and other small grant makers) to ensure learning, exchange of ideas, and coordination

Component 3 Actual at Completion:

A 1st annual meeting among Node partners was held in January 2011 in Antananarivo. This special event for learning and sharing experiences gathered 8 NODE implementing partners through 11 sites. We also used this meeting as an opportunity to present the NODE Program to a wide range of donors present in Antananarivo (World Bank, European Union, KFW, USAID, large NGOs such as CARE, CRS, ADRA, and mining companies interested in models for funding communities as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility programs).

Another learning and experience sharing workshop among NODE partners combined with the presentation of the NODE program evaluation was held in February 2012. The results of the external evaluation of the NODE Program were summarized and an executive summary and a short report made available. The evaluation results helped to shape the proposal to the Helmsley Charitable Trust and its recommendations were used to implement the project funded by Helmsley Charitable Trust. Furthermore, external evaluation report of the NODE Program is a key document to be analyzed through the project funded by Swift Family Foundation. This project aims to assess CI Madagascar's projects involving CBOs through CI's Rights Based Approach and their impacts on livelihoods

Once the model of the NODE bulletin was designed, publishing and printing of the first issue were done in February 2011. Soa An'Ala is the name we chose to bestow on it. Three issues of the Node Bulletin were produced and distributed. Soa An'Ala is completely written in Malagasy language and is targeted at communities benefiting from the Node program. The NODE bulletins were produced and distributed with partners who shared them with local communities. Apart from NODE classical partners, journalists received

an electronic version of Soa An'Ala leading to further reporting in the media and some copies have been deposited in the US Embassy Environmental Press Center. In addition, information and news from the Node Program are also reported in a CI quarterly newspaper called Songadina.

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

No planned activities were unrealized

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

- Node Factsheet
- Success stories Calendar 2013
- Executive summary and the full copy of the external evaluation
- Copies of Soa An'Ala
- Copies of grant management manuals

Lessons Learned

Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building. Consider lessons that would inform projects designed or implemented by your organization or others, as well as lessons that might be considered by the global conservation community.

Having a Node manager who is a full time person is key to ensure an efficient and successful implementation and management is essential to such a program. Apart from CEPF portfolio, CI also manages the Node Small Grants program funded by DELL corporation in the Corridor Forestier Ambositra Vondrozo (COFAV). In order to reinforce the approach, CI mobilized two other technicians in CAZ and COFAV to assist the Node manager in supervising the Program under all current and potential donors (World Bank, Helmsley Charitable Trust).

An initial planning period is necessary to focus first on discussing and negotiating with Node Organization partners on their proposals to consolidate the Node projects on their implementing sites. Those negotiations took a long time to be finalized, due to long discussions with partners and in-depth assessment made on all proposals they submitted, on programmatic, financial and organizational aspects. Although it took a long time, discussing and negotiating a lot with Node Organizations partners led to a better knowledge of the local context of targeted sites, and allowed anticipating the future successes of this program on sites, in terms of community based-organization involvement and the impacts targeted to be reached.

A launching workshop during which all Node Partners attended started this Node program Consolidation Phase. This launching workshop also was held to run the first capacity building activities for Node Partners namely regarding the program management. The workshop helped to build the broader Node network of partners from the very beginning of the project. Long negotiations were then followed by the signature of block grant agreements between CI and Node Partners, and first grant disbursements were made.

Capacity building of Node Partners and then of CBOs is key for such program integrating both small project implementation and small grants management. However the administrative aspects of grants remained extremely challenging for most community based organizations throughout the period of the project. It is therefore essential to build in strong oversight when the final beneficiaries of the projects have extremely weak capacity. Expectations of the speed with which CBOs can adopt good practice need to remain realistic.

Production of the NODE bulletin was important to all partners of the NODE Program and especially to the communities. It allowed sharing experiences, success stories and information about small project implemented in all sites covered by the Node Program among communities and other stakeholders in those New Protected Area in which the NODE program was implemented. Besides the communication role of the Bulletin, it also raised the pride of local organizations and farmers sharing their experience and showing their results. But developing the node bulletin is not so easy as it seems. It required strong commitment from

Node implementers and CI. Gathering information and articles required a lot of time investment and writing in journalistic style demands a specific capacity from the author.

During the current political trouble in the country, mobilizing donors become harder than ever. After the NODE Program workshop held in January 2011, a memorandum of understanding with PSDR (the Government's Rural Development Support Program) was proposed further to a discussion with its management staff. The purpose of this agreement is to foster the NODE Program in ANAE's sites near Moramanga (CAZ). Nevertheless, this did not happen.

There is an important economy of scale aspect that needs to be built into funding to the Node organizations. The more money is granted to Node organization, the more investment is provided to communities and the proportion of budget to administration is lessened. In the case of Madagascar, we estimated that future annual grants to Nodes should not be less than \$80,000 to ensure that 75% of this gets to communities as grants.

Organizing annual workshop gathering all NGOs Node partners is important to reinforce NGOs capacities and to find out funding strategies to develop the CI Madagascar Node Program. In fact, the Node Program currently involves 10 NGO partners working in 7 of CI Madagascar's priority landscapes.

January until April is the cyclone and rainy season in Madagascar. Travelling during this period is harder than usual because of the bad state of the tracks and activities at all sites were slowed by this bad weather. In order to acquire more results and better deliverables, Nosivolo and Mahavavy-Kinkony's agreements were extended. Factoring in seasonal changes into the original project planning is essential.

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

This project was developed to give benefits to community based organizations managing natural resources. The approach claims that 75% of Node partners' budget should be directly allowed to communities and this condition was fully respected.

The NODE program was designed through a participatory approach, by collecting community based organizations wishes in terms of small projects they wish to implement , and discussing at length and negotiating with NGO partners which have significant experience and knowledge of the region where the program was to be implemented

Project Implementation: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings)

All 5 sites of this Node project are categorized as New Protected Areas. Node partners give support to remote communities which are very distant to each other. The project reached disadvantaged and vulnerable people. The monitoring and supervision of small projects became harder but despite this, NGO partners and CBOs benefiting from small grants received adequate support (organization and technical capacity building, financial resources through grants, technical advice). The explanation of this may come from the decentralized and networking approach adopted with this Node Program.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

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	Notes
Moore Foundation	A	\$30.173	For Mangoky-Ihotry
Salary Cost Share	A	\$29,334	8 persons involved in the project
Tsunami Foundation	A	\$63.365	For Fanamby in Menabe
World Bank	B	\$45,000	For ANAE in Ankeniheny-Zahamena
Better U Foundation	B	\$20,000	For ANAE in Ankeniheny-Zahamena
Helmsley Charitable Trust	B	\$112,100	For ANAE in Ankeniheny-Zahamena
JOAC (Jersey Overseas Aid Committee)	B	\$26,000	For Durrell in Nosivolo
FFEM	B	€32,000	For ASITY in Mahavavy-Kinkony
"Fondation pour la Biodiversité"	B	\$145,000	For ASITY in Mahavavy-Kinkony
DELL Foundation	C	\$401,769	For Fandriana-Vondrozo Corridor
EP3 Additional Funding	C	\$134,400	For Fandriana-Vondrozo Corridor
NORAD	C	\$55,857	Grants for CAZ

****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.

In order to deal with the challenge related to the sustainability of generating income activities funded through Node micro-grant, training in value chain analysis was organized for Node implementers and communities. This training aims to control market, assure outlet and manage supply and demand. In addition, so as to respect the natural capital, technical option is carefully chosen to be sustainable and doesn't harm the ecosystem. Organizational capacity building allows communities to become an economic agent pursuing

profitability and economic benefits. These objectives make them more and more independent from natural resource predation.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

Not applicable

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: Haingo Rajaofara

Organization name: CI Madagascar Program

Mailing address: Lot II 27 D – Villa Hajanirina – Rue Vittori François Ankorahotra

Po Box. 5178 - 101 Antananarivo - Madagascar

Tel: (261) 20 22 609 79, (261) 20 22 612 72

Fax: (261) 20 22 250 29

E-mail: hajaofara@conservation.org

*****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

(Enter Grant Term)

Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant.
Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project.

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 1 July, 2012 to 31 December, 2012 (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.	Yes	919,666Ha	919,666Ha	<p>Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mahavavy-Kinkony Complex: 276,836Ha • Nosivolo: 5,993Ha • Ankeniheny-Zahamena Corridor : 371,000Ha • Daraina-Loky-Manambato: 70,837Ha • Menabe: 195,000Ha
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	Yes	919,666Ha	919,666Ha	<p>Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mahavavy-Kinkony Complex: 276,836Ha • Nosivolo: 5,993Ha • Ankeniheny-Zahamena Corridor : 371,000Ha • Daraina-Loky-Manambato: 70,837Ha • Menabe: 195,000Ha
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.	Yes	919,666Ha	919,666Ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mahavavy-Kinkony Complex: 276,836Ha • Nosivolo: 5,993Ha • Ankeniheny-Zahamena Corridor : 371,000Ha • Daraina-Loky-Manambato: 70,837Ha • Menabe: 195,000Ha
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	yes	375	399	<p>399 communities receiving grants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 66 for Mahavavy-Kinkony Complex • 219 for Nosivolo • 102 for Ankeniheny-Zahamena Corridor • 5 for Daraina-Loky-Manambato • 7 for Menabe

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

Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

Please complete this table if your project provided concrete socioeconomic benefits to local communities. List the name of each community in column one. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes. In the bottom row, provide the totals of the Xs for each column.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics								Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit												
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists/nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty rate	Other	Increased Income due to:				Increased food security due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural practices	More secure access to water resources	Improved tenure in land or other natural resource due to titling, reduction of colonization, etc.	Reduced risk of natural disasters (fires, landslides, flooding, etc)	More secure sources of energy	Increased access to public services, such as education, health, or credit	Improved use of traditional knowledge for environmental management	More participatory decision-making due to strengthened civil society and governance.	Other
									Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services									
43 communities for Mahavavy-Kinkony Complex	X	X					X		X	X	X							X	X		
109 communities for Nosivolo	X	X				X	X		X		X						X	X	X		
78 communities for Ankeniheny-Zahamena Corridor	X	X				X	X		X	X				X				X	X		
3 communities for Daraina-Loky-Manambato	X	X				X	X		X				X	X		X	X		X		
3 community for Menabe	X	X					X		X	X	X										
Total	5	5	0	0	0	3	5	0	5	3	3	0	5	1	1	1	1	2	3	4	0

If you marked "Other", please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit: