

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Conservation International - Madagascar

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): Madagascar Small Grants Project

Implementation Partners for this Project: Node partners organizations (please see details below)

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): January 1, 2004 – September 30, 2008

Date of Report (month/year): December, 2008

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

[What I put here below is rather an introduction than opening remarks]

The Madagascar Small Grants project has focused on implementing the Node Program in several CI priority areas in Madagascar.

This project involves communities in conservation, provides economic benefits to local people, and catalyzes an economy based on conservation activity. Small grants were provided to community-level associations to undertake activities that contribute to conservation outcomes

Through this Node Program, CI/Madagascar (CI MAD) has partnered with intermediate organizations working at the regional level to provide and manage small grants to local associations and community-based organizations (CBOs).

The project also contributed to developing more information about threatened species in priority conservation sites identified by CI in Madagascar. Students were mobilized and involved in gathering information on the range and the population of threatened species.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: To involve local communities, researchers, local associations and NGOs in biodiversity conservation in CI priority areas, through the development and refinement of new funding mechanisms that are culturally and technically adapted to the beneficiaries.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	
At least 30% of the CI priority areas have local NGOs, students and communities contributing to conservation programs within in the second year of the project, 50% in the third year	<p>Six of 12 CI priority areas have local associations/NGOs and community-based organizations involved in carrying out activities leading to the achievement of conservation outcomes through this project.</p> <p>These areas include: Daraina, the Ankeniheny-Zahamena Corridor, the Mahavavy Kinkony Wetland complex, the Menabe forest complex, Nosivolo, the Fandriana-Vondrozo forest corridor.</p> <p>Tsitongambarika forest (Anosy region) has been recently added to the Node Program.</p>
30% of threatened species ranges and populations within CI priority areas better known in the second year, 50% in the third year	The Small Grant project was contributing to have a better knowledge of threatened species range and population within CI priority areas (please see table attached to this report)

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

Through the Node Program, CI MAD was able to develop field-level partnerships for conservation outcomes achievements. Through fruitful collaboration with intermediate regional NGOs (known as “Node partners”) more than 250 local associations and community-based organizations were mobilized and benefited from small grants for conservation activities linked to the improvement of human welfare at the community level.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs: (outputs from the project Logical Framework)

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: Node partners (intermediate regional grant manager organizations) around CI priority areas identified and their capacity strengthened	
<p>1.1. By the end of Year 4, 60% of regions containing CI priority areas are visited to identify and evaluate potential Node partners: 10% of regions in Year 1, a further 20% in Year 2, a further 20% in Year 3, and a further 10% in year 4</p>	<p>Field visits to identify potential Node organization partners and assess their capacity were performed in all regions targeted. Visits were conducted prior to and during Node project implementation.</p>
<p>1.2. Grant models (benchmarks) identified for 60% of CI priority areas: 10% areas in Year 1, a further 20% in Year 2, a further 20% in Year 3, a further 10% in Year 4</p>	<p>Grant themes allowing local associations and community-based organizations to contribute to conservation activities have been identified for all sites where Node projects were expected to be implemented.</p> <p>Themes for small grant allocation were identified according to the local context, priority needs, and impact on conservation and human welfare.</p> <p>Themes include: ecological monitoring, income generating activities, natural resource management activities, education-information-communication and awareness building on biodiversity conservation issues, forest restoration, management transfer, etc.</p>
<p>1.3. Reports on partner capacity assessments in 60% of CI priority areas are available by the end of Year 4: 10% in Year 1, a further 20% in Year 2, and a further 20% in Year 3, and a further 10% in Year 4</p>	<p>Capacity was assessed for the following Node Partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ASOS - DAI - BIMP-ASITY - Durrell - Fanamby <p>Sub Node organizations' (Rindra, ASOS, MATEZA, Haonaso, Ny Tanintsika) capacity assessments were run by Node</p>

	<p>partners (DAI Toamasina, DAI Fianarantsoa)</p> <p>Assessment tools such as organizational review; financial assessment questionnaire; organizational audit/due diligence, procedures manual analysis and field visits were used.</p>
<p>1.4. At least one priority partner capacity need is supported in 60% of CI priority areas by end of Year 4</p>	<p>Capacity building activities were mainly focused on local associations and CBOs who benefit from Node small grants, as well as on SubNodes, which aim to ensure the continuity and the sustainability of the Node approach in given sites.</p>
<p>Output 2 Node partners around CI priority areas sign small grant agreements with local communities or NGOs for conservation activity</p>	
<p>2.1. In the first year at least 2 priority nodes sign block grant management agreement with CI; a further 3 In Year 2, a further 3 in Year 3, and a further 2 in Year 4</p>	<p>CI Mad has signed grant agreements with all the Node organization partners during the implementation of the Node Program</p> <p>Eight block grant agreements were signed with DAI (2) Fanamby (2), BIMP (1) , Durrell (1), Tany Meva (1), ASOS (1)</p>
<p>2.2. In the first year 2 node partners allocate small grants to local communities and NGOs, a further 3 in Year 2, a further 3 in Year 3 and a further 2 in Year 4; an average of 10 micro-grants are managed by a node</p>	<p>All node partners allocated small grants to local associations/NGOs and CBOs during the performance period of this project: 270 grantees benefiting from 430 small grants from Node partners.</p>
<p>Output 3. Status of threatened species and habitats in CI priority areas known through studies funded by this project</p>	
<p>3.1. University and NGO partners conducting research on threatened species and habitats in CI priority areas are informed about CI grant mechanisms and procedures</p>	<p>A meeting informing students of grant mechanisms and procedures was held at the beginning of the project.</p> <p>Further, workshops with University departments and NGO partners involved in threatened species studies was</p>

	organized to inform them on research priorities and on grant mechanisms and procedures as well
3.2. Three species or habitat conservation studies agreements signed in the first year, three more in each subsequent year	12 threatened species studies small grant agreements were signed with students under this Madagascar Small Grants Project
3.3. At least one study finished in the first year, three studies finished in each subsequent year	All of the 12 studies were finished by the end of this project.
Output 4. CI requested by other funders to manage small grant funds for conservation	
4.1. One funder requests CI to manage funds for grants in Year 2, and a further one in Year 3	The Tsunami Foundation decided to give funds to CI MAD to contribute to Menabe Node project

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

CI MAD can now develop and strengthen its partnership with the regional intermediate Node organizations, which are now all Malagasy NGOs (except Durrell), to ensure the sustainability of this funding mechanism for the involvement and the mobilization of locally-based partners for conservation actions.

Node organization partners demonstrated their ability to increase awareness and mobilize local actors, to support capacity development and to manage a small grants portfolio. They also learned lessons that help them to improve their capacity to continue acting as Nodes. They can use their capacity for mobilizing other regional sources of funding for continuing small grants for communities

Local associations and CBOs reached by the Node Program became involved in conservation issues through the implementation of micro-projects funded by this Madagascar Small Grants Project. In addition, the funded activities provided a response to their human welfare improvement needs.

Regarding threatened species studies supported by this Small Grants Project, results were used as an input to scientific workshop prior to the identification and implementation of new protected areas,

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

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.

An evaluation workshop of the Node Program was held in July 2008. This session gathered all Node partners to share experiences and identify lessons – positive and negative– to be analyzed for the development of the consolidation phase of the Node Program.

These lessons included the following:

- **Communication campaigns and awareness building** – Node organizations began the grant making program by implementing communication campaigns, which included gathering partners and potential grantees to discuss conservation issues and the need for grassroots action. These efforts resulted in a new momentum for local conservation activity.
- **Local capacity for proposal and project design** – Node organizations provided support to potential grantees to improve their proposals, and also accompanied grantees throughout the grant's life cycle. These efforts increased local capacity in these areas.
- **Community organizational structure** – Nodes spurred community-level organization, including the creation of legally-recognized associations.
- **Grantee mentoring** – Each Node organization provided technical support for local grantees. This support included all areas of the granting process: proposal, budget, award, implementation, monitoring, reporting.
- **Leveraging other partner support** – In many cases, the grant award resulted in new or reinforced partnerships at the local level. For instance, technical assistance for agriculture projects was often provided by partner organizations while the Node grant funded purchase of inputs or equipment.
- **Community-level work** – The Node grants reached the most local level, which is often difficult for larger projects to achieve.
- **Ongoing communication** – As Node grants were awarded, ongoing communication efforts via rural radio or other media were often used to maintain a high level of interest and enthusiasm about the projects.
- **Involvement of local and traditional authorities** – Node organizations deliberately involved local and traditional authorities in various aspects of grantmaking or monitoring. This effort resulted in positive relationships and increased exposure for grant recipients.
- **Financial management capacity** – Node organizations worked hand-in-hand with grant recipients (especially those at the community level) to ensure they had the appropriate level of financial management capacity. This is a skill that will serve these associations in the future as they embark on other endeavors.

- **Grant management capacity** – Node and sub-Node organizations made great efforts to improve their grant management abilities. This effort will help them as they solicit additional funds and/or endowments.
- **SubNodes in CAZ and COFAV** – In the two large forest corridors, Sub-Nodes were created to disburse the grant management burden and to ensure local granting making throughout these large areas. This approach to decentralizing grantmaking resulted in grants and the most local level in the most critical areas.
- **Grantmaking procedures for the community level** – Given the risks involved in community grantmaking, the procedures for awarding and managing grants were adapted to the local reality at the community level. In some cases, this included making in-kind grants.
- **Long-term community-level partners** – Node grants enabled the identification of well-organized, dynamic community-level associations who can now serve as long-term conservation partners in their areas. They can champion conservation while ensuring community benefits from their efforts.
- **Decentralized decision making** – Node and Sub-Node organizations were empowered to make grantmaking decision up to a certain level, which increased the efficiency of how grants were awarded and managed.
- **Community socio-economic conditions** – In several cases, grant results confirmed the hypothesis upon which the Node Program was developed – that conservation work and contribute to improved livelihoods at the local level.

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)

Long discussions with each Node partners happened prior to the conclusion of block grant agreement with them. Node partners and CI MAD discussed a lot on thematic criteria upon which small grants had to be awarded to community based organizations and local associations. The link between themes proposed by Node partners and biodiversity conservation aspects needed to be demonstrated.

Designing and implementing a strong and efficient monitoring and evaluation system is key for a success of such a project. Monitoring and evaluation should focused on results as well as impacts on conservation and on human welfare

The success of the Node program is mainly based on the existence of local implementing partners having the needed capacities to manage grants, support communities and local associations, and technically support the implementation of small projects. But hiring a full time staff to manage the Node Program would have been contributing to better results especially regarding the respect of planned activities, a closer monitoring of node projects as well as the gathering and treatment of information and reports from those field projects.

Reinforcement of the communication related to the Node Program will be one aspect not to be neglected. As well as the communication to potential financial partners to the Program, the

communication and exchanges between implementing partners (Node organizations) should be strengthened and encouraged

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
Gordon & Betty Moore Foundation	A	US \$ 588,590	This was to fund 03 Node partner organizations (DAI for the Fandriana Vondrozo corridor, Ankeniheny-Zahamena corridor, Tany Meva for Vohidrazana-Mantadia corridor, ASOS for Tsitongambarika corridor). Funds are allocated for small grants to be awarded for local associations and community based organizations, and for support activities
Tsunami Foundation	C	US \$20,000	Complementary funding for the Menabe Node project (Fanamby)
		US \$	
		US \$	

***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 funded 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 funded 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.

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF aims to increase sharing of experiences, lessons learned and results among our grant recipients and the wider conservation and donor communities. One way we do this is by making the text of final project completion reports available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and by marketing these reports in our newsletter and other communications. Please indicate whether you would agree to publicly sharing your final project report with others in this way.

Yes _____

No _____

If yes, please also complete the following:

For more information about this project, please contact:

Name: Haingo RAJAOFARA

Mailing address: Conservation International Madagascar, 6 Rue Razafindratandra, Ambohidahy, Antananarivo 101, Madagascar

Tel: (261) 20 22 609 79

Fax: (261) 20 22 250 29

E-mail: hrajaofara@conservation.org

IX- ATTACHEMENT

Madagascar Small Grants Project, Funded by CEPF, from Jan 2004 to Sept 2008

Project Purpose on threatened species: 30% of threatened species range and population within CI priority areas better known in the second year, 50% in the third year.

Activities			FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08
1. Update IUCN Redlist	#threatened species 2004	Indicators					
Amphibians	54	percentage of threatened species assessed annually by taxon	100	0	0	100	100
Birds	36		0	0	0	0	0
Fish	57		100	100	0	0	0
Mammals	50		0	100	0	0	0
Plants	278		24.46043	0.392086	0	0	0
Reptils	18		0	0	0	0	0.277778
Arthropods	42		0	0	0	0	0
2. Global species assessment		Percentage of taxon assessed	42.85714	57.14286		0	0.714286
3. Biological inventories within CI priority sites		Percentage of site inventoried biologically	0.583333	0.625	0.75	0	100
4- Biological monitoring implemented for globally threatened species		Percentage of globally threatened species in Madagascar Hotspot with monitoring in place		Target value:100% (213 / 213 species)	Tentative value: 53.52% (114 / 213 species)	Tentative value: 20.18% (43 / 213 species)	Tentative value 38.02% (81/213)