

## Darwin Initiative Capability & Capacity Annual Report

To be completed with reference to the “Project Reporting Information Note”:  
(<https://www.darwininitiative.org.uk/resources-for-projects/information-notes-learning-notes-briefing-papers-and-reviews/>).

It is expected that this report will be a **maximum of 20 pages** in length, excluding annexes)

**Submission Deadline: 30<sup>th</sup> April 2023**

- **Submit to: [BCF-Reports@niras.com](mailto:BCF-Reports@niras.com) including your project ref in the subject line**

- **Darwin Initiative Project Information**

Project reference	No: DARCC016
Project title	Strengthening managers' and local communities' capacity for more resilient conservation
Country/ies	Madagascar
Lead Partner	Laboratoire de Recherches Appliquées, Department of Forests, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques (LRA, ESSA-Forêts), University of Antananarivo
Project partner(s)	Bangor University, Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, Impact Madagascar, Kew Madagascar Conservation Center, Madagascar National Parks
Darwin Initiative grant value	
Start/end dates of project	01st May 2022 / 30th November 2023
Reporting period (e.g. Apr 2022 – Mar 2023) and number (e.g. Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	Annual Report 1
Project Leader name	Dr Sarobidy Rakotonarivo
Project website/blog/social media	<a href="http://forest4climateandpeople.org/mirari.php.en">MiRARI – Mitantana ara-dRARIny: http://forest4climateandpeople.org/mirari.php.en</a> Facebook: <a href="https://web.facebook.com/mirari.mg">https://web.facebook.com/mirari.mg</a> Twitter: @Forest4People
Report author(s) and date	

### 1. Project summary

Madagascar has exceptional biodiversity but the world's highest recorded rate of extreme poverty. Despite global benefits of conservation exceeding local costs, and widespread consensus (and international agreements) that the poorest should not bear the costs of conservation, our previous work has shown that biodiversity conservation in Madagascar has significant net costs for local people and that safeguard policies often fail to protect the poorest (Rakotonarivo et al. 2017, Poudyal et al. 2018, Hockley et al. 2018). As a result, some extremely poor people are made even poorer by conservation, undermining the Sustainable Development Goals and the Convention on Biological Diversity. National policy requires adequate social

safeguards, yet our review of Malagasy protected areas (PAs) showed that none provided evidence that social safeguards were adequately planned and resourced to match expected impacts (Hockley et al. 2020) and most lacked a Community Management Convention (a formal agreement between PA managers and local communities required for Malagasy co-managed PAs).

Our previous work (<http://p4ges.org/>; <http://forest4climateandpeople.bangor.ac.uk/>) found that these implementation gaps stem from a lack of capacity of among PA managers, government and donors, and gaps in the national guidance available to managers. We organised a national workshop in October 2020 with the Ministry of Environment on the obligations of PAs to ensure social safeguards for local people, reduce poverty and achieve sustainable development. Participants highlighted the need for clearer guidance on planning, implementing and evaluating social safeguards around protected areas and ongoing specialist support.

The design of this project was informed by these experiences. The project is addressing the needs we identified, through training, evidence synthesis and ongoing specialist advice to government, NGO and community stakeholders to ensure that Madagascar's PA network is equitably managed, avoids exacerbating extreme poverty, and enjoys better local support, becoming more resilient and effective.

### **Other biodiversity and human development challenges that the project seeks to address:**

Under its commitments to the CBD, Madagascar has expanded its PA network to over 10% of its land area, and forest conservation and restoration are also key to its UNFCCC Nationally Determined Contribution. National policy requires PAs and reforestation to have social safeguards, so that conservation meets CBD and donor requirements for equitable sharing of the costs and benefits of conservation, as well as the government's requirement that conservation contributes to sustainable development. However, current policy and practice are deficient.

Madagascar's Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development has been conducting their five yearly review of all PAs, with a greater emphasis on social aspects. Our project is working to strengthen Malagasy PAs' ability to meet these requirements, as well as those of donors, thus delivering more resilient PAs which have greater local and national support, and are better able to meet donors' safeguard requirements. The Ministry is also reforming its safeguard policy: this project has been contributing heavily to this policy development and to providing improved guidance to PAs.

## **2. Project stakeholders/ partners**

Our three formal partners named in our proposal are Kew Madagascar Conservation Center, Impact Madagascar, and Madagascar National Parks. The community management convention training (planned for July and August 2023 as part of Output 3) will take place at three protected areas managed by these organisations (The Itremo Massif, which is also part of the new UK-funded Biodiverse Landscapes Fund programme in Madagascar, the new protected area of Madiromirafy, and the National Park of Marolambo). We carried out community consultancy meetings in these three PAs in October 2022

(<http://forest4climateandpeople.bangor.ac.uk/news-blog/mirari-s-team-recently-visited-three-local-communities-across-three-protected-areas-18062>), to understand local communities' perceptions of the PA management. These meetings have informed the design of the community convention training and given us important insights on local community perspectives and needs.

We have established formal agreements with these organisation partners defining the terms and conditions of data sharing on the impacts of their social safeguard and development activities that will feed into our best practice brief (contributing towards Output 1). We have also created a new formal partnership with GERP Madagascar that has also signed the data sharing agreement and provided their datasets. Key outputs include the establishment of these agreements, the analyses of datasets shared so far with us, and a draft practice brief.

A key challenge we have faced is the lengthy and heavy administrative processes in accessing and sharing data with protected area managers. These processes include establishing data sharing and management agreements with the PA managers that must be validated by both parties (LRA hosting our Darwin project and the conservation organisations). These processes took much longer than we had anticipated (Madagascar National Parks is still to sign the agreement).

These partners have been involved in our project planning and decision-making through: ii) helping us to identify specific needs from all three conservation organisations for the content of the technical training we conducted in February 2023 (Output 2), and their participation in the training ii) the active involvement of Madagascar National Parks in our consultancy meetings with the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development in the process of reforming the social safeguard policies around PAs (Output 4).

Participants in the technical training were technical staff working in the forest and conservation sector (from ministries, national office for REDD+ and climate change and NGOs) that we selected purposely from those organisations who expressed interest. 16 participants from 15 organisations attended (see training report) Selection aimed for a diversity of disciplinary backgrounds and experience, and gender equality. The training was interdisciplinary and participatory, with the aim not simply to teach knowledge and skills but encourage reflection and debate among participants and course leaders. People living around forests played an integral role in delivering the courses through: relating their experiences with PAs, taking part in role playing exercises working through different forest and reforestation-related scenarios, and providing detailed feedback to course participants.

We have also established a new partnership with Natural Justice on the design and delivery of the training that we plan to deliver to local communities to further their understanding of the community management convention (Output 3). Natural justice is a team of pioneering lawyers and legal experts that support communities to know the law, use the law and shape the law through legal empowerment, research, policy influencing and litigation, and as part of coalitions and campaigns. They will help the project with the design of the training tools and manuals including the elaboration of a poster that we plan to share widely across Madagascar's PAs.

Natural Justice has also been a key partner in the process of reforming the social safeguard policies around PAs by the Ministry of Environment (Output 4). They have been part of the committee alongside the ONE (National Office for the Environment), staff of the USAID project Hay Tao, and Madagascar National Parks, meeting regularly at least monthly to discuss the key points of the reform. We have now produced a fourth draft of the reform, which is currently being reviewed by the Ministry of Environment.

### **3. Project progress**

#### **3.1 Progress in carrying out project Activities**

**Activities are in bold.**

##### **0.0 Clarify stakeholder needs and opportunities for impact:**

During the first three months of the project (May-June), the team met several organizations managing protected areas (PAs) in Madagascar, such as the consortium of organisations implementing the Biodiverse Landscape Fund project in Madagascar (Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust, Kew Madagascar Conservation Centre, Missouri Botanical Garden Madagascar, Care Madagascar, and Madagasikara Voakajy), and other organisations such as Madagascar National Parks, Impact Madagascar, Fanamby, and the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable development.

These meetings confirmed that there is a high level of demand for the project's proposed activities. Aspects that were most valued by respondents were the establishment of the database on the social impacts of development interventions carried out in and around PAs and especially any lessons learnt from this, that they can apply in designing more effective social safeguards and sustainable development approaches.

Most of these organisations also indicated that they currently lack the ability to identify and apply tools and methods in monitoring and evaluating the social impacts of conservation and safeguard projects, which confirms the need for the training activities. These needs were also emphasized at the [project launch workshop](#), which was attended by 40+ participants and honoured by an opening speech by the UK ambassador HEM David Ashley. Several conservation organisations such as [Impact Madagascar](#), [Madagascar National Parks](#) and [Kew Madagascar Conservation Centre](#). The Ministry of Environment also officially expressed their willingness to collaborate with the project during the launch workshop.

### **1.1 Establish and maintain a database platform on the social impacts of PAs as well as social safeguard measures and other development interventions around PAs:**

PA managers have asked for evidence on what works best to ensure that local people affected by PAs share equitably in the benefits generated by them, and on the determinants of success or failure.

We have collated evidence on this from four protected areas and continue to work with other PA managers to access datasets. These datasets include detailed descriptions of any safeguard or development activities implemented by these organisations, the number of beneficiaries, any measures of their social impacts carried out by the organisation, etc. These datasets were complemented by semi-structured interviews conducted with some staff of the conservation organisations to understand any background contexts and collect any missing information.

We are expecting more datasets from Madagascar National Parks and a few other organisations in the coming months and will also be conducting follow-up interviews with the implementers. These datasets will eventually be fed into an open-source database which will be permanently hosted by FAPBM allowing stakeholders to continue to contribute to it after the end of this project.

Although this activity has proceeded broadly as planned in terms of accessing datasets, the nature of the data received has necessitated some changes to the outputs. Briefly, the data acquired does not generally allow us to rigorously evaluate the success of safeguard interventions. As a result of this, and also demand expressed from stakeholders during the training course in February, we have re-oriented this output towards identifying strengths and weaknesses in PAs monitoring and evaluation of safeguards, in order to distil “lessons learned” and best practice recommendations for the future.

### **1.2 Synthesise and disseminate evidence from the collated data:**

We have analysed and synthesized the datasets we have received from partners so far, and drafted a practice brief (1st draft summarizing the main evidence and key recommendations, in particular on monitoring and evaluating social safeguards. The practice brief will be updated as we receive new datasets from PA managers, and the recommendations will also be shared at the national workshop (scheduled for the 16th June).

### **2.1 Design and run the field-training course for high-level national stakeholders and facilitate sharing of best practices:**

This training / sharing workshop is planned for 16 June 2023 and will target senior staff (15-20 participants) in the ministry of environment and sustainable development, the national office for REDD+ and Climate Change, conservation NGOs, and donors. Some organisations have been identified based on their key roles (e.g., the ministry) and will select their representatives in consultation with us. The training will include sharing and discussion of our key recommendations on the reform of social safeguard policies in Madagascar, the draft evidence synthesis and the practice brief informed by datasets on the effectiveness of safeguard or development activities implemented in and around PAs.

## **2.2 Design and run the in-depth field-based training course aimed at technical staff working in the forest and conservation sector:**

The technical field training was delivered in February 2023 (06-10 February) in collaboration with local communities whose lives are affected by conservation and restoration. Participants were 15 technical staff working in the forest and conservation sector (from ministries, national office for REDD+ and climate change, NGOs, and the private sector). The training included methods for assessing and mitigating impacts of PAs and restoration; issues of marginalisation; lessons learned from past research on impacts of forest conservation and reforestation; ethics (including Free Prior Informed Consent); requirements of the various safeguard systems and norms, both international (e.g. World Bank, Cancun) and national (e.g. REDD+, protected area code, mining code).

The training also helped facilitate an exchange of knowledge between PA managers so they could learn from each other. Critically important was ensuring the voices of local people were heard and we involved residents of two protected areas in the training course. In two communities around Torotorofotsy Ramsar Site, we showed our film "[Voices of the Forest](#)" (made during a previous FCDO-funded project) to initiate various thematic discussions between the course participants and the local communities. We also used role playing games that allowed PA managers and local residents to swap roles and tackle difficult scenarios from the other's point of view. The enthusiasm of the participants made for both lively and hilarious debates and facilitated local communities to share their perspectives with PA managers. Next, local people from Maromizaha New Protected Area helped train course participants in evaluation methods, including discrete choice experiments and contingent valuation. The local residents switched from 'mock respondents' to giving feedback on the methods used and interview techniques.

Overall, the training course was very successful, with rich and lively discussion that ensured everyone involved learned something from the course. We have produced a training report and a blog post. The training was also featured in the latest Darwin newsletter. The training encouraged participants to take the learning from the training and apply it in their work and put forward practical recommendations for the design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of safeguarding activities within their respective organisations. Before leaving, participants were asked to prepare a short action plan of things they planned to change or communicate to their colleagues in their organisations. We will be following up with participants in May to discuss how they are getting on with their plan, and any ongoing support they or their organisations might need.

We will apply some of the lessons we learned from this training to the next three courses we will run for local communities and PA managers on how to negotiate their "Community Management Agreements" (activity 3.1). These will be conducted in partnership with Impact Madagascar, Kew Botanical Gardens, Madagascar National Parks, and Natural Justice.

## **3.1 Train local communities on the community management convention:**

Our review of Malagasy PAs found that very few had a convention management convention which is a formal agreement between protected area managers and local communities, fundamental to co-managed PAs (Hockley et al. 2020). We will work with communities in three PAs to build their capacity to understand and develop a convention. These trainings are planned for the week of 10<sup>th</sup> July 2023 for Itremo PA managed by Kew Conservation Centre, the week of 24<sup>th</sup> July 2023 for Madiromirafy PA managed by Impact Madagascar, and the week of 07<sup>th</sup> August 2023 for Marolambo National Park managed by Madagascar National Parks.

- **Shortly after the launch workshop, in July 2022, we also had the opportunity to attend the first IUCN Africa Protected Areas [Congress](#), Kigali, Rwanda. Our project team, Mirindra Rakotoarisoa took part in a panel discussion organized by African Wildlife Foundation on "Rights-based approach to conservation in Africa". This panel highlighted the potential role of the community management convention in**

**securing local communities rights to decision-making within their PAs, and their rights to the fair and equitable access to the benefits of conservation.**

### **3.1.1 Local community consultations**

To prepare the training, we consulted local communities across these three sites in October 2022; Madiromirafy, a newly established PA managed by Impact Madagascar in North-western Madagascar, Marolambo, a national park managed by Madagascar National Parks in southeast Madagascar, and Itremo, a new PA managed by Kew Madagascar Conservation Center in the central highlands. These local consultations aimed to: 1) support the development of the convention, 2) prepare the training on the Community Management Convention (how does CGC fit in with the existing management transfer in the area), and 3) understand local perceptions of social safeguards and cross check the data provided by the PA managers.

In Madiromirafy, where a new PA is currently being established, we conducted nine focus groups in with local communities (with 85 people in total). In Marolambo, our team visited 3 villages where we conducted a total of 5 focus group with local communities (with 48 people in total). In Itremo, the team conducted six focus groups with local communities (with 62 participants in total). Our findings indicate that there are some misunderstandings across and within the communities of their roles and obligations towards the “co-management” of the PA. Less than 10% of the community is engaged in “co-management”, mostly members of community-based management associations who are responsible for managing some of the forest areas. Most participants perceive that the establishment of the PA has brought a lot of restrictions on their use of resources. In addition, the development interventions are not perceived to be enough to compensate the loss of revenue due to the establishment of the PA.

**1**

**3**

**2**

**4**

*Photo – 1) Crossing Ikopa river before reaching Madiromirafy, the protected forest managed by VOI Aina and Impact Madagascar 2) Billboard presenting the main entrance to the rural commune of Madiromirafy and the protected area 3) Project team explaining the aim of their visit in Madiromirafy 4) Project team during focus-group in Ambodimadiro, Madiromirafy.*

Additional photos from these local community consultations can be found [here](#).

### **3.1.2 Design of posters to facilitate learning in the training**

We have started designing posters to aid the training on the community management convention with local communities. The poster will include the key points of the conventions

such as the rights of each stakeholder (local community and PA manager), the role and responsibility of each and their obligations.

While designing the poster, we are consulting the committee in charge of the reform of the national policy on environmental and social safeguards at the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable development. This is because the community management convention is expected to be a key component of the reform. The poster design is also developed collaboratively with Natural Justice, a team of lawyers supporting local communities (more on this below). Such consultation and collaboration will ensure the long-term use of the poster, and its shared ownership.

### **3.1.3 Partnership with Natural justice**

We have established a formal partnership agreement with Natural justice in designing and delivering these trainings. They will help the project with the design of the training tools and manuals including the elaboration of a poster that we plan to share widely across Madagascar's PAs. We have established a draft of the training agenda and a first draft of the poster in collaboration with the professional designer and Natural justice.

### **4.1 Support ongoing reform of Madagascar's national PA safeguard policies (led by the Ministry of Environment and Madagascar National Parks):**

Government agencies made it clear that while they recognise the importance of addressing social issues in conservation and restoration, they lack capacity to do this effectively. With previous support from the Foundation for Protected Areas and Biodiversity of Madagascar (FAPBM) and the Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF), we have been providing support for the reform of PA social safeguard policies since February 2020, and this continues with Darwin support now. These policies are intended to assist PA managers, government agencies, NGOs and communities to ensure that PAs fulfil their potential as cornerstones for biodiversity conservation and as pillars for achieving sustainable development. We have continued providing this support throughout this project.

A fourth full draft of the policy reform, primarily produced by staff on this Darwin project, under the leadership of MEDD, has been presented to the restricted executive committee composed of 10 representatives of the National Office for the Environment, the Ministry of Environment, Madagascar National Parks, USAID and Natural Justice, in January 2023. This draft includes a detailed list of the norms on the management of protected areas in Madagascar, a methodology to evaluate the social impact of PA, the mechanisms of grievances, the mechanism of stakeholder integration, and a draft of the community management agreement or "Convention de Gestion Communautaire (CGC)" between the PA managers and local community.

This new draft is the key output of nine meetings since the beginning of the project in May 2022 which can be summarized as:

- 04<sup>th</sup>, May 2022: the restricted executive committee discussed the content, social safeguards principles, full and equitable participation of local community and other stakeholders
- 13<sup>th</sup>, May 2022: reflection about some terms on the CGC needing to be determined and also about the social safeguards.
- 16<sup>th</sup>, May 2022: consulting with Natural Justice on the difference and possible linkages between the CGC and other existing agreement between PA managers and local communities in order to inspire the proposed structure and process of the CGC's elaboration
- 24<sup>th</sup>, May 2022: discussion on the content of the text about CGC and its current applications on the field
- 08<sup>th</sup>, June 2022: reorganization of the content of the policy framework to ensure the effectiveness of future management by taking into account the experiences of protected area managers.  
Establishment of the rough draft of the CGC structure, content, and elaboration process.
- 15<sup>th</sup>, June 2022: decision on what to assess in terms of impact evaluation, scope of application and selection of methods to use

- 17<sup>th</sup>, June 2022: sharing of the ongoing reform to the national NGOs working in protected area management in Madagascar and collecting their experiences on the agreements with local communities for the co-management of the PA.
- 15<sup>th</sup>, July 2022: discussion and selection of the norms of the environmental and social management of the PA in Madagascar.
- 18<sup>th</sup> October 2022: presentation of the norms, discussion about the CGC's content and elaboration process.
- 31<sup>st</sup>, October 2022: discussion on tools and methodologies for impact assessment and choice of social safeguard, reflections on the structure of the grievance mechanism
- 11<sup>th</sup>, November 2022: courtesy visit to the new Director at the Ministry and presentation of MIRARI and the work done for the policy reform before his arrival
- 21<sup>st</sup>, February 2023: establishment of a roadmap for the revised social safeguard policy's final approval and publication
- 24<sup>th</sup>, February 2023: presentation of the final policy proposal from MIRARI to the restricted executive committee and collection of the last feedback. Afterwards, the MEDD started a thorough review of the final policy proposal
- 25<sup>th</sup>, April 2023: reflexion on the pending issues about the CGC and the next steps (The Ministry is still reviewing the revised social safeguard policy and requested another meeting to discuss the pending questions in the CGC)

The progress on the reform is slower than expected due to the limited availability of members of the restricted executive committee and the recent changes in the leadership of the Ministry of Environment (new Director in charge of PAs and natural resource management). Validation by the restricted committee is required before this final draft can be presented to the larger committee, including policymakers and broader PA managers (planned for October 2023).



### 3.2 Progress towards project Outputs

Report on how overall progress has been made towards the project Outputs and how likely the project is to achieve them by its close. Address each Output in turn, identifying the baseline condition, change recorded to date, and the source of evidence for this change. Please comment on how you are measuring the Output indicators. Please support comments with evidence and use indicators to support progress towards Outputs.

Outputs	SMART indicators	Evidence	Progress made and next steps
<b>Output 1</b> Database and evidence synthesis on effectiveness of social safeguards and development interventions produced and disseminated in multiple forms, and is used in changes to policy and practice.	1.1 Draft evidence synthesis and best practice manual generated by the database and circulated to stakeholders for comment at month 6, and quarterly updated as new data are fed in the platform.	1.1.1 <b>Draft practice brief</b> to be presented at the high-level training / sharing workshop planned on 16 June 2023, 1.1.2 <b>Technical training report</b> showing that we (Darwin project) have a better understanding of the stakeholders' needs, and any difficulties they've experienced with generating data on the effectiveness of social safeguards.	We have drafted a best practice brief synthesising the evidence we have received so far but with a major shift in the output (we have produced a best practice brief and not a manual as we have only received datasets from four PAs so far and not a representative sample across Madagascar as we had originally anticipated, and the data we have received has not allowed evaluation of the effectiveness of the interventions). This is partly because conservation organisations managing PAs rarely have useful data on the social impacts of safeguard and development measures, and/or they are unwilling / unable to share their datasets.  Also, some of the data we received were of poor quality, lacking some critical information. This means we have to spend considerable time following up with the PA managers for any missing information or clarifications.
	1.2 Draft evidence synthesis and best practice manual presented to at least nine communities in three selected PAs (in Malagasy) during community meetings, and feedback elicited at these meetings and focus groups	1.2.1 <b>Draft practice brief</b> to be presented to local communities at the training planned for July and August 2023 (10-16 July, 24-30 July, and 07-13 August 2023)	The presentation of the best practice brief to local communities will be done concurrently with the training on the community management convention planned for July and August 2023. These presentations will be filmed and published on project website (while preserving anonymity of community participants).

Outputs	SMART indicators	Evidence	Progress made and next steps
	targeting marginalised groups e.g. women, poor or landless households.		
	1.3 Presentation of final evidence synthesis and best practice manual presented to stakeholders at dissemination event in Antananarivo to at least 60 attendees.	1.3.1 <b>Best practice brief</b> to be presented to stakeholders on 16 June 2023	Presentation of the best practice brief will be one of the key agendas of the high-level / sharing workshop planned for 16 June 2023.
	1.4. Revisions to safeguard policies and practices by Partners (Kew Madagascar Conservation Centre, Madagascar National Parks and Impact Madagascar) using the evidence synthesis and best practice manual.	<p>1.4.1 <b>Action plans</b> from the technical training participants in February 2023 on the key changes they would like to advise their organisations to improve policies and practices on the design and implementation of social safeguard policies.</p> <p>1.4.2 Followup calls with training participants in May and June 2023, identifying how they have implemented their action plans, and what further support may be required.</p>	<p>The technical training we conducted in February 2023 was informed by the data collected from partner organisations for the database, allowing us to identify key gaps in monitoring and evaluation of social safeguards, and this helped us target several of the training sessions to building capacity on these points.</p> <p>Participants were encouraged to take the learning from the training and apply it in their work and put forward practical recommendations for the design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of safeguarding activities within their respective organisations. Participants were asked to prepare a short action plan of things they planned to change or communicate to their colleagues in their organisations. We will be following up with participants in May and June to discuss how they are getting on with their plan, what changes have been made already, and any ongoing support they or their organisations might need.</p>
	1.5 Revisions to donors' and government agencies' policies (and possibly practices) as a result of using the evidence synthesis and best practice manual (see also output 4).	<p>1.5.1 <b>Consultation meeting minutes</b> with the Ministry of Environment and Madagascar National Parks</p> <p>1.5.2 Changes to organisational policies</p>	Madagascar National Parks have been revising their safeguard policies using partly the consultancy meetings we have convened on the social safeguard policies with the Ministry of Environment. We have discussed several aspects of their revised policies in these meetings and shared our key recommendations. Once their

Outputs	SMART indicators	Evidence	Progress made and next steps
			safeguarding policy is finalised, we will be able to use it as evidence of the influence of our work.
<p><b>Output 2.1</b> High-level training / sharing workshop conducted with senior staffs of government and conservation organisations) leading to changes in knowledge, policy and practice.</p>	<p>2.1 Participants develop a more advanced understanding of planning, implementing and evaluating social safeguards and development interventions around PAs, followed up with support and mentoring for the remainder of the project.</p> <p>2.2 Sharing of best practices facilitated by the course workshops.</p> <p>2.3 Partners (Kew Madagascar Conservation Centre, Madagascar National Parks and Impact Madagascar) revise their safeguard policies and practices following the training.</p>	<p>Sources of evidence will include training attendance list disaggregated by gender, and pre- and post-training surveys to identify changes in participants' knowledge and understanding.</p>	<p>This high-level training course and sharing workshop is scheduled for 16 June 2023. It will target senior staff (20+ participants) in the ministry of environment and sustainable development, the national office for REDD+ and Climate Change, conservation NGOs, and donors and will include sharing and discussion of our key recommendations on the reform of social safeguard policies in Madagascar, the draft evidence synthesis, and the practice brief.</p>
<p><b>Output 2.2</b> Training courses and follow up support delivered to 15 stakeholders (government and civil society organisations) leading to</p>	<p>2.1 Increase in participants understanding of planning, implementing and evaluating social safeguards and development interventions around PAs, as a result of support and mentoring during the project.</p>	<p>2.1.1 <b>Training attendance list</b> disaggregated by gender,</p> <p>2.1.2 <b>Pre and post-training surveys</b> to identify changes in participants' knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>2.1.3, <b>Training manual and report</b> detailing the modules covered and participants feedbacks.</p>	<p>We delivered this technical training in February 2023 (see progress on the activities in section 3.1). We will be following up with participants later in May and June to discuss how they are getting on with their plan, and any ongoing support they or their organisations might need.</p>

Outputs	SMART indicators	Evidence	Progress made and next steps
changes in knowledge, policy and practice.	2.2 Sharing of best practices facilitated by the course workshops.	2.2.1, <b>Training manual and report</b> giving details on the sharing of best practices between participants and the training modules.  2.2.2 <a href="#">Training blog</a>	
	2.3 Revisions by Partners (Kew Madagascar Conservation Centre, Madagascar National Parks and Impact Madagascar) to their safeguard policies and practices following the training.	2.3.1 <b>Actions plans</b> by the workshop participants (see 1.4.1 above)  2.3.2 <b>Revisions to safeguard policies of Madagascar National Parks recorded</b> , and cross checked for links to project outputs, whether explicit or implicit.	
<b>Output 3</b> Training course delivered to local communities to further their understanding of the community management convention	3.1 Increase in community members knowledge and capacity	Sources of evidence will include training attendance list, pre-and post-training surveys of knowledge, attitudes and perceived capacity, copies of convention documents (signed or in progress).	The training on the community management convention will take place the week of 10 <sup>th</sup> July 2023 in Itremo PA managed by Kew Conservation Centre, the week of 24 <sup>th</sup> July 2023 in Madiromirafy PA managed by Impact Madagascar, and the week of 07 <sup>th</sup> July 2023 in Marolambo National Park managed by Madagascar National Parks.
3.2 Establishment of Community Conventions (completed or in progress)			
<b>Output 4</b> Technical support provided for the reform of the social safeguard policies around	4.1 Active involvement in committee meetings and review process	4.1.1 Meeting attendance disaggregated by gender.	We have now produced the fourth full draft of the social safeguard policies and handed in to the Ministry of Environment. We are waiting for their feedback on the remaining issues and plan to support them through the final stages.
4.2 Establishment of revised safeguard policies (completed or in progress),	4.2.1 Copies of revised safeguard policy documents		
4.3 Revisions by Partners (e.g., Kew Madagascar Conservation Centre,	4.3.1 Follow up survey in September 2023 with partners to identify any revisions to		

Outputs	SMART indicators	Evidence	Progress made and next steps
PAs by the Ministry of Environment and Madagascar National Parks leading to changes in knowledge, policy and practice.	Madagascar National Parks and Impact Madagascar) to their safeguard practices in accordance with the revised national safeguard policy.	safeguard practices, and cross check for links to project outputs, whether explicit or implicit.	

### 3.3 Progress towards the project Outcome

Outcome	SMART Indicators	Means of Verification	Progress made and next steps
Government, donors, NGOs and communities are enabled to deliver fair and equitable conservation through more effective social safeguard processes and adequate investments in food security and poverty alleviation around PAs.	0.1 Increase in stakeholders' knowledge of resources and mechanisms necessary to achieve fair and equitable conservation.	<p>0.1.1 Quantitative survey and qualitative interviews with key stakeholders (including the network of protected areas) early in project and near end of project, disaggregated by gender.</p> <p>0.1.2 Surveys at the start and the end of training workshops (disaggregated by gender).</p> <p>0.1.3 The data fed into the platform to be summarised quarterly into accessible reports and shared with all stakeholders. These reports will provide a synthesis on the effectiveness of compensatory or development interventions around PAs (disaggregated by gender, wealth etc), their impacts on drivers of biodiversity</p>	<p>We also carried out interviews with key stakeholders early in the project to understand their needs and inform the design of the trainings.</p> <p>We have delivered one of the training courses, which have increased the participants' knowledge of resources and mechanisms necessary to achieve fair and equitable conservation (see source of evidence in Output 2.2. above.</p> <p>We will deliver the high-level training course later in June 06th, which aims to further enhance stakeholders' knowledge, and again we will try to measure this change using before and after surveys.</p> <p>As we mentioned above, we have experienced difficulties in establishing data sharing agreements with PA managers and collecting usable datasets that will feed into the evidence synthesis and best practice manual (see our notes on progress in Output 1 above), meaning we have not been able</p>

		loss (e.g. migration) and the likely mechanisms through which they lead to impacts.	<p>to establish the database platform and related reports (Means 0.1.3). However, we have produced the first draft of the best practice brief and will present this to stakeholders at the meeting on June 16th, and also circulate to those who participated in the training course.</p> <p>For the next few months, we will continue engaging with conservation managers to better understand their needs, especially any support they might need in managing and sharing datasets on their social safeguards.</p>
	0.2 Change in government, donor and / or conservation NGO policies with respect to social safeguarding procedures (e.g., through the design and implementation of the community management convention) and development investments around PAs (e.g., incorporation of a guide on social impact assessment and a more adequate grievance mechanism)	0.2.1 Revised safeguard policies (incl Ministry and Madagascar National Parks) finalised and shared with all stakeholders (also including sustainable development approaches around PAs).	<p>We have delivered a full draft of our proposal for the reform of the social safeguard policy to the Ministry of Environment. The progress with the ongoing support is very much dependent on multiple consultations with several stakeholders and requires the validation of the Ministry. These consultations and validation have been delayed because of the recent changes in the leadership of the Ministry of Environment and the limited availability of policymakers (Ministry of Environment) and protected area managers. However, we are working hard towards this and are confident that we will have a final version of these policies by October 2023.</p> <p>Madagascar National Parks is also currently drafting their revised safeguard policy, and our consultancy meetings with the Ministry have helped shape its development.</p>
	0.3 Change in partner NGOs' actions on the ground as a result of the project (e.g., more explicit consideration of the social impacts of their actions and establishment of the "convention de gestion Communautaire" which is formal agreement between protected area managers and local communities)	0.3.1 Knowledge needs and policy and practice changes of stakeholders reviewed quarterly through the steering committee (allows changes made to actions on the ground to be identified). All Conventions de Gestion Communautaire signed during the project will be recorded.	The training course with PA management staff in February allowed NGO staff to identify actions they could feasibly implement as a result of the training. We will be conducting follow up calls and meetings with attendees from May onwards to learn what changes have taken place so far, and provide further support. This indicator is ambitious, given the timescale of the project, and we will have a better sense of what degree of change is likely by project end, once we have conducted the follow up calls in May.

### 3.4 Monitoring of assumptions

We made 5 key assumptions in our original proposal. Of these, four still hold true, listed here with brief commentary:

**Assumption 1:** We can influence the internal policies of stakeholders (having identified knowledge demand during previous projects and subsequent discussions).

We will be able to evaluate this further during our follow up calls in May, but so far we have had good responses from stakeholder organisations.

**Assumption 2:** Adequate funding is available for lasting changes in actions on the ground and political, security and health situation remain conducive.

This assumption still holds true: the political and security situation in Madagascar has not changed significantly, and the health situation has improved with COVID receding. Donor interest in funding equitable conservation in Madagascar remains high, though we have identified that we will need to ensure our messages are clearly articulated to donors so that they understand better what needs to be funded. A key risk on the horizon will be the presidential election due in November 2023.

**Assumption 3:** Trainings and documents hold sufficient interest to key stakeholders. Key stakeholders will be able to access materials.

This holds, indeed, following the training course in February, we have received several requests to run additional training courses (unfortunately we will not have the budget or time to do this in this project).

**Assumption 4:** We can rigorously and/or pragmatically attribute policy change to project activities through surveys and face-to-face briefings with key stakeholders.

To an extent this assumption is untestable, but we have been endeavouring to measure our impact as detailed above.

One assumption has not fully held:

**Assumption 5:** We can collate suitable evidence on safeguarding mechanisms around PAs to feed into the database platform and provide a broader evidence base on best practices.

While some organisations have been happy to share data with us, for the most part this data has not allowed us to rigorously evaluate social safeguard interventions and identify successes and failures. Instead, as described above, we have re-oriented towards collating information on how PAs are implementing, monitoring and evaluating interventions, identifying strengths and weaknesses, and then producing a guide to best practice to address common problems.

### 3.5 Achievement of positive impact on biodiversity and poverty reduction

The ultimate (ambitious) outcome is to influence national and donor policies to result in more resilient conservation and restoration through more effective social safeguards and improved rural livelihoods and people's rights to land. This will help reduce extreme poverty by reducing the costs of conservation for local people and ensure that biodiversity conservation is more resilient to human pressures and has greater political support. In the long term therefore, the project, if successful, will have impacts at national scale across Madagascar.

In the short term, within the lifetime of the project, the following people will benefit from increased capacity:

11 male and 5 female PA managers from 17 conservation organisations and local communities have already benefitted from our training course, learning about the concept of social safeguarding and then discuss and practice our key recommendations on identifying and assessing the socio-economic impacts of PAs.

Nine communities around three protected areas will benefit from our community level training courses in July, which will enhance their capacity to co-manage the protected areas with NGOs. It is difficult at this stage to give precise figures on the numbers of households, but we anticipate at least 10 individuals from each community will attend the trainings and directly benefit from increased capacity. However, because the aim of the training is to increase capacity to co-manage the PA, we expect this to benefit most households in the communities in the longer term. Also, our collaboration with Natural Justice on the design and implementation of the community level training, as well as the design of the posters that will be shared widely across Madagascar's PAs will help ensure that other PAs can benefit from these trainings.

At least 20 national level stakeholders and their organisations will benefit directly from our national level workshop in June, which aims to increase the capacity of these individuals, and their organisations, to manage social issues around PAs.

#### 4. Project support to the Conventions, Treaties or Agreements

The latest Global Biodiversity Outlook report indicates that Aichi Target 11 on expanding and improving protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures has only been partially achieved, as apart from the extent expansion, progress has been more modest on other components of the target, particularly with regard to the equitable and effective management of protected areas. Thus, the project's support to the reform of national social safeguard policies for Madagascar's Protected Areas, ("Cadre de Gestion Environnemental et Social or CGES in French"), the technical training and the training on the community level training are in line with Madagascar's contribution to the implementation of the new strategic plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity. These project inputs respond especially to the following objectives of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework:

- Target 3: Ensure and enable that by 2030 at least 30 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas, and of marine and coastal areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services, are effectively conserved and managed through ecologically representative, well-connected and equitably governed systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, recognizing indigenous and traditional territories, where applicable, and integrated into wider landscapes, seascapes and the ocean, while ensuring that any sustainable use, where appropriate in such areas, is fully consistent with conservation outcomes, **recognizing and respecting the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, including over their traditional territories."**
- TARGET 22: Ensure the **full, equitable, inclusive, effective and gender-responsive representation and participation in decision-making**, and access to justice and information related to biodiversity by **indigenous peoples and local communities**, respecting their cultures and their rights over lands, territories, resources, and traditional knowledge, as well as by women and girls, children and youth, and persons with disabilities and ensure the full protection of environmental human rights defenders.

One of our project members (Sandra Rakotomalala) also attended national consultations on the Post-2020 GBF and the UN CBD Meetings (the Open-Ended Working Group 5 on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and the UNCBD COP15) where she met and talked with the national focal point and the Malagasy delegation team to advocate for youth perspectives and inputs from the findings of the project to feed into Madagascar's national position, especially for Target 3 of the Global Biodiversity Framework.

#### 5. Gender equality and social inclusion

Please quantify the proportion of women on the Project Board.	The project leadership is overwhelmingly female as both the overall project lead (Sarobidy Rakotonarivo), the project manager (Manoa Rajaonarivelo) and the research assistant (Sanda Rakotomalala) are women.
---	--



	Three of five people mentioned on the proposal are female.
Please quantify the proportion of project partners that are led by women, or which have a senior leadership team consisting of at least 50% women	Our only project partner with staff costs is Bangor University. BU council has 7 females out of 19 members.

We have also paid heed to gender balance when inviting participants to the training workshops and community events. We had 40% and 70% representation of women among training participants and speakers/trainers both at the technical training and CGES consultation meetings we've had with the Ministry of Environment respectively.

We will monitor gender balance of attendance and other engagement with the project (e.g., responses to consultation, community training) and consider measures to correct any significant imbalances.

## 6. Monitoring and evaluation

We have been considering M&E at each project management meeting (approx. fortnightly) consisting of Sarobidy Rakotonarivo (Project Lead), Manoa Rajaonarivelo (Project Manager – temporarily replaced by Veloson Manankery until August 2023) and Neal Hockley (our UK-based partner).

The Project Manager usually reports progress against the log frame, budget and implementation timetable. In the first year of the project, both the implementation timetable and the performance indicators identified in the log frame are relevant. We have been closely monitoring budgets throughout the project (reviewed at least monthly).

Many of the indicators in the log frame have gender specific requirements/measures. As well as being reviewed ex post, they have been monitored during the planning of events, e.g., when inviting participants workshops.

The management committee have also reported on progress to a steering committee twice over the first year. This steering committee is composed of representatives of each of the partners (Kew Madagascar Conservation Centre, Impact Madagascar, and Madagascar National parks) and one representative from the Ministry of Environment.

Project Leader (OSR) is ultimately responsible for project M&E, working closely with the Project Manager who may delegate specific M&E tasks to another project team. There has been scope for considerable learning and adaptation during the project. For example, training plans were shared with project partners at steering committee meetings, which allowed for immediate learning and adaptation of the interventions.

No major changes have been made to the project M&E plan over the reporting period.

## 7. Lessons learnt

What worked well: the technical training course was successful, as judged by feedback from participants (both conservation managers and community representatives), though we will have a better idea of the lasting impact after the follow up calls in May-July.

What worked less well: we have been less successful in obtaining data for the database of social interventions. In part this reflects a genuine lack of suitable data held by conservation organisations: the training course identified a serious need for increased capacity in monitoring and evaluation of socio-economic interventions by conservation organisations around protected areas. This has necessitated a refocusing of this part of the project, from synthesising data to drawing lessons from the data that does exist, and providing a best practice guide to monitoring and evaluation of these interventions. With hindsight, knowing what we know now about monitoring and evaluation practices in Protected Areas, we would have planned this activity somewhat differently - focussing more on the promulgation of guidance on evaluating social safeguard interventions earlier in the project. We have already incorporated this learning into our refocusing of this activity, described above.

The support to the ministry's reform process has been long and time consuming, but this was expected. Effective policy engagement takes time, especially when engaging with multiple state, parastatal and NGO actors. We are optimistic that this work will come to fruition before project end.

**8. Actions taken in response to previous reviews (if applicable)**

The feedback mostly concerned small adjustments to the logframe, which we made and resubmitted prior to the project starting.

**9. Risk Management**

No new risks have arisen in the last 12 months that were not originally accounted for.

**10. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere**

None

**11. Sustainability and legacy**

All project staff except NH are Malagasy nationals employed by Malagasy institutions, and all our partner organisations are Malagasy except Bangor University, and will continue to engage with these issues after project end (NH/BU have a long term engagement with Madagascar lasting 20+ years now, and other ongoing projects/engagements in Madagascar).

**12. Darwin Initiative identity**

We have used the Darwin Initiative logo on our project brochure, at the project launch, on materials during the technical training and on the subsequent report.

The UK Government's contribution to the project's work has been acknowledged in all project outputs.

This Darwin Initiative funding is being used for a standalone project with a clear identity - MiRARI

There is quite good recognition of the Darwin Initiative among conservation NGOs in Madagascar, due to the large number of projects which have been funded here over the lifetime of the initiative.

We have a Facebook page which is primarily useful for connecting with Malagasy audiences, and a Twitter account which is better at connecting to international audiences. Yes we have tagged Darwin / Biodiversity Challenge Funds in our tweets.

**13. Safeguarding**

Has your Safeguarding Policy been updated in the past 12 months?	No
Have any concerns been investigated in the past 12 months	No
Does your project have a Safeguarding focal point?	No
Has the focal point attended any formal training in the last 12 months?	na
What proportion (and number) of project staff have received formal training on Safeguarding?	Past: 100% (6) of staff have participated in training in ethics, which has included aspects of safeguarding most relevant to our project.

Has there been any lessons learnt or challenges on Safeguarding in the past 12 months? Please ensure no sensitive data is included within responses.

No significant safeguarding issues have arisen, but we have been alert to these during e.g. the technical training course.

Does the project have any developments or activities planned around Safeguarding in the coming 12 months? If so please specify.  
No specific activities planned.

Project expenditure

**Table 1: Project expenditure during the reporting period (1 April 2022 – 31 March 2023)**

Project spend (indicative) since last Annual Report	2022/23 Grant (£)	2022/23 Total actual Darwin Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain any variance)
Staff costs				
Consultancy Costs				
Overhead Costs				
Travel and subsistence				
Operating Costs				
Capital items				
Others				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£43,617</b>	<b>£43,344.06</b>		

[Redacted]

**Table 2: Project mobilising of matched funding during the reporting period (1 April 2022 – 31 March 2023)**

[Redacted]

	Matched funding secured to date	Total matched funding expected by end of project
Matched funding leveraged by the partners to deliver the project.		
Total additional finance mobilised by new activities building on evidence, best practices and project (£)		

**14. OPTIONAL: Outstanding achievements or progress of your project so far (300-400 words maximum). This section may be used for publicity purposes**

I agree for the Biodiversity Challenge Funds Secretariat to publish the content of this section.

Our MiRARI project organised a training course for 15 managers of Malagasy protected areas (PAs) last February to help conservation organisations, local residents, government and donors tackle social aspects of conservation. The aim of the training was to present PA managers with a summary of research in this area, highlight key national and international laws and guidelines, and train them in some of the techniques they might use to evaluate their social impacts. We also wanted to facilitate an exchange of knowledge between PA managers so they could learn from each other. Critically important was ensuring the voices of local people were heard and we involved residents of two protected areas in the training. In two communities around Torotorofotsy Ramsar Site, we showed our film "[Voices from the Forest](#)" (made during a previous FCDO-funded project) to initiate various thematic discussions between the course participants and the local communities. We also used role playing games that allowed PA managers and local residents to swap roles and tackle difficult scenarios from the other's point of view. The enthusiasm of the participants made for both lively and hilarious debates and facilitated local communities to share their perspectives with PA managers. Next, local people from Maromizaha Protected Area helped train course participants in evaluation methods, including discrete choice experiments. The local residents switched from 'mock respondents' to giving feedback on the methods and interview techniques. Overall, the training course was very successful, with rich and lively discussion that ensured everyone involved learned something from the course.

We will apply some of the lessons we learned from this training to the next three courses we will run for local communities and PA managers on how to negotiate their "Community Management Agreements" in partnership with Impact Madagascar, Kew Botanical Gardens, Madagascar National Parks, and Natural Justice.

**Image, Video or Graphic Information:**

<b>File Type (Image / Video / Graphic)</b>	<b>File Name or File Location</b>	<b>Caption, country and credit</b>	<b>Online accounts to be tagged (leave blank if none)</b>	<b>Consent of subjects received (delete as necessary)</b>
Image		Local communities and PA managers participate in the role-playing games, Madagascar, © MiRARI project	@Forest4People	Yes
Image		PA managers discuss approaches to monitoring and evaluating social impacts of conservation, Madagascar, © MiRARI project	@Forest4People	Yes

- **Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against Indicators of Success for Financial Year 2022-2023**  
 – **Please see section 3.2 and 3.3**

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2022 - March 2023	Actions required/planned for next period
<b>Outcome</b> (Insert <b>agreed</b> project Outcome statement)	(Insert <b>agreed</b> Outcome level indicators)	(Report against the indicators on progress towards achieving the project Outcome)	(Highlight key actions planned for next period)
<b>Output 1.</b> (Insert <b>agreed</b> Outputs with activities relevant to that Outputs in lines below. Activities relevant to more than one Output should be cross-referenced rather than repeated)	(Insert original Output level indicators)	(Report general progress against indicators, comment on their appropriateness, and reference where evidence is provided e.g. <i>Evidence provided in section 3.2 of report and Annex X</i> )	
Activity 1.1 Insert activities relevant to this Output		(Report completed or progress on activities that contribute toward achieving this Output)	(Outline what will be carried out in the next period)
Activity 1.2, Etc.			
<b>Output 2.</b> (Insert <b>agreed</b> Output)	(Insert <b>agreed</b> Output level indicators)	(Report against the indicators on progress towards achieving the Output)	
Activity 2.1.			
Activity 2.2. Etc.			
<b>Output 3.</b> Etc.			

- **Annex 2: Project’s full current Indicators of Success as presented in the application form (unless changes have been agreed) – Below is the revised version with small changes approved by DEFRA**

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<b>Impact:</b>			
More resilient conservation and restoration through more effective social safeguards, and improved rural livelihoods and people’s rights to land.			
<b>Outcome:</b> Government, donors, NGOs and communities are enabled to deliver fair and equitable conservation through more effective social safeguard processes and adequate investments in food security and poverty alleviation around PAs.	0.1 Increase in stakeholders’ knowledge of resources and mechanisms necessary to achieve fair and equitable conservation.  0.2 Change in government, donor and / or conservation NGO policies with respect to social safeguarding procedures (e.g., through the design and implementation of the community management convention) and development investments around PAs (e.g., incorporation of a guide on social impact assessment and a more adequate grievance mechanism)  0.3 Change in partner NGOs’ actions on the ground as a result of the project (e.g., more explicit consideration of the social impacts of their actions and establishment of the “convention de gestion Communautaire” which is formal agreement between protected area managers and local communities)	0.1.1 Quantitative survey and qualitative interviews with key stakeholders (including the network of protected areas) early in project and near end of project, disaggregated by gender.  0.1.2 Surveys at the start and the end of training workshops (disaggregated by gender).  0.1.3 The data fed into the platform to be summarised quarterly into accessible reports and shared with all stakeholders. These reports will provide a synthesis on the effectiveness of compensatory or development interventions around PAs (disaggregated by gender, wealth etc), their impacts on drivers of biodiversity loss (e.g., migration) and the likely mechanisms through which they lead to impacts.  0.2.1 Documentary evidence of revised safeguard policies (incl Ministry and Madagascar National Parks) finalised and shared with all stakeholders (also including	(Max 100 words): We can collate suitable evidence on safeguarding mechanisms around PAs to feed into the database platform and provide a broader evidence base on best practices.  We can influence the internal policies of stakeholders (having identified knowledge demand during previous projects and subsequent discussions).  Adequate funding is available for lasting changes in actions on the ground and political, security and health situation remain conducive.  Trainings and documents hold sufficient interest to key stakeholders. Key stakeholders will be able to access materials.  We can rigorously and/or pragmatically attribute policy change to project activities through surveys

		<p>sustainable development approaches around PAs).</p> <p>0.3.1 Knowledge needs and policy and practice changes of stakeholders reviewed quarterly through the steering committee (allows changes made to actions on the ground to be identified). All Conventions de Gestion Communautaire signed during the project will be recorded.</p>	<p>and face-to-face briefings with key stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>Output 1</b></p> <p>Database and evidence synthesis on effectiveness of social safeguards and development interventions produced and disseminated in multiple forms, and is used in changes to policy and practice.</p>	<p>1.1 Draft evidence synthesis and best practice manual generated by the database and circulated to stakeholders for comment at month 6, and quarterly updated as new data are fed in the platform.</p> <p>1.2 Draft evidence synthesis and best practice manual presented to at least nine communities in three selected PAs (in Malagasy) during community meetings, and feedback elicited at these meetings and focus groups targeting marginalised groups e.g., women, poor or landless households.</p> <p>1.3 Presentation of final evidence synthesis and best practice manual to stakeholders at dissemination event in Antananarivo attended by at least 60 attendees.</p> <p>1.4. Revisions to safeguard policies and practices by Partners (Kew</p>	<p>1.1.1 Feedback from the steering committee and potential users anonymised and recorded, feeds into development of the synthesis,</p> <p>1.1.2 Website downloads, pop-up surveys and online feedback forms, disaggregated by gender,</p> <p>1.2.1 Presentations to communities filmed and published on project website (while preserving anonymity of community participants).</p> <p>1.2.2 Feedback from communities collated and anonymised, used to develop the synthesis,</p> <p>1.3.1 attendance lists and feedback forms from workshop</p> <p>1.4.1. Revisions to safeguard policies recorded, and cross checked for links to project outputs, whether explicit or implicit.</p>	

	<p>Madagascar Conservation Centre, Madagascar National Parks and Impact Madagascar) using the evidence synthesis and best practice manual.</p> <p>1.5 Revisions to donors' and government agencies' policies (and possibly practices) as a result of using the evidence synthesis and best practice manual (see also output 4).</p>	<p>1.5.1 Comparison of revised policies with policies reviewed earlier in the project and cross checked for links to project outputs, whether explicit or implicit.</p>	
<p><b>Output 2</b></p> <p>Training courses and follow up support delivered to at least 30 stakeholders (government and civil society organisations) leading to changes in knowledge, policy and practice.</p>	<p>2.1 Increase in participants understanding of planning, implementing and evaluating social safeguards and development interventions around PAs, as a result of support and mentoring during the project.</p> <p>2.2 Sharing of best practices facilitated by the course workshops.</p> <p>2.3 Revisions by Partners (Kew Madagascar Conservation Centre, Madagascar National Parks and Impact Madagascar) to their safeguard policies and practices following the training.</p>	<p>2.1.1 Training attendance list/ certificates, disaggregated by gender, plus records of follow up meetings.</p> <p>2.1.2 Pre and post-training surveys (disaggregated by gender) to identify changes in participants' knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>2.1.3 Follow up survey (6 months later) to identify changes to organisation policies or practice.</p> <p>2.2.1 Pre and post-training surveys to identify any changes in participants' knowledge from the sharing sessions.</p> <p>2.2.2 Pre and post-training surveys, incl 6 months later to identify any changes to organisation policies or practice from the sharing session.</p> <p>2.3.1 Revisions to safeguard policies recorded, and cross</p>	



		checked for links to project outputs, whether explicit or implicit.	
<p><b>Output 3</b></p> <p>Training delivered to local communities to further their understanding of the community management convention, leading to positive perceived changes in engagement with co-management of conservation.</p>	<p>3.1 Increase in community members knowledge and capacity</p> <p>3.2 Establishment of Community Conventions (completed or in progress)</p>	<p>3.1.1 Training attendance list/ certificates, disaggregated by gender.</p> <p>3.1.2 Pre- and post-training surveys of knowledge, attitudes and perceived capacity (disaggregated by gender)</p> <p>3.2.1 Copies of convention documents (signed or in progress).</p>	
<p><b>Output 4</b></p> <p>Technical support provided for the reform of the social safeguard policies around PAs by the Ministry of Environment and Madagascar National Parks leading to changes in knowledge, policy and practice.</p>	<p>4.1 Active involvement in committee meetings and review process,</p> <p>4.2 Establishment of revised safeguard policies (completed or in progress),</p> <p>4.3 Revisions by Partners (e.g., Kew Madagascar Conservation Centre, Madagascar National Parks and Impact Madagascar) to their safeguard practices in accordance with the revised national safeguard policy.</p>	<p>4.1.1 Meeting attendance disaggregated by gender,</p> <p>4.2.1 Copies of revised safeguard policy documents,</p> <p>4.3.1 Revisions to safeguard practices recorded, and cross checked for links to project outputs, whether explicit or implicit.</p>	
<p><b>Activities</b> (each activity is numbered according to the output that it will contribute towards, for example 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are contributing to Output 1)</p> <p>1.1 Establish and maintain a database platform on the social impacts of PAs as well as social safeguard measures and other development interventions around PAs,</p> <p>1.2 Synthesise and disseminate evidence from the collated data</p> <p>2.1 Design and run the field-training course for high-level national stakeholders and facilitate sharing of best practices,</p> <p>2.2 Design and run the in-depth field-based training course aimed at technical staff working in the forest and conservation sector</p> <p>3.1 Train local communities on the community management convention,</p>			

4.1 Support ongoing reform of Madagascar's national PA safeguard policies (led by the Ministry of Environment and Madagascar National Parks)

**Assumptions**

We can collate suitable evidence on safeguarding mechanisms around PAs to feed into the database platform and provide a broader evidence base on best practices.

We can influence the internal policies of stakeholders (having identified knowledge demand during previous projects and subsequent discussions).

Adequate funding is available for lasting changes in actions on the ground and political, security and health situation remain conducive.

Trainings and documents hold sufficient interest to key stakeholders. Key stakeholders will be able to access materials.

We can rigorously and/or pragmatically attribute policy change to project activities through surveys and face-to-face briefings with key stakeholders

- **Annex 3: Standard Indicators**

**Table 1** Project Standard Indicators: **Not applicable**

DI Indicator number	Name of indicator using original wording	Name of Indicator after adjusting wording to align with DI Standard Indicators	Units	Disaggregation	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Total to date	Total planned during the project
E.g. DI-A01	E.g. People who attended training on CBD Reporting Standards	E.g. Number of officials from national Department of Environment who attended training on CBD Reporting Standards	People	Men	20			20	60
E.g. DI-C17	E.g. Articles published by members of the project team	E.g. Number of unique papers published in peer reviewed journals	Number	None	1			1	4

**Table 2** Publications: **none to report**

Title	Type (e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (authors, year)	Gender of Lead Author	Nationality of Lead Author	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. weblink or publisher if not available online)

- **Checklist for submission**

	Check
Different reporting templates have different questions, and it is important you use the correct one. Have you checked you have used the <b>correct template</b> (checking fund, type of report (i.e. Annual or Final), and year) and <b>deleted the blue guidance text</b> before submission?	yes
<b>Is the report less than 10MB?</b> If so, please email to <a href="mailto:BCF-Reports@niras.com">BCF-Reports@niras.com</a> putting the project number in the Subject line.	yes
<b>Is your report more than 10MB?</b> If so, please discuss with <a href="mailto:BCF-Reports@niras.com">BCF-Reports@niras.com</a> about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line.	No
<b>Have you included means of verification?</b> You should not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	yes
<b>Do you have hard copies of material you need to submit with the report?</b> If so, please make this clear in the covering email and ensure all material is marked with the project number. However, we would expect that most material will now be electronic.	no
If you are submitting photos for publicity purposes, do these meet the outlined requirements (see section 15)?	yes
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	yes
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	yes
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	