

**Madagascar: Environmental Action Plan, Phase 1a (Main Phase)**

**Ex post evaluation report**

<b>OECD sector</b>	41030 / Biodiversity	
<b>BMZ project IDs</b>	1998 65 296 and 1998 70 130	
<b>Project executing agency</b>	Association Nationale pour la Gestion des Aires Protégées (ANGAP)	
<b>Consultant</b>	WWF / GFA	
<b>Year of ex post evaluation report</b>	<b>2009</b>	
	<b>Project appraisal (planned)</b>	<b>Ex post evaluation (actual)</b>
<b>Start of implementation</b>	Q3 1998	Q3 1998
<b>Period of implementation</b>	84 months	126 months
<b>Investment costs</b>	EUR 5.2 million	EUR 5.6 million
<b>Counterpart contribution</b>	EUR 0.7 million	EUR 0.7 million
<b>Financing, of which FC funds</b>	EUR 4.0 million	EUR 4.4 million
<b>Other institutions/donors involved</b>	WWF: EUR 0.5 million	WWF: EUR 0.6 million
<b>Performance rating</b>	2	
• <b>Relevance</b>	1	
• <b>Effectiveness</b>	2	
• <b>Efficiency</b>	2	
• <b>Overarching developmental impact</b>	2	
• <b>Sustainability</b>	2	

**Brief description, overall objective and project objectives with indicators**

The project is part of a programme for the protection of 13 nature reserves which fall within the scope of the Madagascar environmental action plan. This programme was instituted by Madagascar and supported by various donors and non-governmental organisations. The overall objective of the project was to contribute to the protection of Madagascar's biodiversity and to preserve essential natural resources for the local population. The project objectives were to safeguard and manage the Andringitra, Andranahibe Sud, Marojejy and Pic Ivohibe reserves on a sustainable basis through the parks administration authority and the local community (the target group).

**Project design / major deviations from original planning and their main causes**

At the core of the project was the creation of a legally independent foundation to finance the 13 reserves, the 'Fondation pour les aires protégées et la biodiversité de Madagascar' (FAPB), financed by FC funding and funds from a debt swap. Maintenance costs for the

reserves are met from foundation endowment earnings. The project included the following investments:

- Administration of reserve territories (e.g. boundary markers, administration buildings).
- Sustainable management and environmental communications (e.g., development of tourism in the reserve areas, access routes and hiking tracks, camps, collaborations with schools and adult education institutes).
- Development of commercial and social infrastructure (e.g. support for the renovation of schools, health centres and village water supply systems).
- Sustainable use of land and forest (e.g. introduction of boundaries to contain and control the burning of vegetation, identification of protected forest areas).

The project is managed by a non-profit organisation, the Agence Nationale de la Gestion des Aires Protégées (ANGAP). Founded in 1990, it has developed into an efficient parks administration agency, with a decentralised structure and clear delineation of responsibilities. With a staff of 850 and the co-operation of the local community, ANGAP manages the operation of 40 of the 46 reserves entrusted to its care. Six are not yet being managed. The protected areas cover a total of 1.7 million hectares.

Management plans and annual plans of work, produced in compliance with international standards, form the basis on which the reserves are managed. The local community comes together in 'conseils des aires protégées' to participate in the planning of budgets and work schedules. The system of 'vigilance villageoise' also ensures that local inhabitants are actively involved in the management of the reserves.

### **Main conclusions from the impact analysis and performance rating**

The project objective of ensuring sustainable protection and management for the 13 reserves has been achieved. Management plans and annual plans of work for the reserves have been implemented, and conform to international standards.

At the time of ex post evaluation, no further degradation was observed in forest or grazing areas. Populations of important species, notably lemurs, are stable. This contributes to the overall objective of protecting Madagascar's biodiversity.

With regard to the preservation of essential natural resources for the local population, water availability in the area (e.g well yields, dry season supply levels, etc.) needed to improve. This improvement enabled yields of rice, the region's staple crop, to stabilise and, in some areas, to increase significantly (by 20-50 % when compared with yields at the start of the project).

Macroeconomic assessment of the project is difficult, inasmuch as the preservation of 'public assets' such as biodiversity or ecosystems tends to elude quantifiable monetary valuation. The value of these 'public assets' from a qualitative viewpoint is beyond question, and is generally considered to extend beyond national economic boundaries. This project took due account of the principle that 'resource protection' should not only avoid destabilising the living conditions of the directly affected population ("*do no harm*"), but also make a measurable contribution to their improvement.

The area covered by the project – in common with most of Madagascar's structurally weak rural areas – is characterised by a poverty level of 80 % or more. In accordance with the above "*do no harm*" principle, the measures in this programme, together with the development of tourism, have contributed to the reduction of regional poverty.

The positive effects of the environmental protection efforts were counteracted by only minimal negative consequences for the environment, and even these were localised and time-limited (construction of simple tourist accommodation and tracks). The structured involvement of the local population ensured good governance throughout the project.

The project had the potential to contribute to gender equality, not only by creating new posts in tourism establishments and opportunities to market handicraft products such as souvenirs, but also through the expansion of schooling.

We assess the developmental efficacy of the project as follows:

**Relevance:** On the one hand, the reserves are of great biodiversity value (including flora and fauna recognised as a unique global asset), whilst on the other hand they are a reservoir of supra-regional significance – and were therefore, even in retrospect, highly suitable zones to select for intervention. Unsustainable land use practices, originating in neighbouring areas and extending into the reserves, were identified as a core problem, as were the inadequate facilities and unsatisfactory performance of the nature reserve administration. The planned inclusion of local inhabitants in reserve management operations and a scheme of closely linked development in the surrounding areas were both significant elements in the project structure, meeting current standards in their design and effectiveness. The project conforms to BMZ developmental goals and guidelines for the preservation and promotion of biodiversity (MDG 7), for the reduction of poverty (MDG 1) and to the key points of the BMZ country strategy. From the standpoints of design and organisation, the programme was well integrated into the existing donor landscape. We rate collaboration with other donors such as the World Bank, Agence Française de Développement, and the World Wildlife Fund as very good (rating: 1).

**Effectiveness:** The project objective of sustainable protection and management for the nature reserves was achieved. At the time of ex post evaluation, no further degradation was observed in forest or grazing areas. Management plans and annual plans of work for the reserves have been implemented, and conform to international standards (rating: 2).

**Efficiency:** At approximately EUR 40/hectare, the setup costs for the reserves may be considered high, but were acceptable given the small areas involved, the time required, the improvements made to infrastructure and the benefits achieved for the local community. The visibly improved condition of both the natural areas and those cultivated areas supported by the programme (predominantly rice terraces and grazing land), the improvements in living conditions (from the viewpoint of the local population) and the generally good relations between the parks administration and the local population all testify to a satisfactory level of resource efficiency (rating: 2).

**Overarching developmental impact:** To a large extent, the anticipated contributions from the programme to the preservation of natural resources – biodiversity in particular – and to improved living conditions for the local population were realised. From an ecological perspective, both vegetation cover and species populations have at the very least remained stable, and some growth in numbers has been detected. Water availability in the area has improved (e.g well yields, dry season supply levels, etc.). This improvement stabilised and, in some areas, significantly increased yields of rice, the region's staple crop (by 20-50 % when compared with yields at the start of the project). The planned inclusion of the local population in the management of the reserves has made a particularly valuable contribution to structural improvement. The general willingness of the Madagascan Government to intensify their commitment to strengthening the nature reserve system can be considered one of the successes of the project (rating: 2).

**Sustainability:** Overall, the prospects for sustained financial and institutional/social benefits are favourable. The ongoing operation costs of the reserves will be met principally from debt swap funds, which are expected to remain available until 2020. The involvement of German Financial Collaboration and of other institutions, which is scheduled to run until at least 2013, is explicitly dependent upon further improvements in the basic principles for financing the nature reserve system. Expectations for the preservation of natural habitats outside the reserves, through sustainable forest management with the involvement of target groups have not yet been fully satisfied. Based on the current position, we expect the positive effects achieved by the projects so far will continue or, at worst, be marginally reduced (rating: 2).

Weighing up the above individual ratings, we assess the overall developmental efficacy of the project as good (rating 2).

## **General conclusions and recommendations**

The following general conclusions may be drawn from this project:

- Initiatives to protect natural resources demand long-term commitment and require a concerted approach, with adequate co-ordination at a number of levels between the various donor institutions – especially since they tend to operate in areas of tension where a diverse range of interests and players come into frequent conflict. With adequate patience and determination, it is possible to achieve lasting success – or even some structural changes in those places where 'unfavourable conditions' significantly curtail the opportunities for sustainability.
- The preservation of biodiversity as a 'global public asset' is not normally self-supporting in financial terms (e.g. from local revenues). Accordingly, supplementary financial support from external sources is required – in this case the FAPB foundation – to fund ongoing ecosystem protection tasks.
- Commercial organisations which profit from environmental protection activities should be contacted and integrated into the system at the earliest opportunity, to attract additional support from the companies concerned.

## **Notes on the methods used to evaluate project success (project rating)**

Projects are evaluated on a six-point scale, the criteria being relevance, effectiveness (outcome), "overarching developmental impact" and efficiency. The ratings are also used to arrive at a final assessment of a project's overall developmental efficacy. The scale is as follows:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Very good rating that clearly exceeds expectations  |
| 2 | Good rating fully in line with expectations and without any significant shortcomings  |
| 3 | Satisfactory rating – project falls short of expectations but the positive results dominate                                     |
| 4 | Unsatisfactory rating – significantly below expectations, with negative results dominating despite discernible positive results |
| 5 | Clearly inadequate rating – despite some positive partial results the negative results clearly dominate                         |
| 6 | The project has no positive results or the situation has actually deteriorated  |

A rating of 1 to 3 is a positive assessment and indicates a successful project while a rating of 4 to 6 is a negative assessment and indicates a project which has no sufficiently positive results.

## **Sustainability is evaluated according to the following four-point scale:**

Sustainability level 1 (very good sustainability)

The developmental efficacy of the project (positive to date) is very likely to continue undiminished or even increase.

Sustainability level 2 (good sustainability)

The developmental efficacy of the project (positive to date) is very likely to decline only minimally but remain positive overall. (This is what can normally be expected.)

Sustainability level 3 (satisfactory sustainability)

The developmental efficacy of the project (positive to date) is very likely to decline significantly but remain positive overall. This rating is also assigned if the sustainability of a project is considered inadequate up to the time of the ex post evaluation but is very likely to evolve positively so that the project will ultimately achieve positive developmental efficacy.

#### Sustainability level 4 (inadequate sustainability)

The developmental efficacy of the project is inadequate up to the time of the ex post evaluation and an improvement is very unlikely. This rating is also assigned if the sustainability that has been positively evaluated to date is very likely to deteriorate severely and no longer meet the level 3 criteria.

The overall rating on the six-point scale is compiled from a weighting of all five individual criteria as appropriate to the project in question. A rating of 1 to 3 indicates a “successful” project while a rating of 4 to 6 indicates an “unsuccessful” project. In using (with a project-specific weighting) the five key factors to form a overall rating, it should be noted that a project can generally only be considered developmentally “successful” if the achievement of the project objective (“effectiveness”), the impact on the overall objective (“overarching developmental impact”) and the sustainability are considered at least “satisfactory” (rating 3).