



Darwin Initiative Capability & Capacity: Final 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: no later than 3 months after agreed end date.

Submit to: BCF-Reports@niras.com including your project ref in the subject line.

Darwin Initiative Project Information

Project reference	DARCC016
Project title	Strengthening managers' and local communities' capacity for more resilient conservation
Country(ies)	Madagascar
Lead Partner	Laboratoire des Recherches Appliquées in the Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques
Project partner(s)	Bangor University
Darwin Initiative grant value	£ 96.350
Start/end dates of project	01.05.2022 to 31.03.2024
Project Leader's name	Sarobidy [REDACTED]
Project website/blog/social media	MIRARI – MItantana ara-dRARIny (forest4climateandpeople.org) twitter: @Forest4People facebook: mirari.mg
Report author(s) and date	Sarobidy [REDACTED], Manoa [REDACTED], Sanda [REDACTED], Mirindra [REDACTED], Neal [REDACTED], June 2024

1 Project Summary

Madagascar has exceptional biodiversity but has one of the world's highest recorded rates 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 nearly all lacked a Community Management Agreement (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 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 that PAs have 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 benefits from more local support, becoming more resilient and effective.

Biodiversity challenges: 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. However, both recent and longer established PAs have faced continual pressures from agriculture and mining by both local residents and migrants from further afield. These challenges have posed a severe threat to PAs, and the biodiversity they harbour, and PA managers have consistently identified the need to work more closely with local communities. Our work on the community management agreements is designed to support PA managers and local people to work together to improve management of PAs, through formal recognition by each party of their rights and responsibilities. The establishment of these community agreements, as well as our other project activities (training and technical support) will ensure that local communities, and especially the most vulnerable populations, are not harmed by conservation efforts, and biodiversity and ecosystems are more resilient to human pressures and sustainably contribute to climate change mitigation and sustainable development.

Poverty reduction challenges: Madagascar has one of the highest rates of poverty in the world, and the Malagasy government sees PAs as being an important driver of rural development and poverty reduction. However, evidence (e.g. Poudyal et al 2018) suggests that at least some PAs are failing to reduce poverty, and in some cases are imposing net costs on local people. Although national policy requires PAs to implement 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, current policy and practice are deficient. Our project activities, especially the training and sharing workshops that involve the whole protected area network across Madagascar will equip PA managers with the knowledge and tools to implement more effective and equitable safeguards. We have been investing significant technical support to the reform of the national safeguard policy initiated by the Ministry in 2020. We are also working in two PAs as pilot sites for the establishment of the community management agreement, the Itremo Massif PA (Ambatofinandrahana, Fianarantsoa) and Madiromirafy PA (Maevatanana, Mahajanga).

2 Project stakeholders/partners

The Madagascar project team have had regular weekly meetings with [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) to plan the project activities and various technical and financial aspects. All training materials have been developed jointly by our two organisations. [REDACTED] has also taken part in person in the technical training course (Feb 2023) in the two weeklong trainings on the community management agreement at Itremo and Madiromirafy protected areas (July 2023) and the follow up training in Itremo (February 2024) (see **Annex 5.1.1**).

Three other partners were named in our proposal: [REDACTED], which manages the Itremo Massif - part of the UK-funded Biodiverse Landscapes Fund programme

in Madagascar, (b) [REDACTED], manager of the new protected area of [REDACTED] - [REDACTED], and (c) [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] have been heavily involved in project activities, with staff working alongside the project team before, during and after our three visits to each site to co-design and implement the activities. Staff from [REDACTED] and Impact also participated in the technical training and national workshops. Although we haven't worked directly in a PA managed by [REDACTED], MNP have been closely involved in our work developing [REDACTED] [REDACTED].

As part of the processes in delivering Output 1 (evidence synthesis on effectiveness of social safeguards), we have established formal agreements with these partner and other organisations such as [REDACTED] which define 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 (**Annex 5.1.2**). They 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 practice brief and manual.

(Please note that we have agreed to keep these organisation names confidential in the policy practice brief and manual and would appreciate that BCF does the same)

To deliver the technical training courses and follow up support to stakeholders (output 2), we conducted two main training sessions with a total of 58 participants who are stakeholders working in the forest and conservation sector (from ministries, national office for [REDACTED] and climate change and organisations managing protected areas) (**Annex 5.1.3**)

Participants in the technical training were focused on technical staff, attended by 16 participants from 15 organisations (**Annex 5.2.2.1**). Selection aimed for a diversity of disciplinary backgrounds and experience, and gender equality. As we launched a public call for the training participation among our targets, the training was highly successful, first through the quality of participation, as well as the reflection and debate among participants and course leaders during the session. During this training, local communities 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 [REDACTED].

The high-level training targeted senior level staffs from different organisations in conservation: governments, NGOs and civil society. Most of the leading players in the conservation field were invited to the training (**Annex 5.2.2.6**). The workshop covered the key points of the reformed national safeguard policy (hereafter referred to as the Environmental and Social Management Framework or ESMF in short). The participants actively participated and expressed a keen interest in the finalisation of the reform of the ESMF. The use of a live poll during the workshop helped them share their perspectives and recommendations on the various themes raised (**Annex 5.2.2.8**)

To produce output 3 (implementation of the community management agreement within PAs in Madagascar), we also established a partnership with Natural Justice (**Annex 5.1.4**). This institution 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. Natural Justice was involved in every step on the design and delivery of the training we delivered.

The various steps of the community management agreement where they have been included:

- 1) The first step consisted of interviews in October 2022 to understand local communities' perceptions of the PA management [REDACTED]. The project team developed the interview guides which were [REDACTED].

then reviewed by the PA managers (**Annex 5.2.3.1**). We determined together the sites to conduct these interviews.

- 2) The second step involved training the site-based staffs of these PAs as well as some local community representatives and future trainers on the establishment of the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The PA managers helped identify the community representatives that will be tasked with disseminating the knowledge and the content of the training to people in their villages. Collaboratively with Natural Justice, we designed posters to aid the training on the CGC with local communities, with consultation of the committee in charge of the reform of the national safeguard policy at the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable development. The poster includes 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 (**Annex 5.2.3.6**). Such consultation and collaboration will ensure the long-term use of the poster, and its shared ownership.

- 3) The third step was the mass information for local communities, all logistical aspects were prepared in advance by our partners. They also contributed to the training sessions by taking part in the core sessions and explanations (**Annex 5.2.3.4**).

All these partners [REDACTED] participated as panellists at a panel discussion during the national sharing workshop in April 2024 to share their experiences, respond to the audience questions as well as to raise awareness on the agreement with other PA managers [REDACTED]

To produce output 4 (reform of the social safeguard policies around PAs), we have established a close partnership with the [REDACTED]. The project team has steered a national restricted committee on the reform of the national safeguard policy, which is composed of the team from the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] We had a regular monthly meeting to advance the discussion on the key points of the reform. This partnership led to the submission of the final version to the Ministry of Environment (**Annex 5.2.4.1**).

3 Project Achievements

3.1 Outputs

Output 0: Clarify stakeholder needs and opportunities for impact

During the first three months of the project (May, June in 2022), the team met several organisations managing PAs in Madagascar. These meetings confirmed that there is a high level of demand for the project's proposed activities. Most of these organisations specifically 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 emphasised at the [project launch workshop](#), which was attended by more than 40 participants from several conservation organisations and honoured by an opening speech by the UK ambassador HEM David Ashley (**Annex 5.2.0**). The Ministry of Environment also officially expressed their willingness to collaborate with the project during the launch workshop.

Output 1: 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.

PA managers requested evidence on the best practices to ensure that local communities impacted by PAs share equitably in the benefits they generate, and on the drivers of success or failure. To address this, we collected data from four PAs, including detailed accounts of any safeguard or development activities implemented by the managers, counts of beneficiaries, and any assessment of their social impacts. This data collection was enriched by semi-structured interviews with conservation organisation staff to understand the background context and fill any information gaps.

Despite our considerable efforts to reach out to other PA managers, we have not been able to access more datasets. A change in data policy requiring payment for data access at Madagascar National Parks prevented us from finalising our data sharing agreement and accessing information on their 43 PAs. Additionally, other organisations managing PAs commonly lacked useful and rigorous data on the social impacts of safeguard and development activities, and/or were reluctant / unable to share their datasets.

The data received from the four partner organisations were of poor quality and lacked critical information. Consequently, we are unable to establish a comprehensive database. However, we re-oriented the output to identify strengths and weaknesses in monitoring and evaluating safeguards within PAs to extract "lessons learned", resulting in the creation of a best practice brief and manual (**Annex 5.2.1.1**).

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.

We analysed datasets from four protected areas, identifying strengths and weaknesses, and supplemented it with a review of social safeguard plans from 74 PAs in Madagascar we conducted in 2020 to develop a best practice brief and manual (**Annex 5.2.1.1**), incorporating lessons learned and recommendations. We presented the draft practice brief and manual to nine communities across two partner protected areas during local consultation about community management agreements, ensuring at 45 to 65 % participation by women (**Annex 5.2.3.1**). These meetings also aimed to inform communities on the purposes of the development interventions and jointly discuss and assess their impacts on both communities and conservation. This helped us to validate information from shared datasets while gathering feedback from PA managers on local perceptions.

1.3 Presentation of final evidence synthesis and best practice manual to stakeholders at dissemination event in Antananarivo attended by at least 60 attendees.

In April 2024, as our project concluded, we organised a national workshop under the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development's auspices, to share with various stakeholders our final evidence synthesis and best practice manual but also disseminate the need for and our experience on the community management agreement. Over 70 participants from various conservation organisations attended (**Annex 5.2.1.3 and Annex 5.2.1.4**). We distributed a leaflet about the policy best practice brief, which sparked significant interest and questions among participants. The workshop evaluation survey suggested that participants grasped and endorsed key recommendations, particularly emphasising the importance of rigorously evaluating the impacts of development interventions (**Annex 5.2.1.5**).

1.4 Revisions to safeguard policies and practices by Partners (Kew Madagascar Conservation Centre - KMCC, Madagascar National Parks and Impact Madagascar) using the evidence synthesis and best practice manual.

Madagascar National Parks have been revising their safeguard policies using partly the consultancy meetings we have convened on the social safeguard policy with the Ministry of Environment. We have discussed several aspects of their revised policies in these meetings and shared our key recommendations. As examples of key changes to their policies, they have adopted the mitigation hierarchy and have prescribed the implementation of compensation measures in line

with the unavoidable negative impacts on the environment and/or local communities (PS: they shared with us a version of the revised policies which are still confidential).

For Impact Madagascar and KMCC, we were able to hold meetings to share our key recommendations on their safeguard practices, advising on indicators and impact evaluation methods, which they integrated into their monitoring and evaluation tools

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).

We have successfully incorporated all our key recommendations into the revised ESMF. The final version of this reform has been submitted to the Ministry of Environment for validation (**Annex 5.2.4.4**). Upon approval, the policy will be adopted by all conservation stakeholders, including NGOs and donors operating in Madagascar, who will need to align their policies with the standards required in the revised policy.

Output 2: 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.

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. And 2.2 Sharing of best practices facilitated by the course workshops.

We conducted two training sessions to drive knowledge, policy, and practice change among conservation stakeholders. The first training, held from February 6-10, 2023, gathered 15 technical staff from ministries, NGOs, and private sectors (see [Blog of technical training](#) and **Annex 5.2.2.2**). The training covered restoration and PA impact mitigation assessment methods, identification of people affected by conservation restrictions, lessons learned from past research, ethical considerations - including Free Prior Informed Consent, requirements from various safeguards norms and systems - both international (e.g. World Bank, Cancun) and national (e.g. REDD+, Protected Area Code, Mining Code). Additionally, it also fostered peer learning between PA managers through knowledge exchange. We ensured that local people's voices were heard by involving residents from two PAs in the training course (**Annex 5.2.2.1**).

In two communities near Torotorofotsy Ramsar Site, we screened our film "Voices of the Forest," created under a previous FCDO-funded project, to initiate thematic discussions between course participants and local communities. We also conducted role-playing games where PA managers and community members swapped roles to address challenging scenarios from each other's perspectives. The enthusiastic participation sparked lively and engaging debates, fostering a platform for local communities to share their viewpoints with PA managers and provide feedback on methods and interview techniques. The technical training was highly successful, generating rich discussions that enhanced learning for all participants. It was featured in the latest Darwin newsletter (**Annex 5.2.2.4**) and encouraged attendees to apply their new knowledge by proposing practical recommendations for designing, implementing, and monitoring safeguarding activities within their organisations.

The second sharing workshop, held on June 16, 2023, brought together 42 senior staffs from the Ministry of Environment, the national office for REDD+ and Climate Change, conservation NGOs, and donors. It aimed to disseminate key recommendations on the policy reform and foster discussions on best practices. The workshop covered four main themes: assessing social impacts of PA activities, identifying and prioritising social safeguards beneficiaries, the Community Management Agreements (CGC), and the grievance mechanism (**Annex 5.2.2.5**). Live polls conducted during the workshop indicated participants comprehended and endorsed the key recommendations shared (**Annex 5.2.2.8**).

2.3 Revisions by Partners (Kew Madagascar Conservation Centre, Madagascar National Parks and Impact Madagascar) to their safeguard policies and practices following the training.

Following our four-day training in February 2023, participants were encouraged to apply their learning in their work. They provided practical recommendations for designing, implementing, and monitoring safeguarding activities within their organisations (see action plans in **Annex 5.2.2.3**). Discussions with stakeholders confirmed a growing interest and alignment with the changes we suggested (as outlined in the best practice brief and manual). An example is the updating of the indicators used by some of these NGOs to evaluate the impact of their activities, and their willingness to learn more robust evaluation methods, and the process of establishing the CGC.

Staff from conservation NGOs, such as WCS and GERP, have also requested our support for the design, monitoring and evaluation of their safeguard and development interventions around PAs. Although it is too early to document measurable changes in their practices and policies, our activities show great potential for impact. Additionally, the project team has received numerous requests from conservation NGOs for help with the establishment of the Community Management Agreement and related training (see letter of support **Annex 5.1.5**). These organisations, including TAFO MIHAAVO, Blue Ventures, Durrell, and WCS, are committed to promoting equitable community inclusion and improving protected area management.

Output 3: Training delivered to local communities across two protected areas to further their understanding of the community management convention, leading to positive perceived changes in engagement with co-management of conservation.

Our review of Malagasy protected areas found that while various forms of agreements exist between PA managers and local communities, they have significant flaws and lack essential elements needed to ensure effective community inclusion and participation as a community management agreement. We outline below how we have addressed these gaps.

3.1 Increase in community members knowledge and capacity on the community management agreement or Convention de Gestion Communautaire in French (CGC)

3.1.1. Promoting equitable co-management of PAs

In July 2022, Mirindra Rakotoarisoa attended the IUCN Africa Protected Areas Congress in Kigali, Rwanda where he represented our team in an African Wildlife Foundation panel on a rights-based approach to conservation in Africa, emphasising the role of community management agreements in securing local communities' decision-making rights and fair and equitable access to conservation benefits (see [Blog IUCN APAC participation](#)). Following this, we were approached by Maliasili - an organisation defending community rights in natural resource management - to share our experiences on inclusive PA co-management through CGC (**Annex 5.1.6**).

3.1.2. Local community consultations

In October 2022, we consulted local communities in three sites across Madagascar: Madiromirafy in the North-West (managed by Impact Madagascar), Marolambo in the South-East (managed by Madagascar National Parks), and Itremo in the central highlands (managed by Kew Madagascar Conservation Center). The consultations aimed to inform the agreement's development, prepare the training on the Community Management Convention - especially on how the CGC interacts with existing management-transfer areas, and understand local perceptions of social safeguards while verifying data from PA managers.

In Madiromirafy - a PA currently being established, we conducted nine focus groups with 85 local community members. In Marolambo, we held five focus groups with 48 people across three villages. In Itremo, we conducted six focus groups with 62 participants. Our findings indicated misunderstandings within communities about their roles in the "co-management" of the PA, with less than 10% of the community involved - mostly members of community-based management associations responsible for managing some forest areas. Most participants perceived the PA establishment to have restricted their resources use and development interventions insufficient to offset revenue lost to the establishment of the PA (**Annex 5.2.3.1**).

3.1.3. The trainings on CGC

We conducted two series of CGC trainings both for Itremo Massif PA and Madiromirafy PA. Attendees included field staff managers, local communities, traditional and local authorities, and forest administration representatives (**Annex 5.2.3.3**).

We held the first four-day CGC training sessions in July 2023 in the two PAs, with about 70 local community members participating in total. The training covered PA and CGC definitions and goals, rights and responsibilities in PA management, CGC content, negotiation, complaint management, and monitoring and evaluation. We also had practical exercise sessions of CGC negotiation and complaints and grievance management (**Annex 5.2.3.2**). We provided posters (**Annex 5.2.3.6**) and booklets (**Annex 5.2.3.5**) to aid understanding and used interactive techniques like role-playing, public speaking, and negotiation exercises, which participants found valuable. Participants also appreciated the emphasis on regular dialogue between communities and PA managers. Pre- and post-training evaluations showed strong retention of key CGC concepts (**Annex 5.3.1**).

To comply with recommended CGC elaboration steps and respect Free, Prior, and Informed of the CGC parties Consent, we held mass information sessions on the CGC gathering a total of around 600 people from the local communities in the two partner PAs: in January 20-26th 2024 for Ankirihitra-Madiromirafy Complex and February 20-29th 2024 in the Itremo Massif.

These sessions were important to thoroughly inform local community members about the CGC, its benefits, and its development process. The goal was for participants to understand the purpose of a PA, the definition and main steps of CGC, and the associated rights and responsibilities. Additionally, they were made aware of the importance of the CGC hence the necessity to carry out internal community meetings to elect their representatives before negotiating with PA managers and establishing the CGC document. The sessions' highly participative nature enhanced community knowledge and capacity regarding the CGC. Evaluations through games or handstands indicated that the communities fully comprehended the key messages (see **Annex 5.2.3.4 Report of CGC mass information sessions**).

3.2 Establishment of the CGC (completed or in progress)

Due to the lengthy process requiring frequent internal meetings and negotiations sessions within and between parties, the establishment of the CGC is still ongoing at the two pilot sites. However, our partner managers are convinced of its importance and continue to mobilise their communities through internal meetings. Also, this has increased community interest in PA management.

To share the experiences of the two pilot sites and encourage other protected area managers and communities to establish Community Management Agreements, the project produced a documentary film (see [CGC film blog](#) and **Annex 5.2.3.7**). This film, funded with additional support from ISFP through Bangor University, aims to inform, raise awareness, and advocate the need for more equitable and effective protected area management. The film was played and well-received at our national workshop (see [Blog National Workshop](#)). Several conservation organisations have sought our team's technical support for setting up their CGCs. Unfortunately, we haven't secured follow-up funding from Darwin and are currently raising funds to continue such work.

Output 4: Technical support provided for the reform of the social safeguard policies around PAs (ESMF) by the Ministry of Environment and Madagascar National Parks leading to changes in knowledge, policy and practice.

The team has been leading the working group on the ESMF reform since February 2020 where we have been providing significant support to address conservation social safeguard policies due to lack of capacity from government agencies to address these issues.

4.1 Active involvement in committee meetings and review process

The final draft is the key output of 17 meetings which can be summarised as (**Annex 5.2.4.1**):

- 04th May 2022: discussion about the ESMF content, social safeguards principles, the concept and implementation of full and equitable participation of local community and other stakeholders
- 13th May 2022: reflection about social safeguards and some terms in the CGC needing to be determined
- 16th May 2022: consultation Natural Justice to reflect on the differences between the CGC and other existing agreements between PA managers and local communities, as well as the possible structure and processes of CGC.
- 24th May 2022: discussion on the content of the legal text about the CGC and its current applications in the field
- 08th June 2022: reorganisation of the content of the policy document (ESMF) 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.
- 15th June 2022: decision on what to assess in terms of impact evaluation, scope of application and selection of methods to be used
- 17th June 2022: sharing of the ongoing reform to the national NGOs working in protected area management in Madagascar and collecting their experiences and feedback on the agreements with local communities for the co-management of the PA.
- 15th July 2022: Discussion and selection of environmental and social management norms for the protected areas in Madagascar.
- 18th October 2022: presentation of the Norms, discussion about the CGC's content and elaboration process.
- 31st October 2022: discussion on tools and methodologies for impact assessment and choice of social safeguard, reflection on the structure of the grievance mechanism
- 11th November 2022: courtesy visit to the PA new Director at the Ministry and presentation of progress in the policy reform for the environmental and social management of Malagasy PA
- 21st February 2023: establishment of a roadmap for the revised social safeguard policy's final approval and publication
- 24th February 2023: presentation of the draft of the final policy proposal from MIRARI to the restricted executive committee and collection of the last feedbacks. Afterwards, the MEDD started a thorough review of the final policy proposal,
- 25th 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),
- 17th November 2023 : advancement on two main points of the ESMF (the grievance mechanism and the identification and evaluation of impacts) by comparison with the draft ESMF of MNP. Summary of consultation points and key recommendation to add on the final ESMF,
- 04th - 05th January 2024 : two days workshop in Mantsoa and presentation of the final draft to collect feedback (rearranging principles and norms of ESM) leading to the acceptance of the last version from all the committee members.
- 07th March 2024 : handover of the modified final version of the ESMF to the Ministry and planning of the various deadlines (presentation to the broad committee, the SAPM committee, and at the end the government) for the national validation.

4.2 Establishment of revised safeguard policies (completed or in progress)

The two-day retreat on the Environmental and Safeguard Management Framework (ESMF) for Madagascar's Protected Areas, held in Mantsoa on January 4-5, 2024, led the final steps of the reform and finalisation of the document (see [Blog of CGES retreat](#) and **Annex 5.2.4.3**).

The final version of this document, revised after we incorporated feedback from the Ministry in March 2023, is now awaiting the Ministry's validation to be shared with the extended committee and Environmental Ministry staff for final validation within Madagascar's Protected Areas System (SAPM) (**Annex 5.2.4.2**). This version includes updated management Principles and Norms, a methodology for identifying and evaluating social impacts, principles and guidelines for the

grievance mechanism, stakeholder integration process, and a draft Community Management Agreement or “Convention de Gestion Communautaire” (CGC) between PA managers and the local community.

With the project concluding in March 2024, to ensure the completion of the ESMF reform, Lalaina Randrianasolo, a department chief in the Direction of Protected Areas, Natural Resources, and Ecosystems (DAPRNE), has been tasked with leading the final validation process of the reformed ESMF at the national level (**Annex 5.2.4.5**). She will collect feedback from the extended committee, convene a national ESMF workshop, and keep the team updated on progress. Lalaina remains in constant contact with the team for ESMF or CGC information, and if need be she can request meeting and technical support from our team.

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 (ESMF).

The revised safeguard policy emphasised the importance of identifying, assessing, and compensating any unavoidable impacts on local communities' livelihoods, particularly concerning their rights to use, access, and own natural resources, including land. To uphold these safeguard practices, the establishment of Community Management Agreements (CGC) and the introduction of a grievance management mechanism were recommended.

Our main partners have aligned their safeguarding practices with these recommendations. For Impact Madagascar and Kew Madagascar Conservation Center, we reviewed their socio-economic databases for social safeguard activities and provided feedback to enhance social safeguards monitoring and evaluation. They are now updating their practices to comply with the reform.

These organisations also launched initiatives to establish a CGC to ensure more inclusive and transparent socio-economic activities while upholding community rights and responsibilities. The MiRARI team piloted this initiative, adhering to all guidelines for CGC establishment. We conducted two major training sessions and provided various tools and follow-up meetings to ensure successful capacity transfer to their teams.

Our collaborative efforts within the national committee on the reform of the ESMF led Madagascar National Parks (MNP) to significant updates of their social management policies across their 43 protected areas (). MNP's latest updated ESMF emphasises establishing baselines for any activity conducted within PAs and specifies the need to identify impacts according to established standards. MNP now uses both quantitative and qualitative assessments to estimate adequate compensation for unavoidable negative impacts due to PA activities. Additionally, MNP launched a hybrid (online and physical) grievance and complaints management tool for all stakeholders involved in PA management.

3.2 Outcome

Our project activities have helped the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, conservation NGOs and communities gain a better understanding of, as well as increased capacity in the design and implementation of more effective safeguard and sustainable development approaches around PAs. Our project has enabled them to deliver more equitable and resilient conservation through more effective social safeguard processes and adequate investments in food security and poverty alleviation around PAs, in the mid and longer term.

First, the project committed to increasing stakeholders' knowledge of resources and mechanisms necessary to achieve fair and equitable conservation (Indicator 1). We achieved this by providing engaging materials (film, leaflet, booklet, poster) and delivering tailored trainings to targeted stakeholders : local communities, organisations managing protected areas, and the Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development.

- For local communities, the main goal was to strengthen their ability to co-manage the protected area. This included enhancing their knowledge of their rights, responsibilities, and obligations

related to the PA management, as well as their negotiation skills for PA management decision-making. Training also enabled them to participate in monitoring, evaluation of activities and governance aspects, such as social safeguards and co-management activities. This was achieved through two training sessions conducted in each partner PA, supported by posters and booklets to ensure a clear understanding of co-management and the CGC agreement. Before the training, communities were aware that they needed to participate in PA management but lacked specifics. After the training, they had a better understanding of their rights, responsibilities, and obligations towards PA management (**Annex 5.3.1**).

The training courses also enabled the communities to improve their negotiation skills on the management of the PA, and increased their self-confidence. The same applies to their ability to understand what principle of co-management and what agreement should be in place in order to put their knowledge into practice in their protected areas (**Annex 5.3.2**).

- **For NGOs managing PAs**, the project enhanced NGOs' capacity in social management of PAs, including the establishment of equitable and effective social safeguards and co-management. Two trainings were held: one for PA manager NGOs' technicians in February 2023, and another for decision-makers in June 2023.

The training raised managers' awareness of the local costs of conservation (**Annex 5.3.3**) and emphasised the need for improved evaluation of their social safeguard activities (**Annex 5.3.4**).

- The training also helped them identify areas for improvement in current PA management methods and develop action plans for more equitable and effective practices. (*cf.* [action plans in Annex 5.2.2.3](#)). NGO managers also received training to implement co-management through the Community Management Agreement (CGC). Two training levels were provided: one for technical staff and one for senior staffs decision-maker, both aiming to ensure understanding of the CGC, its importance, and its proper establishment. Technical staff are enabled to ensure that free, prior, and informed consent of local communities is respected, conduct mass CGC information sessions, and follow necessary steps. Decision-makers gained increased knowledge about the CGC (**Annex 5.3.5**)
- The project aims to influence national policies to result in more resilient conservation and restoration through more effective social safeguards, and improved rural livelihoods and people's rights to land. We developed technical guidelines in the revised national safeguard policy (ESMF) to help the Ministry delegated managers (NGOs and/or community organisations) assess and evaluate the socio-economic impacts of conservation. Also, the practice manual, based on the analysis of PA manager-generated socio-economic data, enables the Ministry to assess the relevance of impact assessment methods used by PA managers (**Annex 5.2.1.1**).

Second, the project contributed to **change in stakeholders policies (government, NGOs) with respect to social safeguarding procedures (indicator 2)**.

We have submitted the final version of the reformed Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) of protected areas in Madagascar to the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable development (**Annex 5.2.4.4**). The main recommendations from the project have been incorporated into the document (*cf.* [Blog of CGES retreat](#)) and have been extensively discussed with and approved by the Ministry (*cf.* [Meeting minutes in Annex 5.2.4.1](#)). These recommendations include the incorporation of a technical guide on social impact assessment and a more adequate grievance mechanism. PA managers and donors working on conservation in Madagascar are due to comply with the ESMF once it gets final validation at the national level.

Finally, the project ensured that there is a **change in the actions (related to consideration of the social impacts of conservation action, including the establishment of the "Convention de Gestion Communautaire - CGC or Community Management Agreement) of our PA manager partners as well as those who have benefited from our training courses (Indicator 3)**.

We monitored any changes in our partner's policies and actions through ongoing engagement and feedback. Discussions with stakeholders confirmed a growing interest and alignment with the changes we suggested (as outlined in the best practice brief and manual). An example is the

updating of the indicators used by some of these NGOs to evaluate the impact of their activities, and their willingness to learn more robust evaluation methods, and the process of establishing the CGC.

We have provided feedback to our formal partners that shared their datasets on the safeguard and development activities they implement. These feedbacks increased their awareness on the need to use more reliable methods in evaluating the impacts of their interventions, such as the importance of collecting some baseline data to measure changes that can be attributed to their interventions.

Two of our partners (Kew and Impact) are continuing the process of establishing the CGC. They have closely worked with our team in conducting the mass information as well as in training community representatives (cf [Blog of communities empowerment on CGC](#)). However, no CGC was fully established and signed during this project, as this would require a much longer process than anticipated (e.g. repeated mass information sessions to ensure communities free, prior and informed consent, and enable them to elect their representative throughout the CGC process).

3.3 Monitoring of assumptions

We made five 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).

Discussions with stakeholders confirmed a growing interest and alignment with the changes we suggested (as outlined in the best practice brief and manual). An example is the updating of their indicators to evaluate the impact of their activities, and their willingness to learn more robust evaluation methods, and the process of establishing the CGC. The interest of key stakeholders in training and documentation was gauged through participation rates and engagement levels during training sessions. Feedback forms and follow-up surveys indicated a high level of interest and satisfaction, which was reflected in the continued high attendance and active participation in subsequent events organised by our team.

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.

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). Accessibility of materials to key stakeholders was ensured by utilising multiple dissemination channels, including digital platforms (video on YouTube, diverse manual and policy briefs available online as well as every training display materials) and in-person briefings. This approach was validated through direct feedback during stakeholder meetings, confirming that the materials were both accessible and valuable.

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. We maintained detailed records of our meetings with policy makers and the outcomes of those meetings, and are able to attribute some changes to our activities.

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.

We called for collaboration with partner PA managers, we established data sharing agreements to reassure them about the use of their data. Regular check-ins and updates were on track but we faced obstacles with few NGOs providing their data. We addressed this by using our previous data in combination with the data provided by the partners who responded, enabling us to provide a manual of good practice which was designed in part to improve the future availability of evidence.

4 Contribution to Darwin Initiative Programme Objectives

4.1 Project support to the Conventions or Treaties (e.g. CBD, Nagoya Protocol, ITPGRFA, CITES, Ramsar, CMS, UNFCCC)

The project has been involved in co-leading the reform of the Malagasy PA environmental and social management framework (ESMF) which needed to be reviewed to align more PA achievement with international commitment. Our work has been instrumental in developing and promoting policies that ensure conservation efforts are inclusive and beneficial to local communities. This aligns with the CBD's objective of sustainable use of biodiversity, ensuring that conservation initiatives contribute to sustainable development regarding the Aichi Target 11 - 4th element about effective and equitable PA management ([REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The project strengthened capacities of all the manager stakeholders so that they are able to co-manage the PA [REDACTED] by ensuring biodiversity preservation and adequate safeguards for local livelihoods improvement.

This project played as well a crucial role in engaging local communities to ensure the successful establishment and management of PAs through the Community Management Agreement, which will contribute to Global Biodiversity Framework's Target 3 (equitability of the management and emphasises the recognition and respect of the rights of Indigenous People and Local Communities when aiming for the 30 by 30 conservation goal) and the Target 22 (advocates for a full, equitable, inclusive and effective representation and participation in decision-making for Indigenous People and Local Communities and respecting their culture and rights).

4.2 Project support to biodiversity conservation and poverty reduction

The project planned to make progress to support biodiversity conservation and poverty reduction by better equipping PA managers to manage protected areas equitably and effectively.

In the short-term, we have successfully increased the understanding and application of effective and equitable social safeguard and PA co-management approaches among around 100 national key stakeholders through a series of workshops, training and follow-up support sessions. We also organised knowledge-sharing meetings on the CGC that benefited approximately 660 people (approximately 330 households, with about 45% female attendance rate). These training provided these participants with the knowledge to actively participate in PA co-management efforts and ensure that the benefits of capacity building were equitably distributed. Researchers and conservation practitioners have mutually benefited from this exchange, enhancing their practical skills and policy-relevant knowledge.

In the long term, our project aims to influence national and donor policies to foster more resilient conservation for biodiversity conservation and improve rural livelihoods through adequate development projects as well as secure rights. This has been achieved through the approval of the final version of the ESMF and the dissemination of our policy and manual of good practices.

Biodiversity Conservation: Our project contributes to higher-level impacts on biodiversity conservation by promoting equitable and sustainable management practices within PAs. The integration of social safeguards ensures that conservation efforts are inclusive and sustainable, protecting both biodiversity and the rights of local communities. By influencing national policies, our project supports broader biodiversity goals, including those outlined in the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

Poverty Reduction: The project's impact on human development is evidenced by ensuring equitable social outcomes for local communities. Training and capacity-building efforts have

empowered communities as well as PA managers, enhancing their co-participation in conservation activities and decisions, but also by specifically empowering managers for better-designed compensation and development interventions related to conservation.

4.3 Gender equality and social inclusion

Please quantify the proportion of women on the Project Board ¹ .	3/5 of project staffs are female (Sarobidy [REDACTED] - project lead, [REDACTED] Manoa - project manager, [REDACTED] Sanda - research assistant).
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 ² .	3/4 of our partners Our main project partner with staff costs is Bangor University which has 7 females out of 19 members. All of our 3 NGOs PA manager partners are led by female (KMCC, Impact Madagascar and MNP)

We have also paid heed to gender balance when inviting participants to the training workshops and community events. Overall, we had about 45 % representation of women among training participants and speakers/trainers in our events (including the technical trainings we have provided, and consultation meetings with the [REDACTED] as well as national workshops we have convened in Antananarivo).

4.4 Transfer of knowledge

As mentioned before, our approach to knowledge transfer has been multifaceted, leveraging various trainings, follow-up support with practitioners, involvement of partners and effective dissemination through the sharing of hard copies and digital materials.

At national level, we provided in-depth technical support on the Environmental and Social Management Framework through the restricted committee. We ensured progress on the effectiveness of PA management, exchanged knowledge, and provided strategic guidance. We have now transferred the skills to concretize such objectives through written document (ESMF) which are now in the Ministry's hands (Output 4.2).

We also organised a series of training sessions aimed at building capacity among local practitioners and policymakers. These events provided a forum for sharing project findings and discussing their practical applications on sustainable management practices and social safeguards for over 30 stakeholders (see Output 2.1 and 2.2). Through community meetings, we directly involved local communities in the training format which ensured that new knowledge was not only transferred but also put into practice according to local context, enhancing its relevance and impact (see Output 3.1).

We produced a range of hard copies and digital materials (film, poster, booklet about the Community Management Agreement, leaflet of good practice briefs) which were distributed to stakeholders at workshops and local community meetings. These are still available through our project website for wide learning by the public, practitioners and funders in conservation.

4.5 Capacity building

In addition to the increased capability and capacity of our training beneficiaries (Ministry, NGOs and local communities), the project has also increased our project staff's capacity:

Mirindra Rakotoarisoa (M) : played a critical role in the design of the best practice brief and manual on social impact evaluation, which enabled him to integrate the monitoring committee of some

¹ A Project Board has overall authority for the project, is accountable for its success or failure, and supports the senior project manager to successfully deliver the project.

² Partners that have a formal governance role in the project, and a formal relationship with the project that may involve staff costs and/or budget management responsibilities.

projects such as the COMBO program led by WCS and advise the elaboration of the PAGE 3 project of GIZ.

Sanda Anjara Rakotomalala (F) : through her major role in leading the ESMF's writing and the national committee, she has now been integrated into the national reflection committee on updating the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP).

Dr Manoa Rajaonarivelo (F) : through her first experience as a project manager, has now been involved as a co-applicant in other research projects hosted by LRA-ESSA-Forets.

Dr Sarobidy Rakotonarivo (F) : has been promoted to Senior Researcher and is currently involved as an expert advisor to a large UK-funded project (the Biodiverse landscape fund in Madagascar) as well as in other international expert panels, such as the dialogue on the true value of forests led by Wyss Academy of Sciences.

All of our team have gained prominence and have been recently approached by other international scholars on developing new research partnerships.

5 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) 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.

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.

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

6 Actions taken in response to Annual Report reviews

Four main comments have been raised in the reviews of our first annual report.

The first comment is related to our partnership, as the involvement of Bangor University staff to the project has already been addressed in Section 2. Neal Hockley, our staff from Bangor University was part of all technical and financial planning of all of our activities, attending all weekly project meetings by teams. He participated in-person in the delivery of restricted committee meetings, four trainings on three separate visits to Madagascar (only 1 funded by Darwin). Another point raised was about the partnership governance we made with Natural Justice that we mentioned in Section 2. Natural Justice co-planned and co-designed the project tools as well as the local community training about the CGC with our team to deliver Output 3.

To address the reviewer comment on the performance of our activities under Output 2, we included graphs on the pre and post training surveys in **Annex 5.3**. We have also included the attendance lists to justify our activities under Output 4.1 in **Annex 5.2.4.3**.

The difficulty with establishing the database platform has been addressed by the project by the production of policy briefs and a good practice manual, which have been shared with stakeholders and used in the training with local communities (please see Output 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3).

To address the last comment about the need for safeguarding training and focal point, our host institution (Laboratoire des Recherches Appliquées, ESSA-Forêts) has recently updated their policy and procedure (January 2024) and all our project team have been informed about this and trained in the key changes.

7 Lessons learnt

The training and support delivered for capacity and capability building of PA managers were a notable success during the project. We can retain several factors of that success with: 1) effective collaboration with strong partnership and involvement of stakeholders, 2) the design and sharing of appropriate and high-quality training materials accessible to various participants, 3) the use of interactive and practical sessions during the training, including the involvement of local residents of protected areas, 4) technical and financial monitoring and evaluation of every activity.

Despite the overall success, when it comes to data sharing and raising partners' awareness about its importance, a lot more work is needed. Although we sought to address concerns from the potential partner organisations (by establishing appropriate data sharing agreements) funders have an important role to play in requiring and funding rigorous evaluations and in requiring that these datasets be shared to increase transparency and accountability.

To make it easier for future Darwin Initiative project managers to plan activities, it would be useful for the Darwin committee to provide confirmation of the money sent after each request. Also, we learned the importance of having enough cash flows especially in the last quarter where the host organisation is expected to advance the costs for the final quarter.

Finally, when selecting reviewers, the Darwin committee can invest more effort in inviting social science scholars and appreciate the social issues of conservation and restoration as much as the ecological aspects (which aligns with the greater focus of Darwin initiatives on poverty reduction).

8 Risk Management

None

9 Sustainability and legacy

As mentioned in Section 3.1. in our output 2.3, the project received many solicitations from NGO PA managers to collaborate in the establishment and implementation of CGC (Please see **Annex 5.1.5 the letter of support** for our unsuccessful Darwin Initiative follow-up proposal).

Nevertheless, the project already produced several materials that can be used and widely disseminated. We have also provided follow-up support to the Ministry and mentoring to previous participants when requested. We have also observed some cascading effects (previous participants sharing the training materials and knowledge with others who have not attended our training).

To ensure a sustained legacy of our project outcome, we ensured that most project staff are locally based (in Madagascar). The team have taken full leadership and ownership of the project activities and will ensure they continue to liaise with the beneficiaries of the training as well as other government stakeholders. We have also submitted follow-up funding to other funding bodies to continue our engagement activities and ensure sustained outcomes (ISFP, CLARE).

10 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 (see **Annex 5.4**).
- 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. We also regularly post blogs from our recent activities (previously on <http://forest4climateandpeople.bangor.ac.uk/news-blog/> and we have now migrated to our new website, <https://mitsilo.org/news-mirari/>
- Yes, we have tagged Darwin / Biodiversity Challenge Funds in all our social media posts.

11 Safeguarding

Has your Safeguarding Policy been updated in the past 12 months?	Yes
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 ethics training, which included aspects of safeguarding most relevant to our project]
<p>Has there been any lessons learnt or challenges on Safeguarding in the past 12 months? Please ensure no sensitive data is included within responses.</p> <p>No significant safeguarding issues have arisen.</p>	

12 Finance and administration

12.1 Project expenditure

Project spend (indicative) since last Annual Report	2023/24 Grant (£)	2023/24 Total actual Darwin Initiative Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs (see below)				
Consultancy costs				
Overhead Costs				
Travel and subsistence				The establishment of the CGC required a mass information campaign to secure local communities free prior and informed consent. To that end, we conducted a second one-week training in five fokontany within each protected area. This effort necessitated an extension of the field visit and

				resulted in additional field costs.
Operating Costs				
Capital items (see below)				
Others (see below)				
TOTAL	52,733	52,239.50		

Staff employed (Name and position)	Cost (£)
Sarobidy Rakotonarivo, Project lead	
Neal Hockley, Project advisor	
Manoa Rajaonarivelo, Project manager (Sept 2023 - March 2024)	
Veloson Manankery, Project manager (Apr 2023 - Aug 2023)	
Mirindra Rakotoarisoa, Research assistant	
Sanda Rakotomalala, Research assistant	
TOTAL	30,419.98

Capital items – description	Capital items – cost (£)
TOTAL	

Other items – description	Other items – cost (£)
TOTAL	

12.2 Additional funds or in-kind contributions secured

Source of funding for project lifetime	Total (£)
Bangor Overhead waived (year 1)	
International Science Partnership Funds (through Bangor University - Year 2)	
QMM (Support for Neal Hockley travel & Subsistence to Madagascar in year 1 and in year 2)	
TOTAL	11,039

Source of funding for additional work after project lifetime	Total (£)
None	0
TOTAL	0

12.3 Value for Money

The project provided excellent value for money by maximising the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of its expenditures. It has strategically invested in Malagasy researchers by supporting local expertise but also, all the activities have contributed to conservation stakeholders' capacity building. The project has managed its budget effectively, allowing for a six-month no-cost extension and the implementation of all the expected activities which were successfully completed, achieving the desired outputs with notable success. This has been done with respect to the agreed budget including each activity (see Section 12.1). Spend on international travel was minimised, NH was able to fund two of his three visits through other projects.

13 OPTIONAL: Outstanding achievements of your project (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 (please leave this line in to indicate your agreement to use any material you provide here).

This project's key achievements include the production of a best practice brief on monitoring and evaluation of PA social safeguard (**leaflet image in Annex 5.2.1.2**). Such materials are valuable to PA managers and will enable them to design and implement more effective and equitable safeguard measures that will ultimately result in more resilient conservation.

A key achievement was also the creation of posters on inclusive protected area co-management through the convention de gestion communautaire - CGC, which will empower local communities in their role and responsibilities as co-manager (**poster image in Annex 5.2.3.6**). In addition, we produced a film to inform, raise awareness and, share widely the experiences of managers and local communities on this approach (**see [CGC film blog](#) and Annex 5.2.3.7**).

Finally, our project has provided significant technical support to the development of the national policy reform. We have also increased the capacity of various stakeholder groups (government,

conservation organisations, local communities) in tackling the social issues of conservation and ensuring they meet their obligations and have a long-term impact on biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation (e.g. pls see photos of the national workshop in the table below).

File Type (Image / Video / Graphic)	File Name or File Location	Caption, country and credit	Online accounts to be tagged (leave blank if none)	Consent of subjects received
Image		Leaflet about social safeguard monitoring and evaluation - Madagascar - MiRARI project	twitter: @Forest4People Facebook : @Mirari.mg	Yes
Image		Community Management Agreement (CGC) poster - Madagascar - MiRARI project	twitter: @Forest4People Facebook : @Mirari.mg	Yes
Video		Community Management Agreement: key to the sustainable and equitable conservation - Madagascar - MiRARI project	twitter: @Forest4People Facebook : @Mirari.mg	Yes
Image		Participants at the national workshop on managing equitably PAs in Madagascar - MiRARI project	twitter: @Forest4People Facebook : @Mirari.mg	Yes

Annex 1 Project’s original (or most recently approved) indicators of success, including indicators, means of verification and assumptions.

Note: Insert your full indicators of success. If your indicators of success have changed since your application and was approved by a Change Request the newest approved version should be inserted here, otherwise insert the indicators of success.

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Means of verification
<p>Outcome</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>0.1 Increase in stakeholders’ knowledge of resources and mechanisms necessary to achieve fair and equitable conservation.</p> <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)</p> <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</p>	<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 loss (e.g., migration) and the likely mechanisms through which they lead to impacts.</p> <p>0.2.1 Documentary evidence of revised safeguard policies (incl Ministry and Madagascar National Parks) finalised and shared with all stakeholders (also including 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</p>

	<p>between protected area managers and local communities)</p>	<p>actions on the ground to be identified). All Conventions de Gestion Communautaire signed during the project will be recorded.</p>
<p>Output 1.</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 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</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>

	result of using the evidence synthesis and best practice manual (see also output 4).	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>Output 2.</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 checked for links to project outputs, whether explicit or implicit.</p>
<p>Output 3.</p> <p>Training delivered to local communities across two protected areas to further their understanding of the community management convention, leading to</p>	<p>3.1 Increase in community members knowledge and capacity</p>	<p>3.1.1 Training attendance list/ certificates, disaggregated by gender.</p>

<p>positive perceived changes in engagement with co-management of conservation.</p>	<p>3.2 Establishment of Community Conventions (completed or in progress)</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>Output 4.</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>Activities (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> <p>4.1 Support ongoing reform of Madagascar's national PA safeguard policies (led by the Ministry of Environment and Madagascar National Parks)</p>		

Important 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 2 Report of progress and achievements against final project indicators of success for the life of the project

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Progress and Achievements
<p>Outcome</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>0.1 Increase in stakeholders' knowledge of resources and mechanisms necessary to achieve fair and equitable conservation.</p> <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)</p> <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)</p>	<p>Our project activities have helped the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, conservation NGOs and communities gain a better understanding of, as well as increased capacity in the design and implementation of more effective safeguard and sustainable development approaches around PAs. Our project has enabled them to deliver more equitable and resilient conservation through more effective social safeguard processes and adequate investments in food security and poverty alleviation around PAs, in the mid and longer term.</p> <p>Local communities have improved their knowledge about rights, responsibilities and obligations; negotiation skills as well as the monitoring and evaluation participation towards the management of the PA. NGO PA managers are now more equipped to establish equitable and effective social safeguards, and in the implementation of co-management.</p> <p>The environment and sustainable development ministry (MEDD) now has approved the latest draft of the reform of the environmental and social management framework of Madagascar PAs with the collaboration of the project (cf Meeting minutes), which contains clear guidelines for effective social safeguard and equitable co-management. The project also provided different materials to accompany the practical realisation in the field of the required tools such as the CGC.</p> <p>Finally, our NGOs partner began the process of CGC establishment in their PAs for inclusive participation of local communities with respect to the social impacts of their PA management. They also currently take better account of the need to use more robust methods to evaluate the impacts of their interventions (e.g. collect some baseline data).</p>

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Progress and Achievements
<p>Output 1.</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 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</p>	<p>We produced a manual and a policy brief of social safeguard best practice using the data shared by NGOs and interviews, as well as subsequent data (Evidence provided in section 1, output 1.2 and Annex 5.2.1).</p> <p>After the initial preliminary analyses, we were able to present and discuss the findings with 9 local communities within 3 protected areas, in which we selected participants by taking into account gender and beneficiary status (Evidence provided in section 1, output 1.2. and Annex 5.2.2). Discussion with local communities helped us to collect their explanation feedback on the successful practices in terms of social safeguard measures, as well as in co-management realisation.</p> <p>We presented the manual and policy practice brief during our national sharing workshop and also shared them with more than 70 practitioners and conservation stakeholders (Evidence in section 1, output 1.3. and Annex 5.2.3).</p> <p>Madagascar National Parks have been revising their safeguard policies using partly the consultancy meetings we have convened on the social safeguard policies within the restricted committee about the Malagasy PA environmental and social management framework. Impact Madagascar and KMCC took our recommendations on their safeguard practices onboard, e.g. in their collection of baseline data (Evidence in section 1, output 1.4 and Annex 5.2.4).</p> <p>The improvements made, thanks to the evidence we raised and put into the good practice manuals, have been incorporated into the reformed social and environmental management framework for the ministry of environment in Madagascar, in which the project played a key role in finalising (Evidence in section 1, output 1.5 and output 4.2 and Annex 5.2.1 and Annex 5.2.4).</p>

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Progress and Achievements
	using the evidence synthesis and best practice manual (see also output 4).	
<p>Activity 1.1</p> <p>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>- We collected datasets from NGO partners and produced a manual and a policy brief of social safeguard best practice (instead of a database platform).</p>
<p>Activity 1.2.</p> <p>Synthesise and disseminate evidence from the collated data</p>		<p>- We have created manual and policy practice brief about social safeguard</p> <p>- We disseminated the brief with 9 different communities across 3 different PAs, and the manual and practice brief with 75 conservation stakeholders from different sectors (NGOs, communities, government, civil society...)</p>
<p>Output 2.</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</p>	<p>We delivered two trainings attended in total by 58 stakeholders to drive knowledge, policy, and practice change among conservation stakeholders. The training covered impact evaluation methods, as well as the identification and prioritisation of social safeguard beneficiaries, the Community Management Agreements (CGC), and the grievance mechanism and issues of marginalisation and ethics (Evidence in section 1, Output 2.1, 2.2).</p> <p>The first training was more targeted for technical staff and the second for senior and decision-maker staff.</p> <p>We have been able to influence the internal policies of our partners (ex MNP, KMCC and Impact) and other stakeholders which requested for the continuation of collaboration (Evidence in section 1, output 2.3 and Annex 5.1.5)</p>

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Progress and Achievements
	safeguard policies and practices following the training.	
<p>Activity 2.1.</p> <p>Design and run the field-training course for high-level national stakeholders and facilitate sharing of best practices,</p>		<p>We conducted a national training for around 42 senior high-level stakeholders to share best practices on social safeguard on 16th June 2023.</p>
<p>Activity 2.2.</p> <p>Design and run the in-depth field-based training course aimed at technical staff working in the forest and conservation sector</p>		<p>- We conducted a technical training for 15 staff from ministries and among conservation stakeholders on February 6-10, 2023.</p>

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Progress and Achievements
<p>Output 3.</p> <p>Training delivered to local communities across two protected areas 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>We implemented three stages of field visits and training to increase local communities' understanding which will lead to positive changes in co-management engagement with PA managers.</p> <p>First, we led local communities consultation in three PA sites across Madagascar to understand agreement's development and practices between communities and managers, and understand local perceptions of social safeguards (Evidence in section 1, Output 3.1, Annex 5.2.3.1). This approach helped us create training materials to increase understanding of local communities of CGC, that we used during two series of training each for Itremo Massif PA and Madiromirafy PA.</p> <p>The first four-day CGC training sessions in July 2023 engaged around 70 local community members as future CGC trainers. It increased their knowledge and capacity about PA and CGC definitions and goals, rights and responsibilities in PA management, CGC content, negotiation, complaint management, and monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>The second training, conducted on January 20-26th 2024 for Madiromirafy PA and February 20-29th 2024 in the Itremo Massif, was a mass information session on the CGC. It gathered a total of around 600 people within the two PAs. These sessions were crucial in boosting community knowledge and capacity, with evaluations showing a solid understanding of CGC, its benefits, and its development process (Evidence in section 1, Output 3.1 and Annex 5.2.3.4).</p>
<p>Activity 3.1</p> <p>Train local communities on the community management agreement</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We made an overview of co-management approaches in the 3 PAs partners to create appropriate materials for future local training. - We led 2 trainings each for local communities in 2 PAs on the community management agreement. The first was mainly to train local trainers and for spread dissemination of CGC, and the second by reinforcing the sharing of information with the wider communities.

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Progress and Achievements
<p>Output 4.</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>The project team provided support through 17 meetings done to address conservation social safeguard policies within the restricted committee on the reform on the Environmental and safeguard management framework (ESMF) of Protected Areas in Madagascar (see Evidence in section 1, output 4.1, Annex 5.2.4.1).</p> <p>Through these collective reflections and especially after two-days brainstorming session held in Mantasoa on 04th and 05th January 2024, a final version of ESMF, including revised safeguard policies, was approved by the MEDD and finalised, which is now awaiting a validation at national level (see Evidence in section 1, output 4.2. Annex 5.2.4.2 and Annex 5.2.4.4).</p> <p>Our NGOs PA manager partners aligned themselves with our main recommendations regarding safeguard policies which ensure that the rights of local communities are considered and respected in the management and creation of Protected Areas (PAs). They began the process of CGC establishment in their PAs and they also updated their safeguard practices (initiation in more rigorous baseline data for monitoring and evaluation, consideration of the importance of impact evaluation, and thoughts on grievance mechanisms).</p>
<p>Activity 4.1</p> <p>Support ongoing reform of Madagascar's national PA safeguard policies (led by the Ministry of Environment and Madagascar National Parks)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We took part in 17 sessions of discussion, reflection and finalisation of the reform which led to the final version of the ESMF for Madagascar PAs. - We organised a high-level training workshop on 16th June 2023 for senior PA managers to reflect on and discuss our key recommendations in the ESMF reform.

Annex 3 Standard Indicator

Table 1 Project Standard Indicators

Indicator number	Darwin Initiative Standard Indicator	Name of Indicator after adjusting wording to align with DI Standard Indicators	Units	Disaggregation	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Total to date	Total planned during the project
DI-C01	Number of best practice guides and knowledge products published and endorsed.	1.1 Draft evidence synthesis and best practice manual generated by the database and circulated to stakeholders, and quarterly updated.	Number of products	Product typology (One practice brief, one manual brief, one CGC poster, one CGC booklet, one CGC film)	1	4	5	2
DI-C14	Number of decision-makers attending briefing events	1.3 Presentation of final evidence synthesis and best practice manual to stakeholders at dissemination event in Antananarivo attended by at least 60 attendees.	Number of people	Attendee gender balance, types of decision-makers (govt, senior NGO, private sector, local leaders, resource managers (farmers) etc.), Number of events	0	75 (Men: 35 Women: 40) (Government: 12 Donnor: 9 Researcher: 13 NGOs: 26 Local communities: 2 International organism: 7 (Private sector: 2 Civil society: 4)	75	60

Indicator number	Darwin Initiative Standard Indicator	Name of Indicator after adjusting wording to align with DI Standard Indicators	Units	Disaggregation	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Total to date	Total planned during the project
DI-B12	Number of policies developed or formally contributed to by projects and being implemented by appropriate authorities.	4.1 Active involvement in committee meetings and review process,	Number of products	Type of policy meetings Gender Typology of policy (Community/ subnational/ national/ international).	13	4	17	18
		1.4. and 4.3. 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.			0	1	1	3
		1.5 and 4.2. Revisions to donors' and government agencies' policies and establishment of revised safeguard policies (and possibly practices) as a result of using the evidence synthesis and best practice manual (see also output 4).			0	1	1	1
		3.2 Establishment of Community Conventions (completed or in progress)			0	2	2	2
DI-A01	Number of people from key national and local stakeholders completing structured and relevant training.	2.2 Sharing of best practices facilitated by the course workshops, delivered at least for 30 stakeholders.	Number of people	Gender; Stakeholder group	16 (Men: 12 Women: 4)	42 (Men: 16 Women: 26) (Government: 7)	58	30

Indicator number	Darwin Initiative Standard Indicator	Name of Indicator after adjusting wording to align with DI Standard Indicators	Units	Disaggregation	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Total to date	Total planned during the project
					(Local communities: 2) National NGOs: 10 International NGOs: 3 Private Sector: 1) Researcher: 6	National NGOs: 9 International Organisations : 17 Donors: 6 Research Institute: 3)		
DI-A03	Number of local/national organisations with improved capability and capacity as a result of the project.	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.	Number of People	Gender and stakeholder group;	16 (Men: 12 Women: 4 Local communities: 2) (Local NGOs: 10 International NGOs: 3 Private Sector: 1)	42 (Men: 16 Women: 26) (Government: 7 National NGOs: 9 International Organisations : 17 Donors: 6 Research Institute: 3)	58	30
		2.3 Revisions by Partners (Kew Madagascar Conservation Centre, Madagascar National Parks and Impact Madagascar) to their	Number of organisations	Organisation Type	9 (Technical training)	9 (Senior staff training) + 11	23	4

Indicator number	Darwin Initiative Standard Indicator	Name of Indicator after adjusting wording to align with DI Standard Indicators	Units	Disaggregation	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Total to date	Total planned during the project
		safeguard policies and practices following the training.				(National sharing workshop)		
DI-B05	Number of people with increased participation in local communities / local management organisations (i.e., participation in Governance/citizen engagement).	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.	Number of communities		9	0	0	9
		3.1 Increase in community members knowledge and capacity	Number of communities		0	10 (approx 660 people, equiv to 330 household)	10	9

Table 2 Publications

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)

1. Checklist for submission

	Check
Is the report less than 10MB? If so, please email to BCF-Reports@niras.com putting the project number in the Subject line.	yes
Is your report more than 10MB? If so, please discuss with BCF-Reports@niras.com about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line.	no
If you are submitting photos for publicity purposes, do these meet the outlined requirements (see section 13)?	yes
Have you included means of verification? You should not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	yes
Do you have hard copies of material you need to submit with the report? 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
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.	