



FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name	Southern Toliara marine natural resources management
Project Location	<i>Toliara Madagascar</i>
Project reference numbers:	
WWF-International:	MG 0910 (WWF MWIOP)
WWF-Norway:	5018-WWF NO
NORAD:	GLO-08/449-3-NORAD
Project budget	NOK 8 274 657
Donor(s)/ funding sources	<i>WWF-Norway via NORAD/Ministry of Foreign Affairs</i>
implementing agency and partners	WWF MWIOP
Contact person	

Start Date: January 2007	Expected End Date: December 2011.
---------------------------------	------------------------------------------

Network Initiative / Ecoregion Programme / Priority Place(s)¹

¹ Indicate the Network Initiative, Ecoregion Programme as well as the Priority Place(s) in which the project has a conservation impact.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document is an external evaluation of the “Southern Toliara Marine Natural Resource Management Project, MG 0910.01” implemented by the Regional Representation of WWF in Madagascar and the West Indian Ocean (MWIO) from January 1st, 2007 to December 31st, 2011.

The project was implemented in four field pilot sites, Maromena / Befasy, Beheloka, Itampolo and Ambohibola) as well as in the regional capital of Toliara. The project goal was to facilitate and support the implementation of a strategy for participatory management of marine natural resource in southern Toliara Region and included four outputs : (i) An effective communication system between key stakeholders is in place and made operational, (ii) An enabling environment for the sustainable management of traditional fisheries is established and improved in pilot sites , (iii) Community-based organizations (CBOs) are actively and effectively involved in the sustainable use and management of living marine and coastal resources, and (iv) Small-scale alternative livelihoods activities creating socio-economic positive impacts are developed.

The evaluation took place from November 23rd to December 12th. The WWF Project Management Information System provided information which allowed the evaluation of the Project’s performance and explanations. The field data collection included inquiries and surveys with communities based at three Project pilot sites (Maromena/Befasy, Beheloke and Itampolo). The data collection also included interviews with main Project partners and authorities.

Impacts

This project presents a significant probability of reaching its finality for the following reasons:

- ✓ The monitoring of CPUE (by the project) shows the high likelihood that project will significantly contribute towards the realization of the desired and expected impacts. Indeed, the production average has increased for octopus (11.1 kg/day/fishermen vs. 3.4 kg in 2009), for squid (7.2 kg vs. 2.7 kg), for lobsters (10.4 kg vs. 0.9 kg), for sea cucumbers (13.2 kg vs. 9.4 kg) and for fish (10.3 kg vs. 8.5 kg).
- ✓ The proxy indicators (gathered by the project), show slight improvement tendency in income change.
- ✓ According to the survey of the perception by the population of the project impact: the improvement of seafood catches is very positive, raising the “ownership” (appropriation) of the Project and consequently its sustainability.

In addition, beyond the Project’s purposes, Project induced other changes (unanticipated impacts) on the local governance in general. Local populations have perceived an improvement in community mobilization. In the same way, the population has also perceived that following the capacity building initiated by the Project, building cooperation relationship with other actors became easier for the population.

Project effectiveness

This project is effective for the main following reasons:

- ✓ The achievement of the purposes of the project effectiveness is ranked “satisfactory”. The project goal “aims at implementation of a strategy for a participatory management”; it is noted that
 - the CBOs are using "dina" as management tool in pilot sites,
 - local management plans are drafted (but could not be institutionalized), and

- Database structure were developed too but could not be operationalized
- ✓ Output 1 (*A communication system between the key stakeholders is in place and made operational*) is largely achieved, Its achievement is ranked “satisfactory plus”. The majority of the activities planned for the production of this output were carried out : 62% of expected activities were completely achieved and 31% of expected activities were achieved at more than 50%. Weaknesses included inadequate feedback from Fisheries administration due to bureaucratic difficulties and the non-functioning of the fisheries and marine biodiversity database.
- ✓ Output 2 (*An enabling environment for the sustainable management of traditional fisheries is established and improved in pilot sites*), is largely achieved, despite a few short-comings. It is ranked “satisfactory plus”. 83% of expected activities were completely realized. Common vision of sustainable use of living marine and coastal resources management was established, baseline information were available, local conventions were officialized and management plans were developed. However, management plans could not be institutionalized by Fisheries Administration Which constitutes an obstacle to co-management, Output 3 (*Community-based organizations (CBOs) in pilot sites actively and effectively involved in the sustainable use and management of living marine and coastal resources*) is fully achieved, without shortcomings. It is ranked “very satisfactory”. About 89% of expected activities were completely achieved. CBOs roles are reflected in
 - their role in the enforcement of the local convention (dina)
 - their key participation in developing and implementing Community Fisheries Management Plans.
 - their volunteer involvement awareness and training in the neighbouring communities for example, and by accepting and
 - CBOs’ growing responsibilities.
- ✓ *Output 4 (Small-scale alternative livelihoods activities creating positive socio-economic impacts in pilot sites) has a very limited* achievement. Its effectiveness is ranked “unsatisfactory”. The assessment of existing income generating activities in pilot sites was realized. But no new income generating activities were implemented reflecting a strategic weakness and lack of a suitable financing mechanism.

Efficiency

A cost-benefit analysis was deemed implausible given the complexity of the project, the logistic difficulties inherent in working in this part of Madagascar, and the highly changeable political situation.

This project was found to be sufficiently efficient for the following reasons:

- ✓ The mobilization of the resources (financial, human and material) is in conformity with the Project’s operational planning. The annual “disbursement” rate was 98,4%.
- ✓ , 27 activities were completely realized amongst the 36 expected activities.

Viability:

The project durability is fairly uncertain because of some unrealized activities :

- The institutionalization of Communities Management Plan to provide official recognition the Fishery administration of the Communities’ rights and duties by.
- The officialization of Rodobey to ensure long term mobilization of the actors
- The lack of development of income generating activities to reduce fishing-effort and the pressures on the marine resources.

Recommendations:

The implementation of the above-mentioned activities is recommended. Because this project is phasing out, WWF MWIOPIO must promote collaboration with the Fishery administration and partnership with the actors involving in the area for this intention.

Lastly, the results of this Project constitute an interesting academic case study of participative natural resources management which deserves to be diffused for a replication both in term of approach and in term of scientific capitalization.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction.....	7
2	The evaluation methodology.....	7
3	Findings of the evaluation.....	8
3.1	Relevance.....	8
3.1.1	Project’s relevance at the global level.....	9
3.1.2	Project’s relevance at national and regional levels,	9
3.1.3	Project relevance at local level.....	9
3.2	Impact.....	10
3.2.1	The overall impact	10
3.2.2	The repercussion	11
3.3	Efficiency.....	11
3.4	Effectiveness	12
3.4.1	Project’s Results measure	12
3.4.2	Process Analysis	15
3.5	Sustainability.....	17
3.5.1	Technical sustainability.....	17
3.5.2	Institutional viability	18
3.6	Lessons learned	18
3.7	Replicability	18
3.8	Conclusions and overall assessment:	19
4	Recommendations.....	19
4.1	Project Exit Plan.....	19
4.2	For implementing a similar project in the future	20
4.3	Results diffusion	20

ABBREVIATIONS / ACRONYMS

CBO: Community Based Organization

CPUE: Catch Per Unit Effort

DRPRH : Direction Régionale de la Pêche et des Ressources Halieutiques

FID : Fonds d'Intervention pour le Développement

GPF: Global Programme Framework

MNP: Madagascar National Parks

MWIOPO: (WWF) Madagascar & West Indian Ocean Programme Office

NORAD: Norwegian Cooperation Agency for Development

PACP : Projet d'Appui aux Communautés des Pêcheurs

SGP: Small Grants Program

TCR: Toliara Reef Complex

WWF: World Wide Fund for Nature

MAIN REPORT

1 Introduction

This document is an external evaluation of the “Southern Toliara Marine Natural Resource Management Project, MG 0910.01” implemented by Regional Representation of WWF in Madagascar and the West Indian Ocean (MWIOPO) from January 1st, 2007 to December 31st, 2011. Over the course of the project, NOK 8 274 657 were provided by NORAD (at 90%) and WWF Norway (at 10%)

The project was implemented in four field pilot sites, Maromena / Befasy, Beheloka, Itampolo and Ambohibola) and included some policy work at the regional capital of Toliara and the national capital of Antananarivo. It aimed to facilitate and support the implementation of a strategy for a participating management of marine natural resource in southern Toliara and involved the Regional Fisheries Administration (DRPRH Atsimo Andrefana) and the fishing communities. It worked primarily towards achieving four objectives:

1. An effective communication system between key stakeholders is in place and made operational, by the end of 2011;
2. An enabling environment for the sustainable management of traditional fisheries is established and improved in pilot sites, by the end of year 2011;
3. Community-based organizations (CBOs) are actively and effectively involved in the sustainable use and management of living marine and coastal resources, by the end of year 2011;
4. Small-scale alternative livelihoods activities creating positive socio-economic impacts are developed by the end of year 2011.

The main purpose of this Final Evaluation is to evaluate and analyse the implementation of the project during its 5 years at local, regional and national levels by considering its impact on social, environmental and institutional issues. It will also carry out a critical assessment of the relevance and the internal coherence of the project interventions, its design foundations, its methodology approaches, its objectives, the resources used and the results, and determine the project’s success and its shortcomings. Lastly, the report looks into the sustainability aspect of the results and impacts achieved as well as the exit strategy. Moreover, the evaluation is undertaken with a view to enhancing the conservation gains from the project, to develop recommendations for the development of further conservation activities south of Toliara, and to draw key lessons learned and best practices to contribute to WWF organizational learning.

2 The evaluation methodology

The evaluation, which took place between November 23rd to December 12th.

The evaluation process was structured into two components: performance evaluation and value judgement:

The performance evaluation was based on the measure of the achievement of the Project main results compared with the Project initial purposes in term of outputs, goal and finality. The “value judgement” assessed the implementation process, and the quality of project management including both its strategic and tactics approaches

- Project achievements were evaluated based on. the degree of the realization of the objectives, Efficiency, Impacts and Sustainability .

The data and information for this evaluation came from three main sources: the Project Management Information System, field data collection and the official reference documents (project document, technical reports, etc.).

The Project Management Information System provided information concerning Project performance and its explanations. It includes:

- the systematic Peer Reviews and the financial reports;
- The monitoring system of the project bio-ecologic and socioeconomics impacts (coral reef cover, biomass, main species diversity, and proxy socio economic indicators).

The field data collection included inquiries and surveys with the communities of three pilot sites (Maromena/Befasy, Beheloke and Itampolo). It also included interviews with focus groups consisting of members of the management committees in each site, and interviews with 8 persons (4 men and 4 women, with various age groups) who were not part of the local Management Committee.

The data collection also included interviews with main Project partners like Madagascar National Parks through its representation in Anakao, the Fisheries Administration and WWF Antananarivo.

The official referential documentation provided the project's broader context of national and regional conservation and development.

Limits of the evaluation:

There were essentially three main constraints in the realization of this evaluation:

- ✓ Some logical framework's indicators were not suitable for the objectives. There was often confusion between objectives' indicators and activities' indicators. Thus, additional indicators based on "scientific standards" were used to supplement the assessment of the project performance. Thus, certain subjectivity has been introduced into the performance analysis.
- ✓ The monitoring and evaluation system of the project did not envisage implementation of control sites from the beginning of the Project. Consequently, it was not possible to carry out a rigorous evaluation of causal relationships between project activities and perceived impacts.
- ✓ Because of, this project was a first and unique experiment of its type in Madagascar; the data of comparison (similar projects) were not available. Hence the analysis of efficiency loses its practice significance. The evaluation of efficiency was therefore limited to budgetary monitoring- comparing project outputs with the expected budget. The analysis of the budgetary planning system and financial management system provided insights about the optimization of the uses of the funds.

3 Findings of the evaluation

3.1 Relevance

The relevance of this project is confirmed for the following reasons:

- i) The strategy of the project is very relevant :

State weaknesses regarding marine resources management justifies community involvement in resource governance. Indeed, in South-Western Madagascar and more particularly in the Project zone, low State capacity seriously hampers the application of fisheries regulations . The intervention plan reinforcing local capacity promotes co-management, which gives a shared responsibility to the local community.

The project design was based on the "*participative approach address the degradation of the marine resources*". Indeed, to fight the degradation of the Toliara Reef Complex (TRC) and its resources, WWF aligned its interventions with the Rio declaration (1992) recognizing "formally" the crucial role of the local communities in natural resources management. Thus, the Project goal was: "*the strategy of a participative management of the marine resources is*

implemented". Therefore, project design consistency is supported by the theory of community based management of natural resources

ii) The need for the project is large and its priority is high:

About 90% of the population in target sites is involved in the fishery sector. 75% of the fishermen depend directly on the exploitation of the reef ecosystem and on its associated resources (Ranaivomanana et al., 2009). Therefore, the project goal of "protecting the ecosystem integrity and simultaneously improving population's wellbeing", proves to be relevant.

The following section analyses the pertinence of the project and its goal at the global, national and local levels.

3.1.1 Project's relevance at the global level

The project MG 910, clearly contributes to WWF's Global Programme Framework which highlight the importance of protecting reef ecosystem integrity with its recognized biodiversity richness. On the one hand, Madagascar appears amongst the WWF priority places. On the other hand, the Project reaches also address one of the flagship species (marine turtles, and cetaceans) targeted by WWF's GPF, by implementing responsible fishing.

3.1.2 Project's relevance at national and regional levels,

The Fisheries Administration, both at national and at regional levels, recognizes the relevance of Project in the context of fisheries development. Local conventions (Dina) are recognized by the Administration as effective means to reinforce fishery regulations. In addition, making local communities responsible through the implementation of Local Management Committees is a considerable help for the Administration which lacks adequate resources. It is noted that the Fisheries Administration has no operational Representation in the Project zone. The implementation of the Local Management Plan institutionalizes local responsibility.

The Region's Administrative Authority recognized the relevance of the Project by highlighting the role of the fisheries sector in the Regional Development Plan and the importance of littoral zone as development pole. The Regional Authority supports and encourages the participative approach adopted by WWF which is seen as a democratic process in resources management. Regional Authorities also recognize that it is an evolutionary approach which needs continuous improvement and enhancement.

However, recognizing the geographical overlap between the WWF's Project and the Fishing Community Support Project (Projet d'Appui aux Communautés des Pêcheurs: PACP), and to harmonize their interventions, the Regional Authority would like to supplement the reinforcement of the communities' capacities by equipment and materials donations. They would also wish for WWF to help sites by installing radio communications in each Commune to strengthen law enforcement.

Lastly, the Project relevance is justified by its contribution to the "Rodobey" platform which brings together different marine resource management groups. More particularly, MG910 played an important role in the implementation and the operationalization of Nosy Ve Androka's Marine Protected Area by the strengthening of the communities' capacity and by improving food security.

3.1.3 Project relevance at local level

The priority of Project's activities compared with the priorities of the communities highlights the Project's relevance at local level. Indeed, at pilot sites, according to the participative diagnostic analysis conducted in September 2011, the problems perceived by the local population were centred on coral reef ecosystem degradation and resource depletion. Problem analysis had shown that because of lack of alternatives apart from fishing, the over exploitation of resources remained the population's only strategy to meet the demands of

demographic growth. A large part of population agrees that WWF's intervention aims primarily to address these problems. People perceived that the local conventions, the "dina", initiated by the Project, were established mainly to avoid the use of the destructive and non-selective fishing gears and to protect the coral reef.

However, the Project's relevance was masked to a certain extent by the fact that one part of population (which was not directly involved in Local Management Comities) would have wished to benefit directly by receiving materials like fishing gear , to have WWF develop basic infrastructure such as schools, hospitals and to benefit from alternative income generating activities .

In short, the finality aimed by the Project of achieving coral reef protection and improving the wellbeing of the population, are part of local priorities and urgencies at the global and levels. The project goal, the implementation of participative management resources, is also recognized by the main stakeholders as a correct strategy. Therefore, the relevance of the Project, stated by the "mid-term evaluation" review, is still confirmed.

3.2 Impact

Project Impacts Evaluation concerns initially the Project performance by analyzing the likelihood of achieving project objective regarding the health of the ecosystem and its resources and on the improvement of the population's wellbeing. At the same time, we aim to analyse the project impacts beyond the intended purposes, specifically its effect on governance in general and its repercussion outside geographical target sites.

3.2.1 The overall impact

The following reasons indicate the probability to reach the project's finality on marine resources and on the well being of the population:

- ✓ According to the Catch per unit effort (CPUE) data², the production average has increased for octopus (11.1 kg/day/fishermen vs. 3.4 kg in 2009), for squid (7.2 kg vs. 2.7 kg), for lobsters (10.4 kg vs. 0.9 kg), for sea cucumbers (13.2 kg vs. 9.4 kg) and for fish (10.3 kg vs. 8.5 kg).
- ✓ In the same way, these changes are reflected in local perceptions³. The Population's perception of the project impacts are mainly: Improvement of Catches (25 %); Change in population behaviour which starts to take more into account the long and the future one (25%); Impacts in term of cleanliness of the village (12%).
- ✓ As illustration, Itampolo's population assimilates the improvement of the health of reef ecosystem by the reappearance of some fish species like angarera (Haemulidae), atandro (*Liza macrolepsus*), ambatsoy (Serranidae), lovo (Serranidae), fianakoho (Chaetodontidae) which had previously disappeared- and by the reduction of some species indicating a bad health of reef ecosystem like bodoloha (Scaridae), fiantsifa (Acanthuridae).⁴

The number of "infractions" related to unacceptable exploitation of the marine resources fell by 75% between 2009 and 2010⁵. The abandonment of destructive practices reflect, to a certain extent, the advance of the Project toward its goal. For

² One (01) reef survey, four (04) Catch per Unit Effort (CPUE) assessments and eight (08) key resource production assessments were conducted by the project for the monitoring of the project impact on the improvement of seafood catch and Habitat. The project's staff is currently treating and analyzing the data relating to the coral reef cover

³ During the evaluation, it was carried out a survey about the perception by the population of the Project impacts. This survey involved 27 peoples not members of the Management Committee in 3 Pilot Sites. About 81 % responses reflect positive perception of the impacts induced by the project.

⁴ During the evaluation, it was carried out too a focus group involving the Management Committees in 3 Pilot Sites. It was asked to these management committees to provide indicators relevant to the project impact on the health of the coral reef ecosystem.

⁵ Project monitoring

example, people from Maromena and Befasy have confirmed the disappearance of the use of destructive fishing practices.

- ✓ The information gathered by the socio-organizers on proxy indicators reflected a slight income change. This is shown by the building of new concrete housing (average of five in Ambohibola, Itampolo and Beheloke) and the acquisition of household devices and appliances. Admittedly, the causal relationship between the income increasing and the Project's intervention is still hypothetical. However, it could be argued that as fishing is the primary activity of the local population and any other activity has not been noticed, the change would be caused by the increase of income induced by Project's activities. In addition, to a certain extent, the improvement of the CPUE could be related to an increasing of the income.

In short, admittedly the monitoring of CPUE and socioeconomic indicators shows the high likelihood that project will go towards into the realization of the desired and expected impacts. But the most important fact is that the perception by the population of the improvement of seafood catches is very positive, raising the "ownership" (appropriation) of the Project and consequently its probability for sustainability.

3.2.2 The repercussion

The repercussion of the project beyond its purposes and beyond its geographical intervention zone can be appreciated through some isolated observed cases.

- ✓ Beyond the Project's purposes, Project induced other changes (unanticipated impacts) on the local governance in general. Local populations have perceived an improvement in community mobilization. It appears, for example, in the form of many initiatives of communities' social activities initiated by the population like beach cleanup, village hygiene or access to drinking water as shown at Maromena. In the same way, the population has also perceived that following the capacity building initiated by the Project, building cooperation relationship with other actors became easier for the population, Small Grants Program's project in Beheloke for example. It's also recognized that the establishment of the Local Management Comities has contributed to social conflict resolution, through its organisational design which respects the local and traditional structure authority (e.g. Beheloke). It is also reflected in a change in women's socio-cultural behaviour towards getting more involved in resource management activities and taking part in decision making process during community meetings. .
- ✓ Impacts of the Project in term of natural resources management beyond the pilot sites is starting to be evident in the villages around Project's sites. As illustration, following the public awareness campaign undertaken by the Communication Commission of the Local Management Committees and especially following the "kapindry" event organised by the Project, 3 villages beyond the 4 Pilot sites (Besasavy, Befolotsy/Andoharano and Fanambosa) have established their local convention (dina) for local marine resources management.

In short, although the Project's influence appears superficially to be isolated in pilot sites, the Project's strategy has demonstrated a certain potentiality to generate a knock-on effect in neighbouring communities.

3.3 Efficiency

Due to the complexity of this project, the extreme logistic challenges and overarching political fluidity it was deemed impossible to undertake a cost-benefit analysis. However the project is ranked efficient for the following reasons:

- ✓ The mobilization of the resources (financial, human and material) was in conformity with the Project's operational planning: the annual "disbursement" rate indicates a high performance of Project's financial management system : it was since 2007 to 2010 about 98,44% (from January to October 2011, this rate is about 69,22%).
- ✓ The mobilized resources allowed a physical realizations rate about 98,5% (annexe 9)
- ✓ The resources were used properly through an adapted budgeting system: The budgeting system allowed an optimisation of the utilization of these resources to produce the expected outputs. Indeed, the budgeting system was based on the continuous interaction between WWF's Technical and Financial teams. The technical team, headed by Programme Coordinator SW Marine Coordinator and the Project Officer, planned the implementation of activities agreed by Project backer. Thereafter, they worked together for budget planning. The accounting system allowed for budget monitoring including following-up on expenditures, engagements and advances. In the same way, a financial projection of the remaining fund was established and analysis of cash-flows which allowed the timely restocking of funds in the field. Lastly, the project donor sent funds according to the schedule established in the Project contract.
- ✓ In term of human resources management, in spite of a slight delay in recruitment at the beginning of the Project, recruited human resources for the implementation of the Project were satisfactory in both quality and quantity. In addition, the human resources management policy of WWF Antananarivo encourages continuous reinforcement of staff skills.

3.4 Effectiveness

The effectiveness assessment of the project was approached in two ways: The first step was the measurement of project results to understand how project activities led to the achievement the expected outputs. Secondly, the process analysis permits to explanation of these results. On the one hand, it is to estimate the degree of participation of the target group associated to the project, and on the other hand to diagnose the system of project management components which led to the achievements.

3.4.1 Project's Results measure

Project's effectiveness was evaluated by the appraisal of the achievement of the objectives' hierarchy of the Project and the verification of its vertical logic and its main hypothesis.

3.4.1.1 Achievement of the purposes of the project

The following reasons show the level of project's effectiveness in reaching its purposes :

- ✓ The assessment of the Project's impact has shown the probability of achievement of the Project's goal of both the amelioration of the ecosystem and its resources and the progress in population's income.
- ✓ One of the three expected goal's indicators was completely achieved. (i) CBOs are using "dina" as management tool in pilot sites ; (ii) Locally management plans are drafted but could not be institutionalized; (iii) Database structure are developed but could not be operationalized.

In conclusion, the level of the realization of these indicators indicated that the observed improvement in CPUE (and to some extent, the observed progress in population's income) are related to the application of the dina (used by the CBO's as a management tool in Pilot sites)

- ✓ According to the main theory on common management of the natural resources, the project satisfied two of the three conditions required to implement a "true" Community management (i) public awareness and the desire to operate and (ii)

exercise by the population of a customary law. But (iii) Administration's capacity to support the community management was not adequately achieved.

Accordingly we can draw the following conclusions:

- 1- a likelihood to reach the finality is observed:
- 2- the achievement of the goal remains mitigated: the implementation of a strategy for a participatory management is not entirely achieved
- 3- At this stage, the changes reflected by the indicators at the finality level are weakened (this will be discussed later in the section on viability)

3.4.1.2 Achievement of the outputs of the project

Four outputs are expected to accomplish the Project's goal i.e. the implementation of participative management strategy. .

a. A communication system between the key stakeholders is in place and made operational.

The output 1 is largely achieved, despite a few short-comings. The effectiveness of achievement of the output 1 is ranked "satisfactory plus" (2/5) for the following reasons:

- ✓ First, the project should be congratulated for having implemented a communication system between the key stakeholders. The majority of the identified indicators of its output were observed (annexe 9). 8/13 indicators were completely achieved; 4/13 indicators were realized with a rate achievement more than 50% and only 1/13 indicators was unrealized (it was about the revitalization of Rodobey because of problems with institutional anchorage).
- ✓ However, these indicators don't reflect correctly the objective i.e. the state of the system. A communication system is operational if only the flow exchanged (reports *versus* feedback) between transmitter and receiver is regular and symmetrical.

54 reports have been developed from CBOs, and it's observed only 9 feedbacks from DRPRH and/or authorities. This situation indicates a gap in the project intervention strategy about mobilizing government agencies (in the importance of this communication system in the set up of the effective participating management of the marine resources). In so far as regular communication between Fisheries Administration and CBOs plays an important rule into implementing an institutionalized fisheries co-management, the feedback deficiency may discourage surely the CBOs for the systematic reports issue.

b. An enabling environment for the sustainable management of traditional fisheries is established and improved in pilot sites

The output 2 is largely achieved, despite a few short-comings. The effectiveness in the achievement of the output 2 is ranked "satisfactory plus" (2/5) for the following reasons:

- ✓ According to indicators given by the project logical framework, four indicators are achieved (Common vision of sustainable use of living marine and coastal resources management; Biological, socio-economic and catch baseline information are available; dina (local convention) per pilot site is officialized ; A management plan is developed for each pilot site) – and two indicators are unrealized (Agreement on roles and responsibilities among key stakeholders could not be developed; management plans could not be institutionalized by Fisheries Administration)
- ✓ In addition, the output 2 satisfies the three main conditions to establish and to improve "An enabling environment for the sustainable natural resources management" (According to fundamental scientific principles in governance). These conditions are: (i) the State stays prominent in the definition of goals and objectives; (ii) Actors set

should have access to the scientific knowledge, (iii) Stakeholders would have a fundamental part in the management of the common property and in the decentralized decision process.

A regional workshop was held in July 2009, which included the participation of all the region stakeholders. This workshop constituted an important starting point to share a common view of the state of sustainable marine resources management in the South West of Madagascar and allowed the State to clearly express its position.

Then, scientific knowledge became available through the monitoring of keys resources in 4 pilot sites (since 2009), the monitoring of catches per unit effort, and the monitoring of the socioeconomic indicators. However, the weakness in the knowledge sharing network (including database) have impeded stakeholders' access to important data.

Finally, the institutionalization of the local conventions (Dina) allowed the local communities to position themselves in the decentralized decision-making process. Effectively, local conventions based in the local cultures (tradition) have been approved and recognized by all relevant hierarchies, Tribunal, Local and Regional Authorities, and the Regional fisheries Administration. This is followed by catalyzing information/ training in the target communes for a best application

- ✓ However, the incompleteness of the institutionalization of the community's fisheries management plan constitutes an obstacle in the setting of a real marine resources co-management, establishing the role of communities in the management of the common properties including marine which remains dominated by the State.

c. Community-based organizations (CBOs) in pilot sites actively and effectively involved in the sustainable use and management of living marine and coastal resources

The output fully achieved, without shortcomings. The effectiveness in the achievement of the output 3 is ranked "very satisfactory" (1/5) for the following reasons:

- ✓ CBOs' active and effective involvement in sustainable marine resources management was observed particularly regarding their role in the application of the local convention (dina). As illustration, from 2009 to 2011, 15 infractions to the dina have been reported by the CBO
- ✓ CBOs have participated in developing and implementing Community Fisheries Management Plans., These Community management Plans have been submitted to a regional workshop in Toliara, and are currently in submission pending at the ministry of fisheries.
- ✓ This CBOs' effective participation is also reflected by their volunteer involvement in the activities initiated as part of the project (awareness and training in the neighboring communities for example), and by accepting CBO growing responsibilities. As illustration, the CBOs have initiated 7 projects relating to marines resources with technical and financial partners working in the region. Befolotsy, Tariboly, Itampolo, Tsikoroke, Maromena/Befasy and Beheloke have received funds from SGP ; Ambohibola works in partnership with Terre d'Aventure Association in a drinking water project. Also in collaboration with SGP : Ampalaza's bay opening, Lanirano's saliniculture, terrestrial turtles and community ecotourism in Lavavolo (Itampolo), financing request within CSA for Ambohibola.

This dynamism and accepting of responsibility is the result of training that CBOs have received as well as the continuous and close supervision of the project Socio-organizers. For

example, the 6 training during the CBO assessment have been get down in 2009. They touched many fields like social mobilization, conflict management, association life, participatory approach, writing reports (communication and PV), and CPUE datasheet

d. Small-scale alternative livelihoods activities creating positive socio-economic impacts in pilot sites

The output 4 has a very limited achievement with extensive shortcomings. The effectiveness in the achievement of the output 4 is ranked “unsatisfactory” (4/5) for the following reasons:

- ✓ The assessment of existing income generating activities in pilot sites was realized, but
- ✓ The 3 expected new income generating activities (ecotourism, sea cucumber farming, and crafts selling) through Public Private Partnership had been anticipated but that none have actually been implemented. It might denote a weakness in the project strategic in this output execution,

The project strategy was derived from a feasibility study of activities beforehand without having a solid knowledge of the potentiality allowing a prospective analysis of activities development. Consequently, the identified activities met problems related to either technical problems and financial profitability (as transformation of fisheries products or a technical feasibility of sea cucumber, except in Ambohibola) or possibly social appropriation problem.

The project strategy didn't anticipate any financing mechanism in support of new activities. However, partnerships with other actors are starting to show signs of success such as shown in section “c” above.

3.4.2 Process Analysis

a. Degree of target group involvement

The main conditions to implement a true participatory management have been developed. Local Management Committee and local convention (as basic management tools) are institutionalized and have allowed high level communities involvement. For that reason, the level of the communities' participation in marine resources management receives the highest grade of 5 on the co-management scale established by Berkes (1994).

The organization of workshops in 15 villages created a entry point for the Project. The 8 exchange visits, the different communications communication kits, and the many awareness/training activities allowed the project to reach the the third Berkes scale level (1st level: information, 2nd level: consulting, 3rd level: info exchange) in co-management.

The fourth Berkes scale level is reached through the initiation of joint actions and partnerships. The Kapindry festival, the awareness and training actions in the neighbor villages, 32 field trip and especially the 7 initiatives taken by CBO in the community project submitting to different partners are perfect illustrations.

Currently, the involvement of the CBO's in the application of the social convention raise the degree of participation to the highest level of the Berkes scale: “community control”. Nevertheless, in so far as marine resources are qualified by Madagascar's Constitution as “strategic resources”, their management remains the prerogative of the State through the Fisheries Administration. Consequently, the incompleteness of the institutionalization of Fisheries Community Management Plan would handicap the CBOs in the exercising a true community control.

Regarding the process's democratic aspect, it's come out from the population perception that the Management Committee is representative enough of the general community. On the one hand, the fact to be organized by clan/extended family gave the board of managers' a powerful

representativity. Every clan is represented in Committee and this representative is the spokesperson of his/her clan. On the other hand, the nomination process of members reinforces the Committee social legitimacy. Every clan elects its representative within the committee by raised-hand vote which assures more this democratic appearance. Every important decision was taken in fokonolona (community) general meeting and after every finished action a feedback is systematically presented to this meeting. It is noticed that there is no formal administrative relationship between Management Committee and Fokonolona. But the relationship is based on the hierarchical local power structure. In so far as each committee member is recognized as the representative of his/her clan which constitutes social legitimacy. However, external element which could disturb the traditional social organisation may constitute a threat to the viability of this relationship.

b. Analysis of the Project Management System

A scale of 1 to 5 (from very satisfactory to very unsatisfactory)⁶ has been used.

First, output 1 is ranked ***“satisfactory plus”***, (2/5: largely achieved, despite a few shortcomings) the communication system has weaknesses due to some uncompleted activities incompleteness regarding the upstream technical partners (database, platform Rodobey revitalization).

The anchorage of Rodobey could not be realized as expected because of a lack in technical planning and there was no envisaged activity to improve bring the the governmental agency up to speed.

Indeed, for a communication system to operate effectively, it is important to develop a symmetric relationship between the transmitter and receiver: the CBOs as transmitters (drafting reports), and the Administration as receiver. The feedback from the receiver constitutes then an important element of the system. So the sensitizing and the mobilization of the Administration to follow the rhythm of reports need an adapted strategy.

Output2 is ranked ***“satisfactory plus”*** (2/5 : largely achieved, despite a few shortcomings): a favorable environment for the implementation of sustainable marine resources management is set up through the institutionalization of the social convention. The incompleteness of the community fisheries management plan risks handicapping the community positioning in a joint management paradigm. Similarly, the lack of diffusion network, impacts on the governance performance. It too is a matter of ***tactical weakness***: some unrealized activities keep the project from completely achieving the expected result.

These two technical failures are related to insufficient consideration of external factors during the planning process. The database planning execution didn't adequately consider the institutional aspect of its implementation. Similarly, the diffusion of monitoring data, didn't take into consideration the necessary treatment and the channel of diffusion to users .

Output 3 is ranked ***“is very satisfactory”*** (1/5 : fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings). The institutionalization of CBOs and their capacity reinforcement permitted them to participate in an effective and active way in sustainable marine resources management.

And finally, output 4 is ranked ***“unsatisfactory”*** (4/5: very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings). The feasibility studies of the identified Revenue Generating Activities didn't permit their development. This represents a ***strategic mistake***: Activities have been implemented but the output is not produced as anticipated. We believe that this represents a failure in the strategic planning of the output execution which didn't foresee adequate planning nor financing for the development of appropriate activities.

⁶ 1 = fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings; 2 = largely achieved, despite a few shortcomings; 3 = only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced; 4 = very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings; 5 = not achieved

3.5 Sustainability

3.5.1 Technical sustainability

To achieve sustainable marine resources management (the project finality), the project strategy consists of the promotion of participative management (purpose). At date, according to the improvement of fishery productivity, and according to the indications of socioeconomic progress; we can conclude that there is a trend towards the achievement of the expected impact.

It is not possible to know for sure whether the project results are irreversible. Two of the three pillars to establish an effective community natural resources management are currently observed. Although public awareness and the desire to operate (1st condition), and if the exercise by the population of a customary law (2nd condition) may be considered achieved, the relative condition of the Administration's capacity (3rd condition) is far from realized.

The result is that the systems in place and the long-term prospects for maintaining the project's achievements remain fragile. In fact, as of the completion of the project,

- (i) The communication system is “satisfactory plus” but sustainability is in question. After project completion, it is possible that the communities may become discouraged due to the lack of feedback in reporting system. Currently, Project support and supervision are keeping this communication system functioning. For the Committee, an improved feedback system would constitute an additional value beyond its communication function. The system could collapse after the project is completed which is why, all the more reason that the management committee didn't more actively engage.
- (ii) Favorable environment for sustainable management, although judged “satisfactory plus” faces a relatively small degree of risk. Indeed, developed management tools (dina and management committee) have strong institutional anchorage which gives them a good chance to continue after project completion. The perception by the population of the durability of the dina and committee confirms this foundation. It justifies the need to keep the system after the project, in one side by the profit that the population can obtain from the structures in place, and in the other side by the fact of their formalization and officialization: (both traditional and legal adoption). However, maintaining the production and socioeconomic monitoring system is uncertain because, the information sharing system couldn't be systemized and adopted by the communities. Beside its role of sharing scientific knowledge about marine resources management, the production monitoring also constitutes an awareness tool to mobilize and encourage people (although the results are not always immediately palpable). The abandonment of this production monitoring system may compromise the application of the management tools which have been developed as a part of population justifies the need to maintain the dina and a management structure because of the benefit that the population extracts from improved fisheries productivity.
- (iii) The local communities' involvement is judged “very satisfactory” and the gains will likely be permanent.
- (iv) The development of income employment activities, judged “unsatisfactory” may constitute an obstacle in future. Without income generating activities, the fisheries will not be able to absorb increased pressure due to population growth. The fact remains that output 1 and output 2 durability would constitute a buffer to this pressure. If the application of the management tools (structure and dina) tools remain intact the absorptive capacity of the local fisheries will be enhanced and if the management committee maintains a level of operationality, , they both

constitute a driving force to find appropriate solutions to the communities' problems.

3.5.2 Institutional viability

The institutional viability, as previously stated, remains questionable because the community fisheries management plans have not been completed. In fact, on the date of project completion, the community fisheries management plans couldn't get over the institutionalization (legal recognition by the government) step. While it would have provided the communities with a comfortable position in the joint- management context.

3.6 Lessons learned

The main lesson learned through this project is the value of the promoting the co-management of natural resources. The project interventions were based on community structures which respect both traditional and administrative hierarchies to promote sustainable resource management which is a first in Madagascar.

At the end of the Project and looking at its results, the project should be congratulated for having confirmed the importance of the socio systemic approach in sustainable natural resources by integrating the human and social dimension: *"the natural resource management concerns before all the relationship between people concerning the natural resources"*. This is reflected in Management Committee structure, which facilitates relationships between people by integrating traditional and social structures. It's also reflected in **institutionalization** of the developed management tools which gives them an official status which is required for co-management relationships with the government and elected officials. It is also reflected in the prioritizing process that was used to the set up the communication tools between the different stakeholders.

An important lesson is that when developing an operational strategy to remember to respect the different hierarchies when establishing a a joint management approach as stipulated by theorist like Berkes: from the information (like a coming door) to community control passing by joint actions and partnership. And finally, the success of this project could not have been achieved without underscoring the well-adapted supervision strategy- consisting of the socio organizer, the regional coordination in WWF Toliara, the national coordination (WWF in Antananarivo).

About the failure, there are two lessons which must be retained.

First, if the involvement of governmental agency is required in the implementation of the project, the project must envisage an adequate strategy so that the governmental agency can follow the rhythm of the project implementation.

Second, the implementation of this project confirms the conclusion drawn from the implementation of the National Plan of Environmental Action in Madagascar about income generating activities. It is on the one hand the need about a suitable mechanism of funding. And in the other hand, the importance to insert the objective within the framework total of the local development, implying all the local partners

3.7 Replicability

Such an innovative approach unreservedly merits replication in the others places of Madagascar or another country where there is need to establish "mutual confident governance"

especially in the face of failed “authority governance”. The institutionalization of participative resources management through the management Committee, the dina and Community Management Plan can allow to ensure replicability in other sites. Fisheries Administration has to play an essential role in this intention.

Some national or regional workshops for the project capitalization are necessary to share this experience. Indeed, according to the scientific importance of the subject, it’s highly recommended to product a scientific communication about this project to feed discussions on of participative resources management and the socio-systemic approach.

3.8 Conclusions and overall assessment:

The project assessment generated the following main conclusions:

- ✓ The project relevancy is confirmed: both sustainable marine resources management and participative strategy answer to the need and context priority from local level to global level.
- ✓ The project impacts are positive towards the excepted finality and the impacts even beyond the intervention zone demonstrate the improvement in bio ecological and socio-economic indicators.
- ✓ The project efficacy is judged to be mixed due to the non-completion of some excepted outputs which in turn weakens long term sustainability. . The tactical weaknesses in term of planning for the communication system and for the implementation of a favorable environment for participative management, and a strategic failure for the employment activities development of income have been noted.
- ✓ The project efficiency is good as judged by the level of resource mobilization.
- ✓ The project durability stays somewhat “uncertain” due to some of the unrealized activities and some tactical and strategic errors.

4 Recommendations

4.1 Project Exit Plan

Correcting the key technical failures is critical before the project is completed in order to increase chances for long-term stability.

- ✓ A Project Exit Plan to sensitize the Administration as to the importance of ensuring a systematic feedback of the reports/ratios emitted by CBOs, so that CBOs can clearly see that their actions are being taken into consideration. The exit plan must take into account the time necessary to set up a working reporting/feedback system which can be adopted by both the transmitter and receiver.
- ✓ Resources should also be allocated to promote the institutionalization of management tools like the Community Management Plans, the data base, and the formalisation of Rodobey platform.

- ✓ A strategic correction plan for the development of income generating activities. It is recommended to allocate maximum efforts in the development of the partnerships since in which WWF would not be really strong. The Community Fisheries Management Plan, on which technical and financial partners have aligned, would constitute an ideal basis for this. In the same way, a plan for systematic monitoring and assessment of the evolution of income generating activities is useful

4.2 For implementing a similar project in the future

In term of Project design, the consideration of human dimensions was a primary success factor. The project should not only concentrate on the population at the base (what is very significant) – but a parallel action should be led for the official (government) actors to be able to guarantee true a co-management. Also, for the implementation of a project like this, and especially in a country like Madagascar, co-administration requires particular attention to external factors- in particular, relating to the implication of the Fishery Administration Indeed, the failure of the State governance function is the principal justification for promoting the participative approach. It is imperative to ensure that the State (with its limited means) can follow the Project rhythm.

In term of Project management, the interaction between the teams on the ground (socio-organizers), the decentralized managers, the centralized managers (as well as technical and financial Staff) and financial backers constitutes a factor of the success of this Project : human resources capacitation, planning – execution and monitoring of the activities, planning, management and budgetary monitoring.

At last, it will be very useful, for implementing a similar project to envisage control sites from the beginning (collecting comparative baseline data for later analyses).

4.3 Results diffusion

The results of this Project constitute an interesting academic case of participative natural resources management which it deserves to be diffused for a replication both in term of approach and in term of scientific capitalization. Consequently, it is recommended to WWF MWIOPIO:

- The drafting of a "successes story" project document supported by a national or regional workshop
- Drafting “case study” scientific paper and followed by participation at scientific international workshop.
- Annual follow up surveys in both pilot and selected “control” sites which only would allow a scientific verification of the hypothesis according to the effectiveness of socio-systemic as approach in natural resources management.

5 ANNEXES

5.1 Annexe 1 : Terms of reference

FINAL EVALUATION OF PROJECT MG 910.01 - "SOUTHERN TOLIARA MARINE NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT"

Project reference : MG0910.01 AO-070/2011

1. BACKGROUND

The Regional Representation of WWF in Madagascar and the West Indian Ocean (MWIO) has been implementing a project for sustainable management of living marine and coastal resources in southern Toliara since January 2006, starting with an inception phase then entering a first phase of implementation of three years in January 2007, followed by a second phase of implementation of two years. The project is being funded by NORAD (at 90%) and WWF Norway (at 10%). From January 1, 2007 to December 31, 2011, WWF MWIO has received a total amount of NOK 8 274 657 as part of the project "Southern Toliara Marine Natural Resource Management - MG 0910.01". The project is implemented in four pilot sites (from north to south, Maromena / Befasy, Beheloka, Itampolo and Ambohibola) located in four Rural Communes (Anakao, Beheloka, Itampolo and Androka). It aims at facilitating and supporting the implementation of a strategy for a participatory management of natural marine resources in southern Toliara Madagascar in collaboration with the Regional Fisheries Administration (DRPRH Atsimo Andrefana), the fishermen's communities and the entities involved in the fishing sector. It mainly works towards four objectives:

- 1- An effective communication system between key stakeholders is in place and made operational, by the end of 2011;
- 2- An enabling environment for the sustainable management of traditional fisheries is established and improved in pilot sites, by the end of year 2011;
- 3- Community-based organizations (CBOs) are actively and effectively involved in the sustainable use and management of living marine and coastal resources, by the end of year 2011;
- 4- Small-scale alternative livelihoods activities creating positive socio-economic impacts are developed by the end of year 2011. The project lifetime was mainly marked by the achievement of the biological and socio-economic investigations, several steps to implement the communication system, awareness raising actions, setting up of the local management structures and the local convention or *dina*, capacity building, implementation of the resources management mechanism, fisheries production survey, and efforts to ensure the consistency of several interventions in the area. It was also marked by the issuance of the temporary protection statute for the Nosy Ve-Androka Marine Protected Area in December 2010. This conservation initiative has been undertaken by Madagascar National Parks and has reinforced the implementation of the marine resources management in the project area.

2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE

An evaluation is required at end of the project "Southern Toliara Marine Natural Resource Management - MG910-WWF Intl, 5018-WWF NO, GLO-08/449-3-NORAD" as per WWF reporting requirements for Norad projects. It mainly aims at evaluating and analyzing the achievements of the project during its 5 years implementation (from January 2007 to December 2011) at local (from Maromena to Fanambosa), regional and national levels by taking into account its objectives, and by considering their impact on social, environmental and institutional issues. It will also carry out a critical assessment of the relevance and the internal coherence of the project interventions, its design foundations, its methodology approaches, its objectives, the resources used and the results, and will determine the project successes and its shortcomings. The final review will look into the sustainability aspect of the results and impacts achieved as well as the exit strategy. Moreover, the evaluation will be undertaken with a view to enhance the conservation gains from the project, to develop recommendations for the development of further conservation project south of Toliara and to draw key lessons learned and project best practices to contribute to WWF organizational learning.

3. SCOPE AND FOCUS

The evaluation will be focused on the following topics:

- The implementation level of the participatory fisheries resources management strategy and the trends of the natural environment health status;
- The extent of the implemented management system and structures in the pilot sites and the integration level of the local communities in this system;
- The level of the sustainable use of the marine resources and the ecosystems in the pilot sites;
- The compatibility of the sustainable fisheries management strategy in southern Toliara with the implementation of the Nosy Ve - Androka MPA (by MNP);
- The alternative livelihoods catalyzed by the project and their positive socio-economic impacts on local populations;
- The communities' perception related to the implementation of the fisheries resources management system, the presence of WWF staffs and volunteers and the changes brought about;
- The current socio-economic and cultural contexts, and the context before the implementation of the project if possible;
- Other initiatives arising from the establishment of a participatory management of fisheries resources in the pilot sites. The evaluation is expected to inventory the project achievements and results and to assess the achievements level against the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) and the indicators and especially against the following evaluation criteria:

3.1. Quality and relevance of the project design: Are the rationale and the design of the project relevant regarding to the local context? Are the project activities in accord with the conservation and development needs, and priorities at local, regional and national level? Do they correspond to the policy of the Ministries involved and the national objectives? Does the project respond to WWF's conservation goal?

3.2. Consistency:

- Have the implemented activities allowed the project to achieve its objectives?
- Would other resources, in term of quality and quantity, be suitable to reach the objectives? Which ones?
- How and by whom were the project's components controlled and coordinated? -Did the internal capacity and the coordination enable a satisfactory consistency of the project activities?
- Was the partnership between the different actors involved satisfactory?

3.3. Effectiveness:

- To what extent the project activities have permitted to achieve the expected results? The evaluator is invited to compare achievements against objectives (preferably in percentage) and explain the possible differences.

3.4. Efficiency of the planning and implementation:

- Have the resources been used for the project implementation as in the plan?
- Could the results be achieved with resources which are more economical? Here, the resources should be regarded to its wide meanings: financial resources, human resources and materials from the project and local actors.

3.5. Impacts:

- Assess the overall impacts of the project for the Atsimo Andrefana Region and for the project area in terms of biodiversity/ecosystem conservation, resource management and local communities' livelihood;
- Estimate the project impacts at a lower level (sub-region, municipality, and village) interms of technical, economic, social, sanitation issues.

3.6. Potential for sustainability, replication and magnification: Assess the likelihood of performed activities and the gain made (including the sustainable use of marine resources and coral reef protection) to continue and to extend independently (to replicate) after the project withdrawal. It will also be advisable to assess:

- The extend and the quality of the project network's collaboration with the regional actors regarding to the fisheries resource management and environmental protection;
- The ownership level of the marine resources management tools by these actors; -The degree of capitalization and communication around the project activities; -The exit strategy and its relevance to ensure sustainability.

4. METHODOLOGY

The evaluator will have to break the project down into several components (ex: communication system, resources management system in the pilot sites, etc...) according to the results of the project document (and other documents) analysis. Questions that correspond to the six evaluation criteria developed above will be addressed during the phases of the evaluation. Under the supervision of the WWF MWIOP Technical Advisor, the WWF MWIOP Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and the WWF Norway Project Advisor, the evaluator will develop a system of reference for the evaluation as per the evaluation matrix provided by WWF. This involves defining relevant, objective and measurable evaluation indicators. A project

achievements and opportunities analysis will be carried out through the analysis of the semi-annual, annual technical reports, the findings and recommendations from the annual project review and the mid-term first phase project review and other available documents as well as through the interviews of key informants, field visits and visits to the key partners. The evaluator should elaborate a summarized and commented table with the assessment of the project components. This will help to have an overview of the entire project. The evaluator should conduct a SWOT analysis (analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) to show the extent and the quality of the project collaboration network with the actors in the region, the degree of capitalization and communication of the project activities, and the degree of ownership of resources management tools by the actors. Finally, the evaluator will propose a draft of prospects of reproduction and perpetuation of the project achievements (both technical, environmental and institutional) for the technicians of the Fisheries Administration (including PACP) and the management committees at the pilot sites. This will be a trial update of the strategies and the priority actions in order to strengthen the technicians' and managers' interventions in the area.

5. OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

The consultant will deliver to WWF MWIOP Marine Programme Office, the WWF Norway project officer and the WWF Norway project Advisor the following:

- i. A presentation of the methodology used, the preliminary findings and initial conclusions at the final restitution meeting in Toliara or in Antananarivo (PowerPoint presentation) with the digital copy of the presentation on December 01, 2011.
- ii. A digital copy in MS Word format using Arial font 11 of the draft final evaluation report (not > 25 pages, annexes included), as per the report template provided by WWF, by December 06, 2011. WWF will provide feedback and comments within one week of receiving the draft report.
- iii. A digital copy in MS Word format using Arial font 11 of the final evaluation report, as per the template provided by WWF, with the summary of the final evaluation report (3 pages) according to the WWF format within 3 days of receiving consolidated comments on the Final Draft Evaluation Report or by December 16, 2011.

5.2 Annexe 2 : Evaluation matrix

valeur	Principales questions évaluatives	Questions évaluatives secondaires (???)	Données nécessaires	Source et Méthode de collecte des données
1. Pertinence				
1.1- niveau local	Les activités du projet répondent elles aux besoins prioritaires au niveau local?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quelles sont les activités (les préoccupations) prioritaires de la population ? - Quel est le positionnement des activités du projet par rapport à cela 	Préoccupations prioritaires de la population ayant été touchées par le Projet	Comité de Gestion Ménage
1.2 Niveau régional et national	Les activités du projet répondent elles aux besoins prioritaires au niveau régional?	La gestion durable des ressources marines et des écosystèmes est-elle au centre du Plan Régional de développement ?	Préoccupations prioritaires de la Région ayant été touchées par le Projet	Entretien avec les responsables de la Région du Sud Ouest
		Quelle est la place des sites pilotes choisis dans la configuration globale du développement régional ?	Axes d'intervention du PRD « oui/non »	PRD
	Les activités du projet répondent elles aux besoins prioritaires au niveau national ? sont –elles en cohérence avec la politique du secteur et avec les objectifs nationaux ?	Quelle est la place de la gestion durable des ressources naturelles dans la politique de développement du pays		Pas de référentiel officiel pour le moment
		Quelle est la place accordée à la gestion participative dans la gouvernance des ressources naturelles à Madagascar ?		Pas de référentiel officiel pour le moment
1.3 Niveau global	Les activités du projet répondent-elles aux besoins du concept de conservation développement ? Les activités du projet répondent elles à la philosophie de conservation du WWF ?	la stratégie de gestion participative répondent-elle aux préoccupations planétaires contemporaines ? Quelle place accorde WWF (une institution reconnue mondialement pour la conservation) à la promotion du socio-économique comme stratégie menant à la conservation ?		Interview avec les responsables du WWF Antananarivo
		Comment se positionne WWF par rapport au paradigme de gouvernance à confiance mutuelle ?		

valeur	Principales questions évaluatives	Questions évaluatives secondaires (???)	Données nécessaires	Source et Méthode de collecte des données
2. Cohérence				
2.1- Hypothèse secondaire	La stratégie de gestion participative a-t-elle été instaurée à travers la réalisation des extrants ?	Quel est le degré d'achèvement de la mise en place du système et des structures de gestion	Taux de réalisation	Rapports de Suivi et évaluation systématiques du Projet
2.2- Hypothèse principale		Quelles sont les impacts socioéconomiques des activités alternatives catalysée par le Projet sur la population locale	Indicateurs proxy	Suivi WWF
3- Efficacité 31- Mesure des résultats du projet	Quel est le degré de conversion intrants versus extrants par rapport à la prévision ?	Dans quelles mesures les activités du projet ont elles permis la réalisation des extrants attendus ?	Données de suivi-évaluation (technique et financière) du projet	Suivi-Evaluation WWF
32- Processus de mise en oeuvre	Le degré de participation du groupe cible ou des organisations associées dans le projet est-il élevé ? Le projet est-il bien connu ?	Quelle est la perception par la population et les acteurs de la mise en place de la gestion des pêches, l'implication du WWF et les changements induits ?	Positionnement des acteurs par rapport au Projet	CoGE Ménage
	Quels facteurs ont influencé les problèmes de mise en oeuvre?	Quels sont composantes du système de gestion du projet déterminant des achèvements (paragraphe 3.1)		Entretien WWF Toliara et Antananarivo
4- Efficience	Les ressources mobilisées sont-elles conformes à la prévision pour réaliser les activités ?	Quel est le niveau de décaissement du Projet par rubrique : investissements et fonctionnements ?	Suivi financier	Suivi WWF Antananarivo
		Le recrutement de l'équipe de projet est il conforme à la prévision (en quantité et en qualité) ?	Suivi GRH	Entretien WWF Antananarivo
		L'acquisition des matériels et équipements est-elle conforme au document de projet ?	Suivi patrimoine	Entretien WWF Antananarivo

valeur	Principales questions évaluatives	Questions évaluatives secondaires (???)	Données nécessaires	Source et Méthode de collecte des données
5 – Impact				
5.1- Probabilités de réalisation de la finalité	Quelle est la tendance de l'atteinte de la finalité du Projet ?	Quelle est la tendance de l'état de santé des écosystèmes ?	Données de suivi de la production Coraux, diversités poissons, captures pouples, holothuries, langoustes	Suivi des débarquements WWF Toliara
		Quelle est la tendance de l'amélioration de la situation socio-économique de la population ?	Données de suivi Proxy	Suivi des données proxy WWF Toliara
5.2- Répercussions	Au-delà de la finalité attendue du projet, quels sont les autres impacts (positifs ou négatifs) observés du Projet dans les sites ?	Quels sont les impacts induits par le projet sur la gouvernance locale en générale	Opinion des responsables locaux	Entretien Responsables locaux
		Quels sont les impacts induits par le projet sur les aspects sociaux, économiques, techniques et culturel	Perception des usagers	Ménage
	Au-delà des sites pilotes, quels sont les impacts du projet en terme de gestion des ressources naturelles ?	Quels sont les impacts du projet sur la gouvernance des ressources naturelles en générale dans la région ?	Perception	Comité de sensibilisation
6- Viabilité				
6.1- Technique	Quelles sont les probabilités pour que les modifications d'usages et des pratiques induites par le Projet sont maintenues (voire améliorées) après le (financement du) Projet ?	Après le départ du Projet (financement et encadrement) les outils de gestion développé supportant la réglementation des pratiques ont – ils la probabilité d'être mis en œuvre ?	Degré d'appropriation des dina par les communautés cibles	Entretien Comité de gestion
			Degré d'appropriation des dina par les communautés cibles	Entretien Comité de gestion
6.2- Institutionnel	Y a-t-il une capacité d'organisation (et financière) suffisante pour mettre en oeuvre des activités destinées à produire des effets après la fin du Projet?	Le Ministère chargé de la pêche a-t-il la capacité d'appuyer (et d'encadrer) les communautés dans la mise en œuvre du Plan de Gestion communautaire des pêches ?	Degré d'engagement des partenaires clés	Entretien avec les partenaires qui se sont positionnés en faveur des PGC

5.3 Annexe 3 : Timetable

date	Objet	objet	lieu	Responsable	
22 nov	Réunion de mise au point	Validation de la méthodologie	WWF Antananarivo	Paul Siegel – Harifidy Ralison – Lala Ranaivomanana (Consultant)	
23 nov		Validation Matrice d'évaluation	WWF Toliara	Paul Siegel - Vola Ramahery – Consultant	
24 nov		Validation questionnaire	WWF Toliara		
25 Nov	Collecte de données	Entretien avec GoGe et non CoGe	Maromena	Paul Siegel – Equipes 1 et 2	
26 Nov		Entretien avec GoGe et non CoGe	Befasy	Equipe 1	
27 Nov		Entretien avec GoGe et non CoGe	Beheloke Itampolo	Equipe 1 Equipe 2	
28 Nov		Entretien WWF Toliara Entretien avec MNP	Toliara	Consultant	
29 Nov		Entretien Region Entretien avec SGP Entretien avec DRPRH Toliara	Toliara	Consultant	
01 déc		Entretien avec : - RAF (Mandimby Ramilison) - DRH (Bodo Rasendrasoa) - Programme marin (Harifidy Ralison)	WWF Antananarivo	Consultant	
02 déc		Entretien avec - Andriamandimbisoa Holy - Direction Générale des Pêches	WWF Antananarivo Antananarivo	Consultant	
05 au 08 déc		Diffusion	Traitement et analyse des données	Toliara	Consultant
09 au 12 déc			Rédaction Rapport provisoire	Antananarivo	Consultant
12 au 15 déc			Rédaction Rapport d'évaluation final		Paul Siegel, Consultant

5.4 Annexe 4 : List of individuals interviewed and/or communities consulted

Nom	Fonction
Martial	Maromena
Gofy	Maromena
Magiste	Maromena
Damima	Maromena
Henriette	Maromena
Joseph	Maromena
Voavelo	Maromena
Faneva	Maromena
Augustine	Beheloke
Fabienne	Beheloke
Maurice	Beheloke
Dico	Beheloke
Berthine	Beheloke
Nirina Kely	Beheloke
Jacques	Beheloke
Evariste	Beheloke
Vezo mitsinjo ny hoavy	COB Beheloke
Vatoharasoa,	COB Maromena
Tsitingine	COB Befasy
???	COB Itampolo
Selson Alex	Chef Fkt Befasy
Sylvain Jean	Chef Fkt Beheloke
Georges	Chef Fkt Itampolo
Robert	Itampolo
Tsihobo	Itampolo
Eliane	Itampolo
Johns	Itampolo
Taniah	Itampolo
Odilin	Befasy
Eric	Befasy
Clara	Befasy
Tafa	Befasy
Dezy	Befasy
Flovita	Befasy
?	Directeur du Développement Régional (DDR)
?	Coordinateur Région Sud Ouest
Leda Tovonasy	Conseillé Technique Région Sud Ouest
Vola Ramahery	WWF Toliara – Coordinateur
Harifidy Ralison	WWF Antananarivo – Responsable Programme Marin
Bodo Rasendrasoa	WWF Antananarivo – Directeur des Opération
Mandimby Ramilison	WWF Antananarivo – Responsable Financier
Holy Andriamandimbisoa	WWF Antananarivo – Responsable évaluation des COBs
Simon Rabearintsoa ?	Directeur Général MPRH Antananarivo
Noely	DRPRH Toliara
Tolotra	Responsable Parc marin Nosy Ve Androka

5.5 Annexe 5 : List of supporting documentation reviewed

- Plan Régional de Développement de la Région du Sud Ouest
- Global Programme Framework WWF
- Documents : MG 910 Peer Review
- Documents : MG 910 Project Technical Progress Report
- Base de données MG 910 Etudes proxy
- Base de données MG 910 Etudes de production
- Base de données évaluation des CBO, LOME
- MG 910 : Mid-term first phase Project Review 2007-2009
- MG910 : logical Framework Analysis

5.6 Annexe 6 : Research instruments: questionnaire, interview guide(s)

FICHE D'ENQUETE

Fanontaniana ankapobeny

Anarana :

Date d'enquête :

Sexe : Age :

Mpanadihady:

Tanàna :

Fanontaniana

1- Io tetik'asa io va manandrify ty olana amin'ny fitatana ty haza ?

Eny ! ! Tsia !__ !

Ohatry hoe ?

2- Ino koa ty olana hitanareo fa tokony ho nentea amy ty olana mikasiky ty haza?

3- Mahasolo tena any oloiaby ve ny komity ?

Eny !_ ! Tsia !_ !

Amin'ny manao akory iny no ahafahanareo mivola an'izay?

4- Ny rehetra ve miara mandray andraikitra araka ny hevitra tapaka ?

Eny ! ! Tsia !__ !

5- Mitondra soa sa ratsy aminareo ve io tetik'asa io ?

Soa ! ! Ratsy !__ !

Raha soa :

Raha ratsy :

6- Ino zao ty fiantsaikany (fiova nisy teto)?

7- Raha nitondra soa izy dia, ino ty marika ahafahatsika mampahafatatra amin'ny mpahatsivola fa nitondra soa hoanareo ny tetik'asa ?

8- Raha ny hevitrareo, ireo raha napetratsika (dina, Komity, FIJO) dia haharitra (rehefa lasa ny WWF)?

Eny ! ! dia ahoana ?

Tsia !__ ! dia fa manino ?

*** 9- Ino ty asa nataonareo ta an-tana hafa ?**

10- Manao akory fahitan'olo asa nataonareo io amin'ny tanà io ao ?

*** 11- Sarotsy va ty nametraky Komity mpitantana, dina, FIJO ?**

Eny !__ ! Tsia !__ !

Ino iaby ty sakana nisy?

Guide d'entretien Région

Q1 : Quels sont les apports du projet WWF dans le développement Régional des sites concernés ?

***Quelles sont les attentes de la Région et qui ont été pris en compte par le projet WWF ?**

***Quelles sont les attentes qui n'ont pas été satisfait par le projet ?**

Q2 : Comment la Région perçoit l'approche en gestion participative (Comite, DINA) des ressources marines ?

Q3 : Comment la Région perçoit le partenariat avec le projet WWF ? Y a-t-il une synergie, de la complémentarité ou incompatibilité ?

Questionnaire WWF Antananarivo

« Evaluation finale les contraintes dans le processus de mise en oeuvre et les perspectives d'amélioration – relation et processus de prise de décision Terrain-Siège-Bailleur »

Mandimby Ramilison

Données de base :	
Décaissement du projet 910.01 par rapport aux prévisions initiales part Siège vs Terrain part Fonctionnement vs Investissements	
Décaissements du 910 par année	

Appréciations générales	
Comment se manifeste la relation Terrain-Siège-BdF ? planification budgétaire, suivi budgétaire, reapprovisionnement, décaissement, processus de prise de décision, contrôle	
Quelles ont été les différentes contraintes en terme de gestion de fonds du Projet 910.01?	
Comment la gestion des fonds a contribué ou gêné la mise en œuvre du projet 910.01?	
Quelle leçon peut on tirer de la mise en œuvre du projet 910.01 ?	

Harifidy Ralison :

Insertion du projet 910.01 par rapport à la stratégie global du WWF

Comment le projet 910 a-t-il contribué aux objectifs du WWF Madagascar ?

Dans quelle mesure le projet 910 a-t-il contribué au cadre logique global du WWF ?

Autres appréciations en terme de gestion du Projet 910

Holy Andriamandimbisoa (Nanisana) :

appréciation de la capacité des Comités de Gestion ancrage institutionnel et durabilité	
Comment évaluer vous l'ancrage institutionnel des Comités Gestion érigés dans la zone du projet 910.01	
Par rapport aux autres Comités évalués, comment situez vous la capacité des Comités Gestion érigés dans la zone du projet 910.01, leur ancrage et leur durabilité ?	
Quelles déterminants seraient à l'origine de la différence avec les autres comités	
Autres appréciations	

Bodo Rasendrasoa : le niveau de recrutement % aux prévisions

Données de base	
Recrutement du personnel du projet par rapport au planning d'acquisition initial	

Appréciation générale sur la gestion des ressources humaines	
Quelles ont été les contraintes rencontrées en terme d'acquisition du personnel pour le projet 910.01	
Dans quelles mesures la GRH a contribué à ou gêné la mise en œuvre du projet 910.01	
Autres appréciations	

5.7 Annexe 7 : Project logical framework

The overall goal of this project is that local communities benefit from and contribute to the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity in the southern Toliara region, Madagascar.

Goals & Objectives	Indicator	Baseline	Planned Final Result, & Yr.	Data Source/ Means of Verification
The sustainable management of living marine and coastal resources in Southern Toliara is established in pilot sites, in collaboration with local fishermen, the Malagasy Fisheries Administration, collectors, retailers and the local populations by the end of year 2011.	Improvement of seafood catch (Increased trend of Catch per Unit Effort (CPUE)) and Habitat (coral cover, species diversity, biomass etc...).	0 (Jan 07) - No CPUE data available at this date	Seafood catch and habitat health known (2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information system related to fisheries • Report of activities • Technical reports • Baseline data • Management plans • Data base
	Established community based organisations (CBOs) in pilot sites are using management tools.	0 (Jan 07)	Management tools used by CBOs in pilot sites (2011)	
	Locally adapted management plans for marine living resources drafted by the end of 2011.	0 (Jan 07)	Management plans elaborated (2011)	
	Management plans implemented in pilot sites by end of year 2011.	0 (Jan 07)	Management plans implemented in pilot sites (2011)	
	Database structure developed for traditional fisheries in pilot sites by end of year 2011.	0 (Jan 07)	Database structure developed (2011)	
	Participatory monitoring program implemented by 2011.	0 (Jan 07)	Participatory monitoring program implemented (2011)	
	Increased average revenue (or proxy measures) at household level with fishermen in pilot sites.	0 (Jan 07)	Fishermen's revenue increase (2011)	

Goals & Objectives	Indicator	Baseline	Planned Final Result, & Yr.	Data Source/ Means of Verification
Output 1: An effective communication system between the key stakeholders is in place and made operational, by the end of year 2011.	Communication committee structure set up in a participatory way and operational	0 (Jan 07)	Communication committees are operational and share information regularly (2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information system related to fisheries • Report of activities • Meeting minutes
	Number of communication system (reporting/feedback) developed and implemented	0 (Jan 07)		
	Communication tools developed (2 information bulletins; posting boards; posters)	0 (Jan 07)	Stakeholders recognize management committee members and are informed on management rules and progress (2011)	
	Number of exchange visits/meetings between local CBOs	0 (Jan 07)	CBOs meet regularly and share best practices on resource management (2011)	
	Number of joint fieldtrips between local and district fisheries authorities and local users groups	0 (Jan 07)	DRPRH and CBOs regularly meet and discuss on marine resources issues (2011)	
	A fisheries database for the South West region is developed	0 (Jan 07)	A fisheries database for the Southwest region is available for all stakeholders (2011)	

Goals & Objectives	Indicator	Baseline	Planned Final Result, & Yr.	Data Source/ Means of Verification
Output 2: An enabling environment for the sustainable management of traditional fisheries is established and improved, by the end of the year 2011.	Number of pilot sites selected	0 (Jan 07)	Sites meeting several criteria (dynamism of CBOs, importance of fishing activities, accessibility etc. are chosen as pilot (2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical reports • Platform of agreement and collaboration • Reports on biological information • Reports on sociological information
	Common vision of sustainable use of living marine and coastal resources management in pilot sites	0 (Jan 07)	All stakeholders share one vision for the sustainable management of marine resources (2009)	
	Biological, socio-economic and catch baseline information available to feed into fisheries management plans	0 (Jan 07)	Baseline information available (2010)	
	Agreement on roles and responsibilities among key stakeholders (reflected in Dina and pilot sites management plans), proposed through Rodobey meeting.	0 (Jan 07)	Roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders, agreed through Rodobey meeting (2011)	
	Number of Dina (local conventions) officialized	0 (Jan 07)	Fishing zones are managed by local conventions (2011)	
	One management plan developed for each pilot site	0 (Jan 07)	One management plan is developed for each pilot site (2011)	
	Management plans approved by regional authorities, Fisheries and Environment Departments	0 (Jan 07)	Regional authorities support participatory management of marine resources (2011)	
	Financial sustainability of management strategy catalyzed	0 (Jan 07)	Action points towards the financial sustainability of the management strategy (2011)	

Goals & Objectives	Indicator	Baseline	Planned Final Result, & Yr.	Data Source/ Means of Verification
Output 3: Community-based organisations (CBOs) are actively and effectively involved in the sustainable use and management of living marine and coastal resources, by the end of the year 2011.	Number of existing CBOs assessed.	0 (Jan 07)	Existing CBOs assessed (2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports of external consultant on CBO assessments • Reports to share information related to fisheries • Technical reports • Reports of marine resources studies • CBO Work plans • Assessment reports • Proposals • CBOs
	Number of CBOs created or revitalized.	0 (Jan 07)	CBOs are created or revitalized in pilot sites (2008-2009)	
	Training needs of each CBO assessed.	0 (Jan 07)	Organizational and technical capacity of CBOs in sustainable resource management is developed (2011)	
	Training of each CBO undertaken	0 (Jan 07)		
	Participation of CBOs in drafting the management plan	0 (Jan 07)	CBOs participate in drafting a management plan (2011)	
	Percentage of issues on marine resources management solved by CBOs actions.	0 (Jan 07)	CBOs in pilot sites are able to solve issues on marine resources management (2011)	
	Functional CBOs by the end of year 2011	0 (Jan 07)	CBOs in pilot sites are able to manage their marine resources (2011)	
	Number of fundable project proposals submitted	0 (Jan 07)	CBOs in pilot sites have developed 3 project proposals that can be submitted to potential donors (2010)	
Participatory monitoring systems established for different fisheries resources in the pilot sites.	0 (Jan 07)	CBOs carry out regularly participatory monitoring of key resources (2011)		
Output 4: Small-scale alternative livelihoods creating positive socio-economic impacts in pilot sites, by the end of year 2011.	Assessment of existing income generating activities in pilot sites	0 (Jan 07)	Existing income generating activities in pilot sites are known (2008)	
	Number of new income generating activities developed in pilot sites (ecotourism, sea cucumber farming, fish processing, chicken farming, improved agriculture practices, crafts selling)	0 (Jan 07)	At least 3 new income generating activities developed in pilot sites (2011)	

5.8 Annexe 9 : Summary tables of progress towards outputs, targets, goals

Objectif, Sous-Objectif, Résultat	INDICATEURS		RESULTATS ATTENDUS	CUMUL (depuis le début jusqu'à la période)	% réalisation
Project purpose: The sustainable management of living marine and coastal resources in Southern Toliara is established in pilot sites, in collaboration with local fishermen, the Malagasy Fisheries Administration, collectors, retailers and the local population	Improvement of seafood catch (Increased trend of Catch per Unit Effort (CPUE)) and Habitat (coral cover, species diversity, biomass etc...).	nb reef surveys	2	1	50,0%
		CPUE assessment	8	4	50,0%
		key resource production assessment	12	8	66,7%
	Established community based organisations (CBOs) in pilot sites are using management tools.	CBOs use "dina" as management tool.	4	7	175,0%
	Locally adapted management plans for marine living resources drafted by the end of 2011.		4	4	100,0%
	Management plans implemented in pilot sites by end of year 2010.		4	4	100,0%
	Database structure developed for marine and coastal biodiversity and small scale fisheries in Southwestern Madagascar by end of 2011.		1	1	100,0%
	Monitoring program implemented by end of year 2011.		2	0	0,0%
	Increased average revenue (or proxy measures) at household level with fishermen in pilot sites by end of year 2011.		1	0	0,0%
AVERAGE PROJECT PURPOSE					71,3%

Objectif, Sous-Objectif, Résultat	INDICATEURS		RESULTATS ATTENDUS	CUMUL (depuis le début jusqu'à la période)	% réalisation
Output 1 : An effective communication system between the key stakeholders in place and made operational, by the end of year 2010.	Communication committee structure set up in a participatory way and operational.	village workshop;	15	15	100,0%
		commune workshop;	4	4	100,0%
		regional workshop	1	1	100,0%
	Communication system (reporting/feedback) developed and implemented.	reports from CBO communication commission;	16	54	337,5%
		feedback from DRPRH and/or authorities	16	9	56,3%
	Number of Communication tools developed	bulletin news	2	1	50,0%
		t-shirts	250	500	200,0%
		posting boards	5	21	420,0%
	Number of Exchange visits/meetings between local CBOs realised.		12	8	66,7%
		kapindre events	2	2	100,0%
	Number of joint fieldtrips between local and district fisheries authorities and local users groups realised.		37	32	86,5%
	A fisheries database for the South West region is developed.		1	1	100,0%
	Mise en place d'un statut et de règlement intérieur pour Rodobey (consortium of actors working in southern Toliara).	1 statute; 1 internal regulation	1	0	0,0%
AVERAGE OUTPUT 1					132,1%

Objectif, Sous-Objectif, Résultat	INDICATEURS		RESULTATS ATTENDUS	CUMUL (depuis le début jusqu'à la période)	% réalisation
Output 2: An enabling environment for the sustainable management of traditional fisheries is established and improved in pilot sites, by the end of the year 2010.	Number of pilot sites selected.		4	4	100,0%
	Common vision of sustainable use of living marine and coastal resources management in pilot sites.		1	1	100,0%
	Agreement on roles and responsibilities among key stakeholders developed through Rodobey agreement, management plan and Dina.	agreement on roles and responsibilities of stakeholders developed	1	0	0,0%
		Dina approved;	4	4	100,0%
	Biological, socio-economic and catch baseline information available to feed into fisheries management plans.	management plans developed	4	4	100,0%
		biological data available	1	1	100,0%
		socio-economic data available	1	1	100,0%
		key resource production realised;	4	4	100,0%
	1 dina (local convention) per pilot site officialized.	CPUE data available (1 for each pilot site)	4	4	100,0%
		dina officialized	4	7	175,0%
	One management plan developed for each pilot site		4	4	100,0%
	Approval of management plans by regional authorities, Fisheries Service and Environment Department		4	0	0,0%
AVERAGE OUTPUT 2					89,6%

Objectif, Sous-Objectif, Résultat	INDICATEURS	RESULTATS ATTENDUS	CUMUL (depuis le début jusqu'à la période)	% réalisation
Output 3: Community-based organizations (CBOs) in pilot sites actively and effectively involved in the sustainable use and management of living marine and coastal resources, by the end of the year 2011.	Number of existing CBOs assessed.	4	4	100,0%
	Number of CBOs created and revitalized.	4	4	100,0%
	Training needs of each CBO assessed.	4	6	150,0%
	Training of each CBO undertaken.	6	13	216,7%
	Participation of CBOs in drafting the management plan.	4	4	100,0%
	Number of offence caught and treated	15	15	100,0%
	Functional CBOs by the end of year 2011.	4	0	0,0%
	3 fundable project proposals submitted.	3	7	233,3%
	4 CBOs implementing participatory monitoring systems for different fisheries resources.	4	4	100,0%
AVERAGE OUTPUT 3				122,2%
Output 4: Small-scale alternative livelihoods activities creating positive socio-economic impacts in pilot sites, by the end of the year 2011.	Assessment of existing income generating activities in pilot sites	1	1	100,0%
	New income generating activities set up in pilot sites (ecotourism, sea cucumber farming, crafts selling) through Public Private Partnership	3	0	0,0%
AVERAGE OUTPUT 4				50,0%
AVERAGE PROJECT				98,5%

5.9 Annexe 10 : Short biographies of the evaluators

Lala RANAIVOMANANA, PhD (46 ans)

ETUDES SUPERIEURES

- ✓ Doctorat halieutique de l'ENSAR France (2006)
- ✓ MSc.Gestion des ressources marines UQAR Québec (1994) :
- ✓ Ingéniorat Halieutique IHSM Toliara (1991)
- ✓ Ingéniorat des Eaux et Forêts ESSA Antananarivo (1988)
- ✓ Certificat en Analyses prospectives Min Plan Antananarivo (2006)
- ✓ Certificat en Management Stratégique CIMAP/ ESC Lille (2000) :
- ✓ Certificat en Systèmes d'évaluation de projet ILI Washington, DC (1999) :

EXPERIENCES PROFESSIONNELLES

- ✓ depuis 2008 : Maître de conférences IHSM Toliara (Gestion de Projet –et- GIZC)
- ✓ 2004 à 2011 : Directeur de l'Administration et de la Planification ONE Antananarivo
- ✓ 2002 à 2004 : Coordinateur Technique du PE2 à l'ONE Antananarivo
- ✓ 1999 à 2001 : Chef de Cellule Programmation et Suivi-Evaluation à l'ONE Antananarivo
- ✓ 1997 à 1998 : Cadre d'études Cellule Technique d'Appui ONE Toliara
- ✓ 1994 à 1997 : Directeur Adjoint du PCDI Marojejy WWF Andapa

ETUDES

- ✓ Conception da méthodologie de l'élaboration du Schéma Régional d'Aménagement du Territoire de la Région Anosy. MultiSector Information Service 2011.
- ✓ Développement des plans de gestion locale des pêches et des plans de suivi. Projet WWF MG0910.01 « Gestion des Ressources Naturelles Marines au sud de Toliara ». 2011.
- ✓ Etude de la répartition des valeurs ajoutées au niveau de la filière de la pêche traditionnelle et artisanale dans la zone Sud de Toliara pour la Région Atsimo Andrefana. Projet WWF MG0910.01. 2011
- ✓ Développement d'une base de données sur la biodiversité marine et côtière, et la pêche traditionnelle pour la Région Atsimo Andrefana. Projet WWF MG0910.01 . 2011
- ✓ Elaboration du Schéma Global d'Aménagement de la future AMP de Salary. Projet WWF MG 0925.01 - 2010
- ✓ Assesseur du Regional Programme for the Sustainable Management of Coastal Zones of the countries of the Indian Ocean (ReCoMaP/ProGeCo) AM2. 2009
- ✓ Rédaction rapport d'Analyse diagnostic marin et socio-économiques Projet WWF MG0885 (Toliara Coral Reef Conservation Project). 2008
- ✓ Assesseur du Regional Programme for the Sustainable Management of Coastal Zones of the countries of the Indian Ocean (ReCoMaP/ProGeCo) AM1. 2008
- ✓ Evalueateur Fiscal Agent Millenium Challenge Account. 2007

PUBLICATIONS PERTINENTES

RANAIVOMANANA L., MAHAFINA J., FERRARIS J. , RALIJAONA C. & CHABANET P., 2010
Gouvernance des ressources halieutiques : cas des réserves marines temporaires dans le Sud Ouest de Madagascar (attente publication VertigO)

RANAIVOMANANA L, 2010 : L'Etude d'impact environnemental et la gouvernance des Aires Marines Protégées. Acte du Colloque internationale sur L'évaluation environnementale pour la gestion des ressources naturelles, Antananarivo (à paraître)

MAHAFINA J., RANAIVOMANANA L., CHABANET P., RALIJAONA C., & FERRARIS J., 2010 :
Acceptability and adaptability of the fishermen communities to the Marine Protected Areas in South West of Madagascar. WSFC Bangkok.

RANAIVOMANANA, FONTENELLE, RABENEVANANA, 2009: What conditions for coastal communities to appropriate ICZM approaches: Great Reef lagoon of Toliara, Madagascar?" Communication orale et poster présentés à la 6^e conférence du WIOMSA, La Réunion du 23 au 28 Août 2009

RANAIVOMANANA, 2007 : Integrated management of the ecosystems: case of the Toliara's large reef. Challenges of Natural Resource Economics & Policy. 2nd National Forum on Socioeconomic Research in Coastal Systems

RANAIVOMANANA, 2006: Les conditions d'appropriation par la population d'une gestion durable des ressources naturelles et des écosystèmes, cas du Grand Récif de Toliara. Thèse de doctorat halieutique en cotutelle École Nationale Supérieure Agronomique de Rennes et de l'Institut Halieutique et des Sciences Marines de Toliara.

RANAIVOMANANA, MANWAI RABENEVANANA, 2004: Integration of aboriginal knowledge by means of identification of ecosystem indicators in view of cooperative appropriation of Integrated Coastal Zone Management. International Symposium on Quantitative Ecosystem Indicators for Fisheries Management, avril 2004, UNESCO, Paris.

Annex - Achievement Rating Scale

1 = fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings

2 = largely achieved, despite a few short-comings

3 = only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced

4 = very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings

5 = not achieved

Objective Statement	Achievement Rating for year being assessed	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Progress against the Indicators	Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts
<p>Purpose (state below, then rate and comment)</p>	1			<p>Bio ecological impact : The production average has increased for octopus (11.1 kg/day/fishermen vs. 3.4 kg in 2009), for squid (7.2 kg vs. 2.7 kg), for lobsters (10.4 kg vs. 0.9 kg), for sea cucumbers (13.2 kg vs. 9.4 kg) and for fish (10.3 kg vs. 8.5 kg).</p> <p>Socio economic impact This is shown by the building of new concrete housings (average of five in Ambohibola, Itampolo and Beheloke) and the acquisition of household devices and appliances.</p>	<p>The project durability is fairly uncertain because of some unrealized activities :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An institutionalized Communities Management Plan The officialization of Rodobey which ensure in the long terms the mobilization of the actors toward the implementation of a sustainable marines resources management in the region. - The development of income generating activities which allows to reduce the fishing-effort and the pressures on the marine resources. This is an important condition facilitating the maintenance of the enforcement of established local management rules

Objective Statement	Achievement Rating for year being assessed	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Progress against the Indicators	Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts
Outputs					
A communication system between the key stakeholders is in place and made operational.	2	16 reports 16 feedback Plateforme Rodobey institutionalised Operational Bdd		54 reports have been developed from CBOs, 9 feedbacks from DRPRH and/or authorities Statute Rodobe unrealized <i>Bdd developed but not operational</i>	First, there were the difficulties with the revitalization of Rodobey because of problems with institutional anchorage. Second, there was non-functioning of the fisheries and marine biodiversity database in the South West which had a fundamental role in helping people understand the state of marine resources management and thus each actor's sensitivity.
An enabling environment for the sustainable management of traditional fisheries is established and improved in pilot sites	2	4 sites pilotes 4 dina 4 Community Management Plans		7 CBOs use "dina" as management tool 4 Locally adapted management plans for marine living resources drafted	The institutionalization of the local convention (dina) allowed the local communities to position themselves in the decentralized decision-making process. Effectively, local conventions based in the local cultures (traditional) have been approved and recognized by all relevant hierarchies, Tribunal, Local and Regional Authorities, and the Regional fisheries Administration.
Community-based organizations (CBOs) in	1	4 CBOs fonctionnal		the level of the communities' participation in marine resources	The incompleteness of the institutionalization of the community's

Objective Statement	Achievement Rating for year being assessed	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Progress against the Indicators	Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts
pilot sites actively and effectively involved in the sustainable use and management of living marine and coastal resource				management receives the highest grade of 5 on the co-management scale established by Berkes (1994).	fisheries management plan constitutes an obstacle in the setting of a real marine resources co-management,
Small-scale alternative livelihoods activities creating positive socio-economic impacts in pilot sites	4	3 new income generating activities		The 3 expected new income generating activities (ecotourism, sea cucumber farming, crafts selling) through Public Private Partnership had been anticipated but that none have actually been implemented.	The project strategy didn't anticipate any financing mechanism in support of new activities. However, partnerships with other actors are starting to show signs of success such as shown in section c above.
Activities	Realisation : 94% Décaissement : 98,44%				