



"Reconciling the sustainable management of Madagascar's New Protected Areas with poverty reduction"

The sustainable management of Madagascar's natural richness has been at the heart of a national priority even since the time of the Royalty. Indeed, during the reign of Ranavalona II, the code of 305 articles emerged, from its articles 91 to 106, the abusive use of forest resources was already reprehensible [1]. The management of natural resources took a different turn after the colonization of the country. This period was marked by the extraction of resources to meet the needs of the colonizers. Strict national reserves and national parks excluding communities from any access to resources were set aside by the colonizers [2]. After the country gained its independence, several national conservation programs and projects were influenced by the trend in the international arena for governance of biodiversity [3]. Included in the list of mega-diverse countries recognized for their biological richness and diversity, Madagascar is the 9th country in the world to receive the most international aid funds for conservation with more than one hundred million dollars invested in more than 500 environmental projects [4], [5].

In 2003, the World Parks Congress reinforced the discourse on the sustainable management of protected areas. The slogan following this congress is that local communities and indigenous populations should not be placed in a precarious situation as a result of conservation actions [6]. During this congress, Madagascar expressed its desire to combine the sustainable management of natural ecosystems with poverty reduction, with the ambition of starting from 1.7 million ha of protected areas to 6 million ha through the establishment of Madagascar's protected area system (SAPM) [7]. Several actors joined the SAPM commission to make this ambition a reality by developing framework documents and manuals to achieve this objective [8]. This Durban vision has led to the establishment of 80 New Areas Protected (NAP); and in 2020, the country accounts for more than 140 AP.

The achievement of the objective of PAs' sustainable management and poverty reduction remains controversial in Madagascar. For decades, the use of natural resources has been the basis of the economy of communities near areas currently promulgated as PA [9]. Often the management rules imposed by PAs are in opposition with the customary use of these resources, such as deforestation for agricultural and / or energy purposes [10], [11]. Establishing sustainable management thus becomes complex following this heavy dependence on protected resources combined with a worrying precarious situation of these local communities affected by PAs.

Due to this situation, PAs generate socio-economic impacts that are costly to local communities [12]. Recognizing this strong dependence of local communities on these resources managed in PAs, a policy, strategy and practice of social safeguard materialized during the establishment of the NAPs. Several framework documents have been drawn up in order to harmonize the operationalization of this social safeguard policy with the requirement that all PAs must have a reference management tool in terms of social safeguard. This tool is

an imperative requirement for the PA to access an environmental permit. It is known as the environmental management and social safeguard plan (PGESS) or the social and environmental safeguard plan (PSSE).

Several studies have shown that the application of the social protection policy comes up against several limits. The identification of PAP or Population Affected by the PA Project turns out to be biased by elite captures where the most vulnerable households are not identified [13]. The costs of the use restrictions imposed by the PA borne by local households are substantial and are offset by social safeguard measures perceived as a short-term and / or one-off approach [12].

Following these results, this project entitled "Reconciling the New Protected Areas (NAP) of Madagascar with poverty reduction: good practices and new approaches" capitalized on the achievements of previous studies to guide a participatory review of the policy, strategy and practice of social safeguard of PAs. This review has three main objectives:

- Identify gaps and / or inconsistencies between PA social safeguard policy, strategies and practice
- Share good practices and new approaches in social safeguard
- Consolidate political, strategic and practical recommendations on social protection in PAs

Reaching the end of a participatory research of the PAs safeguard policy, strategy and practice, our project in collaboration with several key actors of conservation will lead a national workshop of sharing and inter-institutional dialogue addressing various themes on social safeguard in the PAs. A workshop that will take place on 08 and 09 October 2020 at the SOANALA MEDD Ambatobe-PAGE / GIZ Office.

The national workshop is an opportunity to shed light on key reforms for a better practice of social safeguard in PAs. In order to re-discuss with conservation stakeholders, the recommendations that emerged from our research, several interactive sessions will be set up throughout the workshop to consolidate and finalize the new approaches.

For sanitary reasons, participation can only be done by invitation. However, some sessions will be broadcast live on the "ESSA Eaux et Forêts" facebook page (<https://web.facebook.com/ESSAForestry>).

However, if you want to participate online through Microsoft Teams / Zoom for the two days, please send an email to alexandra.rasoamanana@gmail.com.



"Workshop program: Consolidate the results and recommendations of the participatory review of the PAs safeguard policy, strategy and practice of social safeguard"

For the two days of the workshop, three themes will be addressed in order to highlight the state of knowledge on social safeguard policy in the Madagascar's PAs and to define the new approaches to be initiated to reconcile the sustainable management of PAs with poverty reduction:

- Theme 1: Social safeguard in PAs

The concept of social safeguard in PAs was established during the implementation of the Durban vision. The majority of PAs that have been established to achieve this vision are now reaching the end of their first five-year management contract. Our project carried out a participatory analysis of the application of the social safeguard policy of the NAPs and identified key reform elements for a better practice of social safeguard in the PAs.

This theme will give a better understanding of the concept of social safeguard in PAs with a general overview which will be given by ONE; followed by the presentation of the key results of the project with its recommendations, which will be discussed again during an inter-institutional dialogue through a debate between the Minister of the Environment and Sustainable Development with the various non-state actors playing a key role in the management of PAs.

	SESSION TITLE	SPEAKERS
SESSION 1.1	Presentation series: Protected areas in Madagascar and the social safeguard policy	DAPRNE and ONE
SESSION 1.2	Presentation series: Participatory review of social safeguard policy, strategy and practice	ESSA-Forêt/Bangor University
SESSION 1.3	Inter-institutional debate: Obligations of protected areas in terms of social protection, poverty reduction and sustainable development: What, How and Who?	Madame the Minister of MEDD, Madagasikara Voakajy, World Wide Fund-Madagascar, TAFO MIHAAVO

- Theme 2: Conservation and sustainable development: why, how and challenges?

In order to complete the discussion of this first theme, the challenges of conservation in terms of social safeguard, poverty reduction and sustainable development will be addressed over two sessions.

	SESSION TITLE	SPEAKERS
SESSION 2.1	Inter-institutional debate: Challenges for PAs in terms of social safeguard, poverty reduction and sustainable development: What, How and Who?	Madam the Minister of MEDD, Sir the Minister of MAEP TAFO MIHAAVO, FORUM LAFA, FAPBM, FNF
SESSION 2.2	Presentation: The national strategy for conservation and sustainable development: What, How and Who?	MEDD

- **Theme 3: Best practices and new approaches to social safeguard in PAs**

Following our review, several best practices were identified in the application of the social safeguard policy. Various PAs NGO managers / promoters will present their experience to highlight the DOS and DON'TS in terms of social safeguard. 4 series of best practices presentations will be conducted by the PAs promoters / managers.

	SESSION TITLE	SPEAKERS
SESSION 3.1	Presentation Series: Best practices in social safeguard PAs	GERP, WWF, ESSA Forêt, CI
SESSION 3.2	Presentation: New approaches to social safeguard in PAs	ESSA Forêt/ Bangor University

- [1] E. P. Thébault, *Code des 305 articles: promulgué par la Reine Ranavalona II, le 29 mars 1881 : texte malgache intégral, avec traduction française et notes bibliographiques*, Imprimerie. 1960.
- [2] I. R. Scales, "Farming at the forest frontier: Land use and landscape change in western Madagascar, 1896-2005," *Environ. Hist. Camb.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 499–524, 2011.
- [3] C. Corson, "A history of conservation politics in Madagascar," *Madagascar Conserv. Dev.*, vol. 1, no. 01, pp. 49–60, 2017.
- [4] D. C. Miller, A. Agrawal, and J. T. Roberts, "Biodiversity, Governance, and the Allocation of International Aid for Conservation," *Conserv. Lett.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 12–20, 2013.
- [5] P. O. Waeber, L. Wilmé, J. R. Mercier, C. Camara, and P. P. Lowry, "How effective have thirty years of internationally driven conservation and development efforts been in Madagascar?," *PLoS One*, vol. 11, no. 8, pp. 1–14, 2016.
- [6] D. Roe, "The origins and evolution of the conservation-poverty debate: a review of key literature, events and policy processes," *Oryx*, vol. 42, no. 04, p. 491, 2008.
- [7] des F. et du T. Ministère de l'Environnement, "Rapport Final Manuel De Procedure De Creation Des Aires Protegees Terrestres Du Systeme D ' Aires Protegees De Madagascar (Sapm)," 2008.
- [8] REPOBLIKAN'I MADAGASIKARA, *Arrêté Interministériel n°_____2008/MEEFT/MAEP/MEM portant création, organisation et fonctionnement de la Commission SAPM*. 2008.
- [9] C. J. Gardner *et al.*, "The rapid expansion of Madagascar's protected area system," *Biol. Conserv.*, vol. 220, no. February, pp. 29–36, 2018.
- [10] A. N. Gardner, C.J.; Ferguson, Barry; Rebara, F.; Ratsifandrihamanana, "Integrating traditional values and management regimes into Madagascar's expanded protected area system: the case of Ankodida," *J. Chem. Inf. Model.*, vol. 53, no. 9, pp. 92–103, 2008.
- [11] L. C. Ratsimbazafy, K. Harada, and M. Yamamura, "Forest conservation and livelihood conflict in REDD : A case study from the corridor Ankeniheny Zahamena," vol. 3, no. November 2011, pp. 618–630, 2012.
- [12] M. Poudyal, O. S. Rakotonarivo, P. G. Jones, R. Mandimbinaina, A. Rasoamanana, and N. S. Andrianantenaina, "Who bears the cost of forest conservation ?," pp. 1–35, 2017.

- [13] M. Poudyal *et al.*, “Can REDD+ social safeguards reach the ‘right’ people? Lessons from Madagascar,” *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, vol. 37, pp. 31–42, 2016.