



PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)

for the project:

Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity in the Northwestern Landscape (Boeny Region) – Madagascar

FY21

July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021

Directorate of Protected Areas, Renewable Natural Resources and Ecosystems (DAPRNE)
Madagascar Biodiversity Fund (FAPBM)
Directorate of Research Promotion and Integration of the Sustainable Development Approach,
CI-Madagascar



Project Information			
Project Title:	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity in the Northwestern Landscape (Boeny Region) – Madagascar		
Country(ies):	Madagascar	GEF ID:	9606
GEF Agency(ies):	Conservation International	Duration in Months:	47
Executing Agency(ies):	Directorate of Protected Areas, Renewable Natural Resources and Ecosystems (DAPRNE), Madagascar Biodiversity Fund (FAPBM), Directorate of Research Promotion and Integration of the Sustainable Development Approach and CI-Madagascar	Actual Implementation Start Date:	06/10/2019
GEF Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity	Expected Project Completion Date:	6/30/2022 NCE: 05/31/2023
GEF Grant Amount:	\$6,817,431	Expected Financial Closure Date:	11/30/2023
Expected Co-financing:	\$9,719,868	Date of Last Steering Committee Meeting:	10/27/2020
Co-financing Realized as of June 30, 2021:	\$7,021,520	Mid-Term Review-Planned Date:	01/15/2021
Date of First Disbursement:	06/10/2019	Mid-Term Review-Actual Date:	09/01/2021
Cumulative disbursement as of June 30, 2021:	\$5,287,887	Terminal Evaluation-Planned Date:	02/01/2023
PIR Prepared by:	Michele Andrianarisata	Terminal Evaluation-Actual Date:	TBD
CI-GEF Project Manager:	Orissa Samaroo	CI-GEF Finance Lead:	Elizabeth Mast

The CI-GEF Project Agency Project Implementation Report (PIR) is composed of six sections:

- Section I: Project Implementation Progress Status Summary:** provides a brief summary of the project as well as the implementation status and rating of the previous and current fiscal years;
- Section II: Project Results Implementation Progress Status and Rating:** describes the progress made towards achieving the project objective and outcomes, the implementation rating of the project, as well as recommendations to improve the project performance, when needed;
- Section III: Project Risks Status and Rating:** describes the progress made towards managing and mitigating project risks, the project risks mitigation rating reassessment as needed, as well as recommendations to improve the management of project risks;
- Section IV: Project Environmental and Social Safeguards Implementation Status and Rating:** describes the progress made towards complying with the Environmental & Social Safeguards and the Plans prepared during the PPG phase, the safeguard plans implementation rating, as well as recommendations to improve the project safeguards;
- Section V: Project Implementation Experiences and Lessons Learned:** describes the experiences learned by the project managers and the lessons learned through the process of implementing the project; and

SECTION I: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS SUMMARY

PROJECT SUMMARY

The Boeny region of Northwestern Madagascar is crucial for biodiversity and under intense threat, mainly in the form of habitat loss. Land conversion for subsistence agriculture, fires, and forest removal for charcoal production remain the greatest threats.

To address these threats, the project's first component will strengthen the management of the 5 Protected Areas (PAs) in the region that together cover 588,494 hectares or 20% of the region's territory. Between (estimated) May 2019 to May 2022, the project is expected to contribute to improving the PAs management effectiveness and increase collaboration and knowledge exchange between PA managers within the region.

The financial sustainability of PAs is low, and currently, there are very limited long-term funding opportunities for the 5 PAs in Boeny. However, over recent years the Madagascar Biodiversity Foundation (Fondation pour les Aires Protégées et la Biodiversité de Madagascar, FAPBM) has been investing an average of USD 195,000 per year to the PAs in the region. As part of the project, an additional USD 4.5M contribution to FAPBM's Trust Fund capital is proposed that will be specifically earmarked for the Boeny PAs. An estimated USD 137,000 annually generated from interest on USD 4.5M, will contribute to the recurring costs of the PAs in addition to FAPBM's current contributions.

The second component of the project will focus on ensuring that the PAs play a role in supporting the SRAT (Schéma Régional d'Aménagement du Territoire) and SAC (Schema Communale d'Aménagement) by encouraging sustainable production by local communities around the targeted PAs. Over the project's life, 2600 beneficiaries (from an estimated 2000 households) will be supported, and 500 hectares of habitats outside of PAs are expected to be managed using sustainable production practices.

PRIOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS

During year 1, the project established the Project Management Unit (PMU), completed the hiring of all required staff, and set the foundation for project implementation in year 2. The team that constitutes the PMU was in place by October 2019: The Project National Director, the Technical Coordinator, the M&E Manager, the Livelihood Manager, the Grants, and Contract Manager, and the Financial Manager.

The first meeting of the Steering Committee was held in Mahajanga on December 19, 2019. The Steering Committee is chaired by the Secretary General of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD).

The following agreements were signed: IDENTI'TERRE on March 11, 2020, ASITY Madagascar on March 17, 2020, the Development and Environmental Law Center Mizana Maitso (DELIC) on March 19, 2020, the Madagascar National Parks on March 26, 2020, and with DIREDD on May 27, 2020.

Most of the activities planned in Q2 and Q3 were delayed because the first meeting of the steering committee to validate the workplan and budget for year one for each protected area was in December 2019.

While there were delays in signing the grant agreements with all 5 protected areas and DIREED, the project has made progress since April 2020.

Component 1: The protected area managers started activities according to their workplans. These activities include: ecological monitoring, fire breaks/firefighting, patrols with communities, rangers and "mixed brigades" (police/gendarme, forestry agents, local community representatives), forest restoration, communication and awareness-raising, park delimitation, and maintenance of existing park boundary markers, and support of the governance structure of the protected areas.

Component 2: Partners started activities based on the approved workplans. These activities include the promotion of income-generating activities, including beekeeping, market gardening culture, rice production, restoration, and enhancing the value of raphia forests, salt, fisheries, bovine, and poultry breeding sectors. In addition, TORs were published to conduct the value chain analysis for priority sectors in the Boeny region, including the silk sector.

Concerning the impact of COVID-19, project staff from the capital were unable to travel to the Boeny Region due to COVID-19 restrictions from March 2020 until August 2020. The project conducted mandatory training (financial and monitoring evaluation) for our grantees at the beginning of April through Teams. Meetings with each grantee (representatives working in Antananarivo and the field) were organized the week of May 11 and May 18 to discuss M&E tools, datasheets, guide to monitor project activities, and to discuss implementation challenges encountered by each grantee.

Concerning the implementation of safeguards, the Accountability and Grievance Mechanism (AGM) documents, including the signage, were validated by the Project Management Unit and ready for printing. Local contacts for the AGM at each protected area and in each government executing agency were nominated. The project will continue to progress with implementing the safeguard plans during year 2.

CURRENT PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS (FY21)

In year 2, changes took place in the Project Management Unit. The new Grants and Contract Manager was recruited in May 2020. The Procurement Manager resigned in October 2020, and his successor has already been recruited. The second meeting of the Steering Committee was held in Mahajanga on October 27, 2020.

Component 1: In FY21, protected area managers started activities according to their approved workplans for year 2. These activities include ecological monitoring, fire breaks/firefighting, patrols with communities, rangers and “mixed brigades” (police/gendarme, forestry agents, local community representatives), forest restoration, communication and awareness-raising, park delimitation, and maintenance of existing park boundary markers, monitor of the management plan implementation and activities within each PA, Monitor PA managers (assessment of adherence to terms of PA delegation contracts). While there were delays in signing the grant agreements with DAPRNE et DPRIDD, which has been further delayed due to the lack of functional bank accounts, activities of the six grantees have progressed well since July 2020.

The signing of the grant agreement between CI and the Madagascar Biodiversity Fund was on November 24, 2020, and FAPBM received the cash transfer on December 18, 2020. After receiving the capital, the FAPBM invested USD 4.5 million units in the Lombard Odier Money Markets Fund.

Component 2: In FY21, partners have started activities based on the approved workplans. These activities include the promotion of income-generating activities, including beekeeping, market gardening culture, rice production, restoration, and enhancing the value of raphia forests, green charcoal production, development of tourism, and the development of value chain of sustainable products such as Raphia, beekeeping, salt, fisheries, bovine, and poultry breeding sectors.

CI recruited the Association Leadership for Local Development (ALLD) to conduct additional studies in the charcoal, honey, and raffia value chain. The purchase of the materials as In-Kind Grants for the grantees started in January 2021.

The PMU team conducted capacity building activities on monitoring and evaluation tools, finance management, Accountability and Grievance Mechanism for our grantees and supervision missions in the PA of Antrema and CMK. Supervision missions and support for the use of monitoring and planning tools were carried out by Livelihood Manager in the PAs of Ankarafantsika and Bombetoka in October 2020 and CMK and Antrema in November 2020.

Safeguards: A training on AGM was organized in October 2020. Posters on AGM were distributed to implementing partners for sensitization of beneficiaries in the field.

Impact of COVID-19: Travel restrictions have prevented the supervision of activities of the protected area managers. In addition, the training on PA legislation, SMART monitoring, and the application of METT were all delayed due to COVID-19 restrictions.

SUMMARY: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS

PROJECT PART	PRIOR FY20 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	CURRENT FY21 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING ¹	RATING TREND ²
OBJECTIVE	S	S	Unchanged
COMPONENTS AND OUTCOMES	S	S	Unchanged
ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS	MS	S	Increasing

PROJECT RISK RATING³

RISKS	H	H	Unchanged
-------	---	---	-----------

¹ **Implementation Progress (IP) Rating:** Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more details about IP rating, please see the Appendix I of this report

² **Rating trend:** Improving, Unchanged, or Decreasing

³ **Risk Rating:** Low (L), Moderate (M), Substantial (S), High (H)

SECTION II: PROJECT RESULTS IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS AND RATING

This section describes the progress made towards achieving the project objective and outcomes, the implementation progress rating of the project, as well as recommendations to improve the project performance. This section is composed four parts:

- a. Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Objective: this section measures the likelihood of achieving the objective of the project
- b. Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Outcomes (by project component)
- c. Overall Project Results Progress Rating, and
- d. Recommendations for improvement

a. Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Objective:

This section of the report assesses the progress in achieving the objective of the project.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE:	To strengthen the long-term conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the northwestern landscape of Madagascar
---------------------------	--

OBJECTIVE INDICATORS	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁴	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
Indicator a: Number of hectares protected within the national protected area system (SAPM) in the northwestern landscape of Madagascar (588,494 ha)	516,551 ha	IS	<p>While the five protected areas (588,494 ha) are now within the national protected area system, the development of the Management Plan and the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) of the Bombetoka (71,943 ha) are in the process of being finalized. The validation of the documents at the regional and national levels will be completed by Q1 FY22.</p> <p>The completion of these documents is needed to finalize the protected area status of Bombetoka (to secure the decree of definitive creation). Once these documents are completed/formally approved, the project will achieve Objective Indicator a.</p>
Indicator b: Number of protected areas in the northwestern landscape that improve their management effectiveness (5)	5 Protected Areas	IS	The training of the protected area managers on the application of METT was delayed due to the closing of the Boeny region and the restriction of travel because of COVID-19 in Madagascar.

⁴ **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

OBJECTIVE INDICATORS	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁴	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
			<p>The METT scores of the 5 targeted PAs obtained annually serve as a key indicator to measure the results of Component 1 of the project. In order to consolidate the METT scores achieved by PAs, a coordination workshop for the 2020 annual METT evaluation was organized on May 18, 2021, with the participation of the managers of the five targeted PAs and the DAPRNE.</p> <p>The main purposes of the workshop were to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Present the report and methodology of the METT assessment of each PA for the year 2020. - Present the information entered into the METT tool with the stakeholders and the DAPRNE team; - Collect the difficulties encountered and the recommendations necessary for the next evaluation exercise. <p>FY21 METT Scores: Baie de Baly: 79% Bombetoka: 58% Antrema : 87% Complexe Mahavavy Kinkony : 76% Ankarafantsika : 79%</p> <p>Comparing management effectiveness in FY21 with the baseline, it was found that the scores have improved.</p>
Indicator c. Number of protected areas in the northwestern landscape with improved financial sustainability (5)	0	IS	<p>The signature of the grant agreement between CI and the Madagascar Biodiversity Fund was received on November 24, 2020. FAPBM received the cash transfer in December 18, 2020. After receiving the capital, the FAPBM invested the USD 4.5 million in the Lombard Odier Money Markets Fund (ISIN CH011101295).</p>

OBJECTIVE INDICATORS	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁴	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
			The income generated from the USD 4.5 million will be the subject of a financing agreement for the year 2023.
Indicator d: a Number (and percentage) of regional and local development plans that include the target protected areas and are consistent with their objectives (1 SRAT and 22 Schema d’Amenagement Communaux (SACs))	22 out 24 SACs (92%) and 1 SRAT for the Boeny Region	IS	<p>The Boeny Regional Development Plan (2019-2029) was validated in 2019. This plan breaks down the Boeny Regional Spatial Planning Scheme (2016/2017) (SRAT) into concrete activities for the next 10 years.</p> <p>Several activities of the Protected Areas funded by GEF- 6 contribute to the strategic axes and activities of the PRD and SACs.</p> <p>In addition, the PAGs of the PAs are consistent with the BOENY SRAT and consider the SACs of the communes bordering the protected areas, especially in terms of zoning and strategic axes for biodiversity conservation and economic development.</p>
Indicator e: Number of households directly benefitting from sustainable production initiatives linked to the target protected areas (2000)	829 households	D	<p>According to the planning for year 2, 1460 households were expected to benefit directly from sustainable production initiatives. During year 1 and 2 (July 2019 - June 2021), the partners were able to support 829 households, i.e. 41 % of the project target of 2000. These 829 beneficiary households are composed of 546 men and 283 women.</p> <p>We will prepare a plan with each protected area manager at the beginning of FY22 to ensure that the targets for the number of households are met. For the income-generating activities, households benefited from green charcoal production, the craft and beekeeping project, tourism, cattle rearing, poultry farming, salt sector, market gardening, and an improved rice-growing system.</p>

OBJECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION
S	The project has been assigned a Satisfactory (S) rating for the FY21 IP rating. Despite delays due to COVID-19, the project has made progress in key areas: 1) almost achieving the number of hectares protected within the protected area system 2) achieving a 92% outcome for the local/regional development plans that include the targeted PAs, and training 829/2000 households. It is also expected that all five (5) of the protected areas have improved their management effectiveness. In terms of the five (5) protected areas achieving improved financial sustainability, USD 4.5M was transferred to the FAPBM, which was then invested.

b. Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Outcomes (by project component).

This part of the report assesses the progress towards achieving the outcomes of the project.

COMPONENT 1	Strengthening the management and the sustainable financing of five protected areas (PAs) to reduce the threats on natural resources and to contribute to the resiliency of the North-western Landscape (Boeny region)
Outcome 1.1:	Increased management effectiveness of 5 targeted PAs of the Northwestern Landscape
Outcome 1.2:	Improved financial sustainability of 5 targeted PAs

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁵	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
Outcome indicator 1.1.: METT scores of the 5 targeted PAs, covering about 588,494 ha	15% increase of the average METT score for the 5 targeted PAs	Baie de Baly: 79% Bombetoka: 58% Antrema : 87% Complexe Mahavavy Kinkony : 76.47% Ankarafantsika : 79.17%	IS	Protected area managers have used the same tools to assess PA management effectiveness. The assessment is done in relation to the context of status, threats/planning/inputs, what is needed/the process, how the management is organized, and finally, the results. The evaluation takes place towards the end of each year, i.e. in December, in the presence of the members of the Orientation and Monitoring Committee of each PA. Looking at the results obtained in December 2020, we have noted an improvement in the management effectiveness of each PA compared to the baseline, particularly that of Bombetoka. This improvement is due to the implementation of conservation and patrol activities within the new Protected Area. The Bombetoka Management Plan, as well as the Environmental and Social Safeguarding Management Plan, are currently being validated.

^{5 5} **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁵	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
				<p>Baseline</p> <p>Baie de Baly: 78% Bombetoka: 20% Antrema: 77% Complexe Mahavavy-Kinkony: 52% Ankarafantsika: 67%</p>
<p>Outcome indicator 1.2.: Amount of long-term financing available annually for the 5 targeted PAs</p>	<p>USD 137,000 additional funding available annually for the 5 targeted PAs</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>IS</p>	<p>The signature of the grant agreement between CI and the Madagascar Biodiversity Fund was received on November 24, 2020. FAPBM received the cash transfer in December 18, 2020. After receiving the capital, the FAPBM invested the USD 4.5 million in the Lombard Odier Money Markets Fund (ISIN CH011101295).</p> <p>The income generated from the USD 4.5 million, estimated at approximately USD 137,000 per year, will be the subject of a financing agreement for the year 2023. This funding will be in addition to the existing allocation from the FAPBM. Thereafter, the level of funding available at perpetuity for the PAs recurrent costs will increase from USD 195,000 to USD 332,000 per year.</p>
<p>Outcome indicator 1.2.: Financing gap (expressed as % of total need defined in management plans) of the 5 targeted PAs during 2022- 2025</p>	<p>Financing gap for 2022-2025 reduced to 25 % of total need as defined in management plans</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>IS</p>	<p>There are 3 funding requests that will be submitted to potential donors. A consultation workshop to identify the needs of each protected area manager was held in December 2018. In July 2019, a workshop to compare the needs of the PA managers with their domain of intervention was held with the participation of the PA managers, the Organisme de Coordination et de Suivi des Investissements et de leurs Financings (OCSIF), the development projects (CASEF, MINAE, DEFIS), and the FAPBM.</p> <p>Field visits were planned for the year 2020, but due to the COVID-19 health crisis, we were unable to carry them out.</p> <p>In 2021, to revitalize the activity, the FAPBM contacted the OCSIF, and they are waiting for the next steps because a restructuring has been carried out within this organization.</p>

COMPONENT 1 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING		RATING TREND
S	A Satisfactory (S) rating has been assigned for Component 1. There has been progress in 2 out of the 3 outcome indicators. Notably, there has been an improvement in the management effectiveness score of the 5 protected areas, and the USD 4.5 million funding to FAPBM was transferred, which would allow investment income to be generated on the capital. In terms of reducing the financing gap to 25% of total need, the project plans on submitting 3 funding requests to potential donors. This submission was delayed due to COVID-19.	Unchanged

COMPONENT 2 Supporting sustainable production by local communities around targeted PAs to strengthen PA protection efforts and improve community wellbeing

Outcome 2.1: Key local communities around targeted PAs have adopted sustainable production practices

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁶	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
Outcome indicator 2.1.: % of households self-reporting as food insecure	2.1.1: 20% reduction in the number of households reporting that they are food insecure	0	IS	<p>Beneficiaries per PA have already been identified with the PA managers. The project baseline was 72% of households, self-reporting as food insecure. The indicator will be collected during the household survey and carried out at the midterm of project implementation.</p> <p>For year 2, activities related to the indicator have started for the 5 protected areas such as:</p> <p>Promote Income-generating activities Theoretical and practical training for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intensive rice cultivation (SRA) - Market gardening - the monitoring/ distribution of materials/accompaniment of beneficiaries - Beekeeping <p>Rice cultivation: construction of dams in Ambanjabe, Ampambabe, Andolonomy and Madirobe</p>

⁶ **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁶	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Raphia: Theoretical and practical training, diversify products, distribution materials, restoration campaigns, and exchange visits - Theoretical training on the valorization of raffia fibers - Eucalyptus reforestation sub-project, planting of bamboo, jujube and cashew trees <p>Value chains of sustainable products</p> <p><u>Fisheries</u>: Management transfers in the blue belt of NAP Antrema: Three VOI are created including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the VOI Antrema - VOI Ambanjabe, - VOI Ampampamena <p>Freezers and the solar kit were already purchased. Formalization of fishermen, equipment allocation, and fry provisioning.</p> <p><u>Poultry farming</u>: Donation and support to poultry farmers</p> <p><u>Cattle rearing</u>: Purchase of bovine genitors, support of cattle breeder.</p> <p><u>Salt</u>: Continuation of salt production by the salt workers, rehabilitation of the salt production basin, and more than 5 tons of fleur de sel reached.</p> <p><u>Bombetoka</u>: Value chain study to improve the marketing of their product and make it their main income-generating activity.</p>
Outcome Indicator 2.2.: Number of months that households are food insecure Indicator	2.1.2: Median number of months households are food insecure is reduced to 3 months	0	NS	The baseline for the median number of months households is food insecure is 4 months. The indicator will be collected during the household survey to be carried out in the midterm of project implementation.
Outcome indicator 2.3.: a) % increase in household income of the local participating communities	2.1.3: 15% increase in average annual household income for participants in	0	IS	The project has not yet measured whether there is a change in household income, as this measurement will be collected from the household surveys at the midterm and end of the project. However, the project has started implementing activities that will lead to an increase in income (activities detailed under Outcome Indicator 2.1.

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁶	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
	sustainable production initiatives supported by the Project			
Indicator 2.4: number of hectares where sustainable production practices have been adopted	2.1.4: On 500 hectares sustainable production practices have been adopted	193.5 ha	IS	The surface area targets for each year were determined with PA managers during the planning process and were communicated to partners.

COMPONENT 2 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND
S	A Satisfactory (S) rating has been assigned to Component 2. Even though there has been no status change in 3 of the 4 outcome indicators, the project significantly progressed in promoting income-generating activities. The measurements for increased income and food insecurity will be done at the mid-term of the project. In terms of the hectares where sustainable practices have been adopted, about 38% of the target has been achieved. The project is working on a no-cost extension until FY23, and it is expected that that this target will be achieved.	Unchanged

c. Overall Project Results Rating

OVERALL PROJECT RESULTS IMPLEMENTATION RATING

OVERALL RATING		RATING TREND ⁷
S	Despite the delays due to COVID-19 and initial delays with signing the grant agreements, the project has made progress in all of the targets. The project team has initiated a no-cost extension (NCE) request. The NCE is proposed until May 2023, to ensure that activities are completed. There is enough project budget to facilitate the NCE.	Unchanged

d. Recommendations

CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE
1) continue monitoring the project sites for impacts of COVID-19. CI-GEF anticipates the approval of only one NCE, hence it is important to ensure that targets are achieved within the new project duration.	EA	Continuous, no deadline
2) The mid-term review will be completed by Q2 in FY22. CI-GEF will work with the EA to ensure that recommendations from the MTR are incorporated and reflected into the project.	CI-GEF, EA	December 2021

⁷ Rating trend: Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

SECTION III: PROJECT RISKS STATUS AND RATING

a. Progress towards Implementing the Project Risk Mitigation Plan

This section describes the activities implemented to manage and reduce high, substantial, modest, and low risks of the project. This section has three parts:

- a. Ratings for the progress towards implementing measures to mitigate project risks and a project risks annual reassessment
- b. Recommendations for improving project risks management

a. Progress towards Implementing the Project Risk Mitigation and Plan Project Risks Annual Reassessment

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ⁸	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY21 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ⁹
Risk 1: Exacerbated illegal logging, poaching, and fires following social and/or political crises	The project will strengthen the involvement of civil society members and partnerships with the private sector, so that it is less dependent on political influence.	Civil society participated in several activities within the protected areas, such as the participation to patrol activities (Mixed brigades), awareness raising, capacity building and sustainable production.	IS	Protected area managers included relevant activities with civil society in their workplans e.g. conduct patrols with communities, “mixed brigades” with police/gendarme, local community representatives). Fire is one of the main threats in the Boeny Region. Protected area managers actively work with local communities against uncontrolled fires and the installation or maintenance of firebreaks.	High	High	Unchanged

⁸ **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

⁹ **Rating trend**: Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ⁸	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY21 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ⁹
<p>Risk 2: Weak institutional capacities for planning, management, and governance</p>	<p>The project will work with and strengthen the capacity of diverse institutions (at both the local and regional levels). The project also includes activities to support the governance structures of the SPAs.</p>	<p>The Project Management Unit organized a capacity-building workshop on the technical and financial monitoring systems and related technical and financial reporting tools in October 2020.</p> <p>The Project Management Unit organized a capacity-building meeting on AGM, the Certification System, beneficiaries database, and the financial aspects in January and March 2021.</p>	<p>D</p>	<p>The capacity-building workshop on the technical and financial monitoring systems and related technical and financial reporting tools in October 2020 focused on data management, resource management, operational procedures, the use of technical and financial monitoring tools, the Accountability and Grievance Mechanism (AGM) tool for formulating grievances and maintaining public support for the project.</p> <p>For the capacity-building on AGM, in order to help all project stakeholders in the effective implementation of the AGM plan, an analysis of the experiences is essential to make the mechanisms efficient and effective. Because of COVID 19, we could not organize the meeting. However, we organized a meeting with each of the partners to discuss the progress in the field, the problems encountered, and the action plan to carry out the sensitizations in the field.</p> <p>Activities under the output 1.1.3: Participation of local communities in the management of targeted PAs improve, have not started in FY21 because of COVID-19 and the fire season (August - November 2020). The project management unit already made a reminder about the need to do these activities.</p> <p>Two activities wait for the start of DPRIDD's activity after the signature of the contract. Activities could not be held</p>	<p>Substantial</p>	<p>Substantial</p>	<p>Unchanged</p>

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ⁸	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY21 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ⁹
				due to the closing of the Boeny region and the travel restrictions due to COVID-19 in Madagascar.			
Risk 3: Uncertainty related to performance of FAPBM's investments	FAPBM's aim for its investment portfolio is to generate sufficient investment performance to fulfill its environmental mission through annual disbursements while preserving the value of	The grant agreement between CI and Madagascar Biodiversity Fund was signed on November 24, 2020. FAPBM already received the cash transfer on December 18, 2020. After receiving the capital, the FAPBM invested the USD 4.5 million in the Lombard Odier Money Markets Fund (ISIN CH011101295).	IS	The income generated from the USD 4.5 million will be the subject of a financing agreement for the year 2023, starting in January 2023. Report on investment during Q3 FY21 available. Concerning the fundraising activities, a consultation workshop to identify the needs of each PA manager was held in December 2018.	Modest	Modest	Unchanged

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ⁸	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY21 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ⁹
	the Capital that has been contributed to it, in real terms (i.e. after inflation) and over the long term. To this end, the FAPBM's experienced investment committee regularly assesses investment risk to ensure that its investments remain appropriate.	The CI-GCF team is responsible for the assessment of investment risk.		<p>Following the consultation workshop, another workshop to compare the needs of the PA managers with their domain of intervention in project development (activities, region, etc.) was held in July 2019 with the participation of the PA managers, the Organisme de Coordination et de Suivi des Investissements et de leurs Financements (OCSIF), the development projects (CASEF, MINAE, DEFIS), and the FAPBM.</p> <p>Field visits were planned for the year 2020, but due to the COVID-19 health crisis, we were unable to carry them out.</p> <p>In order to face the consequences of the crisis, the FAPBM has shared to PA managers funding opportunities.</p> <p>In 2021, in order to revive the activity, the FAPBM contacted the OCSIF, and they are waiting for the next steps because a restructuring has been carried out within this organization.</p>			
Risk 4: Uncertainty due to regional government shift in priorities and/or policy change	The project will strengthen political commitment by supporting the regional government and municipal plans (SRAT and SAC) by developing sustainable	The PAGs of the PAs are consistent with the BOENY SRAT and take into account the SACs of the communes bordering the protected areas, especially in terms of zoning and strategic axes for biodiversity. conservation and economic development.	IS	<p>22 /24 SACs completed.</p> <p>While the GEF-6 project was not involved in the finalization of the SAC/PDC, it contributes to the implementation of these standards.</p>	Modest	Modest	Unchanged

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ⁸	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY21 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ⁹
	<p>production systems/practices and demonstrating the value-add of integrative approaches.</p>	<p>Several activities of the Protected Areas funded by GEF- 6 contribute to the strategies and activities of the PRD and SACs such as:</p> <p>Reinforcement of 20 local sustainable production initiatives to improve livelihoods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mangrove silk (Bombetoka) - Raphia handicrafts (Ankarafantsika, Antrema, Mahavavy kinkony complex) - flower of salt (Antrema) <p>Promote Income Generating Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - beekeeping (AKF, BBL, CMK, Antrema) - market gardening, (CMK, Antrema) - rice,(CMK, Antrema) - fishing (CMK, Antrema) - Cattle and poultry industries by Antrema - Conduct of PATROL activities by the 5 PAs - Forest restoration - Ecological monitoring training <p>In addition, the representative of the Boeny Region is a member of the steering committee and</p>					

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ⁸	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY21 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ⁹
		participated to the second meeting of the steering committee and the capacity building workshop on the technical and financial monitoring systems and related technical and financial reporting tools in October 2020.					
Risk 5: Impacts of global climate change	The project will work with PA staff, regional institutions, and grassroots organizations to share experiences related to climate change adaptation and resiliency for production systems.	Complex Mahavavy Kinkony: Cultivation calendar in relation to planting plot and availability of water (on baiboho vs. rainfed tanety crops), fertilization and mulching.	IS	A climatic risk evaluation of some sectors in Boeny Region were conducted and funded by the PAGE/GIZ project. Impact chains were developed and adaptation options were identified. Livelihoods Manager shared experiences related to climate change adaptation and resiliency for production systems.	Modest	Modest	Unchanged
Risk 6: Weak results on the ground due to COVID-19	Risk Rating included during implementation: High	Give the necessary technical support and supervision so that the grantees can carry out the activities on the ground according to the WP and the donor's requirements.		COVID-19 is impacting the project and will affect the Q4 report. The Project Management Unit could not organize training with grantees on-site and could not conduct the planned supervision mission. For the grantees who have already started activities, some meetings were canceled to avoid contamination. Some activities in the risk areas could not be carried out. For the two directorates of the Ministry of Environment, DAPRNE and DPRIDD, whose contracts were signed and bank accounts opened in March, they were obliged to postpone the implementation of their activities due to the closing of the Boeny region and the restriction of	High (from FY20)	High	Unchanged

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ⁸	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY21 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ⁹
				travel because of COVID-19 in Madagascar.			

OVERALL RATING OF PROJECT RISKS	JUSTIFICATION	RISK RATING TREND ¹⁰
H	Although the project continues implementing risk mitigation activities for all the risks identified, the risks from COVID-19 continue to threaten the project. The pandemic has slowed down implementation progress in consultations, fundraising activities, monitoring, etc. We will continue to closely monitor the project in FY22, especially since a no-cost extension has been requested.	Unchanged

Recommendations

MITIGATION AND CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE
1) Continue to monitor, assess, and communicate on the impacts of COVID-19	PM, PMU, CI-GEF	No deadline

¹⁰ **Rating trend:** Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

SECTION IV: PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS IMPLEMENTATION STATUS AND RATING

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved Environmental and Social Safeguard plans, as well as recommendations to improve the implementation of the safeguard plans, when needed. This section is divided in three parts:

- a. Progress towards Complying with the CI-GEF Project Agency’s Environmental & Social Safeguards
- b. Overall Project Safeguard Implementation Rating
- c. Recommendations

a. Progress towards Complying with the CI-GEF Project Agency’s Environmental & Social Safeguards

MINIMUM SAFEGUARD INDICATORS	PROJECT TARGET	END OF YEAR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ¹¹	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<p>ACCOUNTABILITY AND GRIEVANCE MECHANISM</p> <p>1. Number of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project’s Accountability and Grievance Mechanism</p>	<p>Not established</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>IS</p>	<p>A training on AGM was organized in October 2020. Posters on AGM were distributed to implementing partners for sensitization of beneficiaries in the field. In March 2020, a meeting was planned with grantees on the Accountability and Grievance Mechanism (AGM). In order to help all project stakeholders in the effective implementation of the AGM plan, an analysis of the experiences is essential to make the mechanisms efficient and effective. Because of COVID-19, we could not organize that meeting. However, we organized a meeting with each of the partners to discuss progress in the field and the problems encountered.</p> <p>During the training in October 2020 and field visit in December 2020, the GEF-6 project team asked the managers about</p>

¹¹ **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

<p>2. Percentage of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism that have been resolved</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>N/A (0 received)</p>	<p>IS</p>	<p>any problems. They replied that the AGM is still new for the PAs, and that they have not yet received any grievances.</p> <p>PA managers also mentioned that communities do not like to report complaints, especially written complaints with their names.</p> <p>In March, we asked each manager to establish an action plan to carry out sensitizations on AGM in the field, and to find other ways to facilitate the report of complaints.</p>
<p>GENDER MAINSTREAMING 3. Number of men and women that participated in project activities (e.g. meetings, workshops, consultations)</p>	<p>Men 1300 Women 1300</p>	<p>FY21 Q1 (Jul -Sept 2020): 669 M and 230 W FY21 Q2 (Oct -Dec 2020): 333 M and 366 W FY21 Q3 (Jan-Mar 2021): 594 M and 417 W FY21 Q4 (Avril 2021-Juin 2021): 299 M and 214 W</p> <p>For a total of FY21: 1895 M and 1227 W = 3122</p>	<p>IS</p>	<p>In Q1, gender participation was M:W 75:25 In Q2, gender participation was almost 50:50. In Q3, gender participation was almost 50:50. In Q4, gender participation was almost 50:50.</p>

<p>4. Number of men and women that received benefits (e.g. employment, income generating activities, training, access to natural resources, land tenure or resource rights, equipment, leadership roles) from the project</p>	<p>Men 1300 Women 1300</p>	<p>FY21 Q1 (Jul -Sept 2020): 4350 M and 443 W FY21 Q2 (Oct -Dec 2020): 501 M and 221 W FY21 Q3 (Jan -Mar 2021): 964 M and 184 W FY21 Q4 (Apr-June 2021): 424 M and 125 W For a total of FY21: 6239 M and 973 W = 7212</p>	<p>IS</p>	<p>In doing the analysis, it was found that during Q1, mainly men participated in the training, awareness-raising, and meetings. In Q2, Q3 and Q4 the number of women and men who participated in trainings on income-generating activities and meetings were almost the same. In addition, it was mainly women who participated in trainings on Raffia and exchange visits on Raffia in Q2.</p> <p>The number of men dropped significantly in Q2 compared to Q1. Because of the establishment and maintenance of firewalls in Ankarafantsika, most of the beneficiaries were men. In Q3, most beneficiaries are men because they participated in ecological monitoring and patrols.</p>
<p>5. Number of strategies, plans (e.g. management plans and land use plans), and policies derived from the project that include gender considerations (this indicator applies to</p>	<p>5 management plans</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>The development of the Management Plan and the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) of the Bombetoka (71,943 ha) are in the process of being finalized. The validation of the documents at the regional and national levels will be completed in Q4 FY21.</p>

relevant projects)				
<p>STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT</p> <p>6. Number of government agencies, civil society organizations, private sector, indigenous peoples, and other stakeholder groups that have been involved in the project implementation phase on an annual basis</p> <p>7. Number persons (sex-disaggregated)</p>	<p>10 government Agencies/2000 Households/03 private Sectors/07 (PA managers, CI, FAPBM/02 universities/ 02 other partners</p> <p>1300 female 1300 male</p>	<p>FY21 Q1 (Jul -Sept 2020): Government agencies: 3 New government agencies Decentralized Territorial Collectivities: 1 New Decentralized Territorial Collectivities CSO: 8 New CSO Private sector: 5 Persons: TBD (representing 5,319 inhabitants)</p> <p>FY21 Q2 (October – December 2020): Government agencies: 1 New government agencies Decentralized Territorial Collectivities: 2 New Decentralized Territorial Collectivities CSO: 5 New CSO Private sector: 0 Persons: TBD (representing 1,203 inhabitants)</p> <p>FY21 Q3 (January – March 2020): Government agencies: 1 New government agencies Decentralized Territorial Collectivities: 0 New CSO: 0 New Private sector: 0 New Persons: TBD (representing 1,665 inhabitants)</p> <p>FY21 Q4 (Apr-June 2021) Government agencies: 2 New government agencies Decentralized Territorial Collectivities: 0 New CSO: 8 News Private sector: 1 New Persons: TBD (representing 1,302 inhabitants)</p> <p>FY21 Q1 (Jul -Sept 2020): 4720 M and 599 W</p>	<p>IS</p> <p>IS</p>	<p>The same stakeholders have been involved in the project implementation from Q1 to Q4.</p> <p>New stakeholders were involved when workshops or meetings were held at the regional level.</p>

<p>that have been involved in project implementation phase (on an annual basis)</p>		<p>FY21 Q2 (Oct -Dec 2020): 755 M and 448 W FY21 Q3 (Jan- Mar 2021): 1271M and 394W FY21 Q4 (Apr-June 2021): 642M 255W For a total of FY21: 7388 M and 1690 W = 9078</p>		
<p>8. Number of engagement (e.g. meeting, workshops, consultations) with stakeholders during the project implementation phase (on an annual basis)</p>	<p>05</p>	<p>FY21 Q2 (Oct -Dec 2020): Consultation: 1 Capacity building/Training: 20 Awareness raising: 7 Meeting: 3 Exchange visit: 4 Workshop:1</p> <p>FY21 Q3 (Jan -Mar 2021): Capacity building/Training: 11 Meeting: 7 Exchange visit: 1</p> <p>FY21 Q4 (Apr-June 2021) Capacity building/Training: 11 Awareness raising: 2 Socioeconomic survey: 1</p>	<p>NS</p>	
<p>9. Percentage of stakeholders who rate as satisfactory the level at which their views and concerns are taken into account by the project</p>				

b. Information on Progress, challenges, and outcomes on stakeholder engagement

The main challenge is that this project includes a wide range of stakeholders from different sectors and interests: forestry and environment, agriculture-livestock-fishing, land-use planning, tourism, mining, artisanal crafts, and scientific research. Institutions responsible for maintaining law and order are also stakeholders, particularly concerning wildlife trafficking and illicit exploitation of natural resources, which are important threats in Boeny. The achievement of the project objectives will be highly dependent on the support of these different stakeholders. The same stakeholders in year 1 have been involved in the project implementation in year 2 (Q1 from Q4). In Q1 and Q2, it was found that new government agencies, civil society organizations, private sector were involved in project implementation. New stakeholders were involved when workshops or meetings were held at the regional level. Concerning the number of persons (sex-disaggregated) that have been involved in the project implementation phase, it was found that the number of men is higher than women. In Q1, the number of men engaged in the construction of firebreaks was very high.

The different stakeholders cited in the CEO endorsement/approval are involved in the project implementation phase. Our grantees continued to engage relevant stakeholders in the implementation of their activities in the fields even during the pandemic period. They organized socially distanced in-person meetings. Some meetings were canceled, and some activities in risk areas could not be carried out. For the two directorates of the Ministry of Environment, DAPRNE and DPRIDD, whose contracts were signed and bank accounts opened in March, they were obliged to postpone their activities due to the closing of the Boeny region and the restriction of travel because of COVID-19 in Madagascar. Because it is impossible to organize training with grantees on-site and conduct the planned supervision mission from March 2021 until June 2021, the Project management Unit conducted meetings, workshops, and training through Teams. As field missions were not allowed due to COVID-19, the Livelihood Manager worked with partners to follow up their on-site activities through phone calls.

In September 2020, the project team in Antananarivo returned to Mahajanga. They organized a steering committee meeting with stakeholders, capacity building with our grantees, and supervision missions. Because it is challenging to organize training with grantees on-site and conduct the planned supervision mission from March 2021 until June 2021, we conducted meetings, workshops, and training through Teams.

c. Provide information on the progress towards achieving gender sensitive measures/targets

At the end of FY21:

1. Number of men and women that participated in project activities (meetings, workshops and consultations with local persons): **1895 M and 1227 W = 3122**
2. Number of men and women that received benefits (Financial training, Mandatory training, meetings, workshops and consultations with local persons, temporary employment created by the patrols) from the project: **6239 M and 973 W = 7212**

Concerning the gender measures that have been implemented, grantees have made efforts to balance the number of men and women participating in the implementation of project activities. Discussions will be made with each grantee for the improvement of the number of women that received benefits from the project.

d. Overall Project Safeguard Implementation Rating

SUMMARY: PROJECT SAFEGUARD IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY TYPE OF PLAN

SAFEGUARDSTRIGGERED BY THE PROJECT (delete those not applicable)	CURRENT FY21 IMPLEMENTATION RATING	RATING TREND
Accountability and Grievance Mechanisms	S	Increasing
Gender Mainstreaming Plan (GMP)	S	Increasing
Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)	S	Unchanged

OVERALL PROJECT SAFEGUARD IMPLEMENTATION RATING

RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND
S	A Grievance Mechanism poster was developed and disseminated. No grievances were received, albeit the project reported that the mechanism is still new to stakeholders and that stakeholders are not comfortable completing written grievances and signing their names. Gender participation for women is approximately 40%, while due to the nature of the activities, benefits were skewed towards men. Stakeholder engagement continues to be satisfactory and new groups were engaged by the project.	Increasing

e. Recommendations

CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE
The project needs to identify other channels that are more suitable for stakeholders to submit complaints. Perhaps explore local and traditional methods for receiving grievances. The project should also communicate that the grievance mechanism allows for the receipt of anonymous complaints and caters for confidentiality.	Project Management Unit	September 30, 2021

SECTION V: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES, KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND LESSONS LEARNED

Required topics

1. Knowledge activities/products (when applicable), as outlined in the knowledge management plan approved at CEO endorsement/approval.

In Year 2, several activities were carried out within the knowledge management framework.

The project learns from and assists PA managers in the Madagascar Protected Areas System (SAPM). The project website and activities will share lessons between the Boeny PA managers. Training workshops and coordination meetings are additional opportunities for grantees to share experiences in PA management.

Document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites)

- The project will produce 3 lessons learned briefs that could be of interest to the wider PA community in Madagascar. These are expected to document lessons related to: 1. Mainstreaming PAs within the SRAT and SAC planning process; 2. Regional level coordination and cooperation between PAs; and 3. Implementation of livelihood activities and increasing local value for products.
- The creation of the website for the project is in progress. The general objective is to make the shared and updated data for learning and knowledge management available and accessible to users.

Improve stakeholder knowledge: There are plans to improve stakeholder knowledge of essential PA legislation (the Code des Aires Protegees, COAP), management tools, as well as activities targeted at PA management staff, to improve and standardize the monitoring of species and threats through the use of new technologies and approaches. This will be done using the SMART monitoring tool that has been successfully piloted in Madagascar and is now being rolled out across the SAPM network. The project also includes activities to improve the use of the METT tool to measure PA management effectiveness. Training could not be held in FY21 due to the closing of the Boeny region and the restriction of travel because of COVID-19 in Madagascar. In addition, the grant agreement was signed in October 2020, and when the transfers were made, they were rejected by the bank. It is no longer allowed for the directorates within the ministries to open bank accounts. The bank account was opened in March 2021.

The Project Management Unit could not organize training with grantees on-site and could not conduct the planned supervision mission because of COVID-19. The two directorates of the Ministry of Environment, DAPRNE and DPRIDD, were obliged to postpone the implementation of their activities due to the closing of the Boeny region and the restriction of travel because of COVID-19. Because it is not possible to organize training with grantees on-site and conduct the planned supervision mission from March 2021 until June 2021, we conducted meetings, workshops, and trainings through Teams. As field missions were not allowed due to COVID-19, the Livelihood Manager worked with partners to follow up their on-site activities through phone calls.

Additional topics (please choose two)

2. Engagement of the private sector:
3. Scientific and technological issues
4. Interpretation and application of GEF guidelines
5. Financial management and co-financing.

Trainings on finance management and procedures have been conducted. The three directorates (DAPRNE, DIREDD, DPRIDDD) of the MEDD are not used to project financial management and accountancy. Additional training has been carried out to strengthen their abilities regarding managing the funds and using the different financial tools and documents (accounting documents, financial report framework). In addition, it was recommended that they submit their accounting document while submitting their financial report to assure that both give accurate views of the transactions.

6. Project institutional arrangements, including project governance

7. Capacity building:

From the beginning, the Project Management Unit conducted mandatory training on financial management, procurement, prohibited practices, code of ethics (April 2020). To ensure the effective implementation of the project, it is necessary to continuously strengthen the capacity of executing partners. After the mandatory training, the monitoring and evaluation manager provided training to each grantee on monitoring and evaluation tools. During the pandemic period in 2020, it was not possible to do face-to-face training, so we had to do it in teams. As the tools are new for the grantees, they had difficulties understanding and using them. That's why we organized the capacity-building workshop in October. In addition, the Livelihood Manager and his activities in the framework of capacity-building of PA managers in sustainable production always provided support for the completion of monitoring tools. For the Accountability and Grievance Mechanism, a meeting was planned with grantees. To help all project stakeholders effectively implement the AGM plan, an analysis of the experiences is essential to make the mechanisms efficient and effective. Because of COVID-19, we could not organize the meeting. However, we organized a meeting with each of the partners to discuss the progress in the field and the problems encountered. During the training in October 2020 and field visit in December 2020, the GEF-6 project team asked the managers about any problems. They replied that the AGM is still new for the PAs and have not yet received any grievances. PA managers also mentioned that communities do not like to report complaints, especially written complaints with their names. In March, we asked each manager to establish an action plan to carry out sensitizations on AGM in the field and to find other ways to facilitate the report of complaints.

Training activities for local communities both on PA governance and on improving livelihoods: Activities under the output 1.1.3: Participation of local communities in the management of targeted PAs improve are not started in FY21 for Mahavavy-Kinkony Complex and Baie de Baly because of COVID-19 and the fire season (August - November 2020). The project management unit already made a reminder about the need to do these activities. Theoretical and practical training to improve income-generating activities were provided by protected area managers to local communities.

8. Implementation of safeguard policies, including gender mainstreaming, accountability and grievance mechanisms, stakeholder consultations

9. Factors that improve the likelihood of long-term sustainability of project impacts

10. Factors that encourage replication, including outreach, dissemination of lessons learned, and communications strategies

Concerning the stakeholder exchanges:

An exchange visit on beekeeping was organized by the manager of the Mahavavy Kinkony Complex. Three beekeeper associations visited Besely (Commune Port Bergé, District Port Bergé) and in Anjepy (Commune Anjepy, District Manjakandriana). The objectives of this visit are

- To see the modern production equipment,
- See the techniques of use of the different materials,
- See breeding and production techniques,
- See marketing and marketing techniques.

An exchange visit on crafts was organized by the manager of Mahavavy inkony Complex and carried out from 19 to 25 October 2020 in Ampombolava (Commune Tsaramandroso, District Ambato Boeny), in Manerinerina (Commune Manerinerina, District Ambato Boeny), in Alarobia (Commune Alarobia, District Manjakandriana), in

Ambangabe (Commune Ambalavao, District Atsimondrano). 16 craftswomen participated, including 08 women members of the Tsarajoro association in Benetsy and 08 other members of the Vehivavy Vonona association in Marosakoa II. The objectives of this visit are to see other models of handicrafts, see the production quality of other craftswomen, see the production techniques (materials, rhythm, productive behavior), see the marketing and commercialization techniques.

Two exchange visits were organized by the manager of Antrema for the FMAA Association. The first one was in Ampombilava Ankarafantsika for 10 days from 02/11/20 to 08/11/20. The objective of this first visit was to discover the use of weaving equipment and to improve the diversification of handicraft products. 10 women participated. The second exchange visit was conducted in Benetsy, District of Mitsinjo part CMK for 7 days from 11/11/20 to 17/11/20. The objective was the same.

APPENDIX I: PROJECT ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING

Rating		Overdue (O)	Delayed (D)	Not started on schedule (NS)	Under implementation on schedule (IS)	Completed/Achieved (CA)
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	HS	0%		100%		
Satisfactory (S)	S	20%		80%		
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	MS	40%		60%		
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	MU	60%		40%		
Unsatisfactory (U)	U	80%		20%		
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	HU	100%		0%		

- **Highly Satisfactory:** 100% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project. The project can be presented as an example of “good practice” project,
- **Satisfactory:** 80% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; except for only 20% that are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action,
- **Moderately Satisfactory:** 60% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; while 40% are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action,
- **Moderately Unsatisfactory:** 40% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; while 60% are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action,
- **Unsatisfactory:** only 20% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; while 80% are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action, and
- **Highly Unsatisfactory:** 100% of the indicators: a) are overdue, and/or b) delayed in their implementation, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project.

APPENDIX II: RISK RATINGS

Rating	
Low (L)	L
Moderate (M)	M
Substantial (S)	S
High (H)	H

- **Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.
- **Moderate Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.
- **Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
- **High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.

APPENDIX III: PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT EXPECTED OUTPUTS

INDICATORS	PROJECT TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ¹²	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
Outcome 1.1 Outcome 1.1.: Increased management effectiveness of 5 targeted PAs of the Northwestern Landscape				
Output Indicator 1.1.1: <i>Number of protected areas that are acknowledged and mainstreamed into Regional Development Plan (Schema Regional d'Aménagement du Territoire, SRAT) and Communal Management Schemes (Schema d'Aménagement Communal, SAC)</i>	5 protected areas	Four PAs have their Management Plan consistent with the BOENY SRAT and take into account the SACs of the communes bordering the protected areas, especially in terms of zoning and strategic axes for biodiversity conservation and economic development.	IS	22 /24 SACs completed. The GEF-6 project was not involved in the finalization of the SRAT/PRD and SAC/PDC but contributes to the implementation of these standards. This GEF project encourages the operationalization of the SAC by supporting environmentally-friendly production practices and natural resource use priorities identified in the SACs.
Output Indicator 1.1.2: <i>Number of management plans up-to-date and implemented in targeted PAs</i>	5 protected areas	Four management plans of four protected areas implemented.	IS	The validation of the Management Plan and the Social and Environmental Management Plan at the regional and national level. The PA of Bombetoka will obtain its decree of definitive creation, funded by GIZ and the GEF-5 project mangroves, in June 2021.
Output Indicator 1.1.3: <i>Number of Local management structures that are in place and fulfilling terms of reference at all 5 targeted PAs</i>	5 management structures (each management structure has at least 20% women)	4 Protected Areas have local management structures. The setting up of the management structure in Beleboka PA is in progress	D	2 protected areas plan to support governance structures. The planning of the management structures composed by the COS, COSAP, Marambitsy Miaro ny Zavaboary-(MMZ), Antrema Miray (AMI) was planned for FY20 and FY21; but was postponed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. For Baie de Baly, the delay is due to the fire period.

¹² **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

Outcome 1.2 Improved financial sustainability of 5 targeted PAs				
Output Indicator 1.2.1: <i>Amount contributed to the capital of FAPBM through the Project</i>	USD 4.5 million	The signature of the grant agreement between CI and Madagascar Biodiversity Fund took place on November 24, 2020. USD 4.5 million transferred.	IS	After receiving the capital, the FAPBM invested the USD 4.5 million in the Lombard Odier Money Markets Fund (ISIN CH011101295).
Output Indicator 1.2.2: <i>Annual contribution to the 5 targeted PAs attributable to the USD 4.5 million contribution to FAPBM's capital</i>	USD 137,000 additional annually from year 3	0	IS	The income generated from the USD 4.5 million, estimated at approximately USD 137,000 per year, will be the subject of a financing agreement for the year 2023. This funding will be in addition to the existing allocation from the FAPBM. Thereafter, the level of funding available at perpetuity for the PAs recurrent costs will increase from USD 195,000 to USD 332,000 per year.

<p>Output Indicator 1.2.3: <i>Number of funding requests submitted to potential donors</i></p>	<p>3 funding requests.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>D</p>	<p>Concerning the fundraising activities, a consultation workshop to identify the needs of each protected area manager was held in December 2018.</p> <p>Following that, another workshop to compare the needs of the PA managers with their domain was held in July 2019; with the participation of the PA managers, the Organisme de Coordination et de Suivi des Investissements et de leurs Financements (OCSIF), the development projects (CASEF, MINAE, DEFIS) and the FAPBM. Field visits were planned for the year 2020, but due to COVID-19, we were unable to carry them out. To face the consequences of the crisis, the FAPBM has shared with the PA managers funding opportunities (e.g. BIOPAMA,).</p> <p>In 2021, to revitalize the activity, the FAPBM contacted the OCSIF, awaiting the next steps because a restructuring has been carried out within this organization.</p>
<p>Output Indicator 1.2.4: <i>Number of donor databases developed</i></p>	<p>Number of donor databases developed</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>D</p>	<p>Activities related to the indicator have not yet started</p>
<p>Outcome 2.1 Key local communities around targeted PAs have adopted sustainable production practices</p>				

Output Indicator 2.1.1: Number of sustainable production initiatives supported to improve livelihoods	16 livelihood initiatives	12 livelihood initiatives	IS	Intensive rice cultivation Market gardening Beekeeping Irrigated Rice cultivation Raphia Green charcoal production Silk Ecotourism Fisheries Salt Bovine breeding Poultry breeding
--	---------------------------	---------------------------	----	---

<p>Output Indicator 2.1.2: Number of people (gender-disaggregated) participating in sustainable production initiatives supported by the Project</p>	<p>1300 women; 1300 men; 2000 households</p>	<p>Fy20 & Fy21 : 829 households (546 M, 283W)</p>	<p>IS</p>	<p>AKF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 312 households benefitted from green charcoal production project • 60 households benefitted from craft project • 120 households benefitted from beekeeping project • <p>Antrema:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 beneficiaries of tourist circuits • 1 beneficiary of the bovine sector • 76 beneficiaries of the poultry farming sector • 0 beneficiary of the fishing industry • 52 beneficiaries of the salt sector • 38 women basketry beneficiaries (38 households benefitted from Raphia activities) <p>BBL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 beekeeping beneficiaries • 0 beneficiaries of rain-fed rice cultivation • 21 beneficiaries of vegetable farming <p>BOMBETOKA :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 silk industry beneficiaries <p>Complexe Mahavavy-Kinkony</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 39 households benefitted from beekeeping activities
--	--	--	-----------	---

				<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 132 households benefitted from activities in improved rice-growing system (SRA)• 143 households, benefitted from activities in various market gardening activities• 19 households benefitted from Raphia activities
--	--	--	--	---

<p>Output Indicator 2.1.3: Number of value chains developed and executed.</p>	<p>3 value chains</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>IS</p>	<p>CI recruited the Association Leadership for Local Development (ALLD) to conduct additional charcoal, honey, and raffia value chain studies. The purpose of these studies is to help the GEF-6 project implementation partners better target actions and support to enhance the value of the commodity chains as sustainable livelihoods for beneficiary households.</p> <p>ALLD started activities in the field in August 2020. They conducted document analysis, data collection at the local and regional level, focus groups, individual surveys, interviews with local authorities, and restitutions at the level of the 5 PAs.</p> <p>A validation workshop was organized in September 2020.</p> <p>Green charcoal: 44 persons (33M,11W) Honey: 46 persons (31M, 15W) Raphia: 41 persons (26M, 15W)</p> <p>The results obtained from these complementary studies will be used to effectively support sustainable production practices, focusing mainly on the development of the green coal, honey and raffia sectors. The implementation of these actions will have repercussions on the livelihoods and food security of 2000 beneficiary households targeted by the project and also on</p>
--	-----------------------	----------	-----------	--

				the reduction of pressures on the biodiversity in the Boeny Region.
--	--	--	--	---