



PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)

for the project:

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

FY22

July 1, 2021 – June 30, 2022

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:	55
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: 12/31/2023
GEF Grant Amount:	\$6,817,431	Expected Financial Closure Date:	3/31/2024
Expected Co-financing:	\$9,719,868	Date of Last Steering Committee Meeting:	09/22/2021
Co-financing Realized as of June 30, 2022:	\$7,609,697	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, 2022	\$ 5,910,644	Terminal Evaluation-Planned Date:	02/01/2023
PIR Prepared by:	Michele Andrianarisata	Terminal Evaluation-Actual Date:	
CI-GEF Project Manager:	Orissa Samaroo	CI-GEF Finance Lead:	Elizabeth Mast

Minor Amendment Categories	
Results framework <input type="checkbox"/>	No
Components and cost <input type="checkbox"/>	No
Institutional and implementation arrangements <input type="checkbox"/>	No
Financial management <input type="checkbox"/>	No
Implementation schedule <input type="checkbox"/>	No Cost Extension until December 2022
Executing Entity <input type="checkbox"/>	No
Executing Entity Category <input type="checkbox"/>	No

Minor project objective change <input type="checkbox"/>	No
Safeguards <input type="checkbox"/>	No
Risk analysis <input type="checkbox"/>	No
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5% <input type="checkbox"/>	No
Co-financing <input type="checkbox"/>	
Location of project activity <input type="checkbox"/>	No
Other <input type="checkbox"/>	No

MINOR AMENDMENT RESPONSE FROM CI-GEF

A no-cost extension was granted until December 2022.

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 VI: Project Geocoding:** documents the precise and specific geographic location(s) of activities supported by GEF investments based on information available in project documentation

SECTION I: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS SUMMARY

PROJECT SUMMARY

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

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

In year 2, changes took place in the Project Management Unit (PMU). 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 was 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, 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 chains. 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 (AGM) 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, application of METT was delayed due to COVID-19 restrictions.

CURRENT PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS (FY22)

Key updates: The Monitoring and Evaluation Manager resigned in July 2021, and his successor has already been recruited. The third meeting of the Steering Committee was held in Mahajanga on September 22, 2021.

Component 1: In FY22, protected area managers implemented activities according to their approved workplans for Year 3. 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, maintenance of existing park boundary markers, monitoring the implementation of management plans and activities within each PA, and reviewing PA managers (assessment of adherence to terms of PA delegation contracts). Activities of the eight grantees have progressed well since July 2021. The bank account of the DIREDD at BNI has been suspended from October 2021 until February 2022. The new account was opened on March 8, 2022.

In FY22, the FAPBM invested USD 4.5 million in the Lombard Odier Money Markets Fund and carried out regular monitoring of the portfolio. FAPBM received an endowment from KfW in December 2021 of USD 51.6 million. As a result, all five PAs will receive an increase in funding starting January 2023.

Component 2: In FY22, 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, 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.

The purchase of the materials as In-Kind Grants for the grantees started in January 2021 and continued in FY22.

The PMU team conducted supervision missions and support for the finalization of the workplan and budget FY22 in Ankarafantsika, Antrema, Mahavavy Kinkony, and Baie de Baly in September 2021, in Bombetoka in November 2021 and in Antrema in March 2022, Mahavavy Kinkony in MAY 2022, Baie de Baly and Ankarafantsika in April 2022 and June 2022.

Midterm Review: The overall objective of the review was to provide the project management team with feedback on the project’s performance to date and identify risks to project sustainability, effectiveness, efficiency, progress towards results, as well as project safeguards. The scope of the review assessed the project implementation activities from its inception in May 2019 to June 2021. The MTR was undertaken from August 2021 to November 2021 by Cynosure. The MTR report was shared with the GEF and recommendations were provided for CI-Madagascar/PMU and for CI-GEF/GEF.

Safeguards: the MTR report recommended to increase outreach and awareness activities on AGM so that project beneficiaries are more aware of existing grievances mechanisms. A group of consultants was hired in FY22 to provide technical support to grantees to ensure effective implementation of the Accountability and Grievance Mechanism in the field and to monitor the implementation of the Gender Mainstreaming Plan.

Household survey: Under the technical supervision of CI Madagascar, the Data Collection Team (DCT) will conduct field surveys to collect the same data on the same indicators to measure the impacts of the GEF-6 project at mid-term, particularly on the percentage of households reporting food insecurity, the number of months of household food insecurity, and % increase in household income in participating local communities.

Audit by external auditors appointed by the Executing Agency:

The firm QUALEX was recruited to conduct a financial audit of the GEF-6 Boeny project's implementing partners for the fiscal years 2020 and 2021. The intervention was carried out at each of the partners' headquarters, two of them are in Majunga (DIREDD and DELC) while the remaining 6 (six) are based in Antananarivo (DPRIDD, DAPRNE, MNP/AKF, MNP/BBL, MNHN/ANTREMA, ASITY/CMK).

SUMMARY: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS

PROJECT PART	PRIOR FY21IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	CURRENT FY22 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING ¹	RATING TREND ²
OBJECTIVE	S	S	Unchanged
COMPONENTS AND OUTCOMES	S	S	Unchanged
ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS	S	MS	Decreasing

PROJECT RISK RATING³

RISKS	H	M	Decreasing
-------	---	---	------------

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 since the start of the project 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)	588,494 ha	CA	While the five protected areas (588,494 ha) are now within the national protected area system, the Management Plan and the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) of the Bombetoka (71,943 ha) were validated at the Regional and National level. The completion of these documents is needed to finalize the protected area status of Bombetoka (to secure the decree of definitive creation); the National Validation meeting to mark completion will take place in July.								
Indicator b: Number of protected areas in the northwestern landscape that improve their management effectiveness (5)	5 Protected Areas	IS	<p>The training of the protected area managers on the application of METT was held from June 16 to June 18, 2021.</p> <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 2022 annual METT evaluation was organized on May 17, 2022, with the participation of the managers of the five targeted PAs and the DAPRNE.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;"></th> <th style="width: 12.5%;">Baseline METT Scores</th> <th style="width: 12.5%;">FY21 METT Scores</th> <th style="width: 12.5%;">FY22 METT Scores</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="height: 20px;"></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Baseline METT Scores	FY21 METT Scores	FY22 METT Scores				
	Baseline METT Scores	FY21 METT Scores	FY22 METT Scores								

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																				
			<table border="1" data-bbox="1003 277 1829 513"> <tr> <td>Baie de Baly</td> <td>78%</td> <td>79%</td> <td>79%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bombetoka</td> <td>20%</td> <td>58%</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Antrema</td> <td>77%</td> <td>85.3%</td> <td>87%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Complexe Mahavavy-Kinkony</td> <td>52%</td> <td>76%</td> <td>75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ankarafantsika</td> <td>67%</td> <td>78%</td> <td>80%</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="1003 548 2018 610">Comparing management effectiveness in FY22 with the baseline, it was found that the scores have improved. The average of the increase of METT score for the 5 Protected Areas is 18%.</p>	Baie de Baly	78%	79%	79%	Bombetoka	20%	58%	65%	Antrema	77%	85.3%	87%	Complexe Mahavavy-Kinkony	52%	76%	75%	Ankarafantsika	67%	78%	80%
Baie de Baly	78%	79%	79%																				
Bombetoka	20%	58%	65%																				
Antrema	77%	85.3%	87%																				
Complexe Mahavavy-Kinkony	52%	76%	75%																				
Ankarafantsika	67%	78%	80%																				
Indicator c. Number of protected areas in the northwestern landscape with improved financial sustainability (5)	0	IS	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 data-bbox="1003 821 2018 915">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 data-bbox="1003 951 2018 1013">Several activities of the Protected Areas funded by GEF- 6 contribute to the strategic axis and activities of the PRD and SACs.</p> <p data-bbox="1003 1049 2018 1143">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 axis for biodiversity conservation and economic development.</p> <p data-bbox="1003 1179 2018 1305">The SAC of 2 communes Antsakoia Mileka et Andranomavo in the Baie de Baly NP were not elaborated because the budget of PAGE 1/GIZ project was very limited, The PAGE2/GIZ project supported the implementation of the existing SACs. There are no additional funds to cover the costs for the remaining 2 communes. Project. The project only achieved 22/24 SACs.</p>																				
Indicator e: Number of households directly benefitting from sustainable production initiatives linked to the target protected areas (2000)	1,840 households	IS	During Year 1, 2 and 3 (July 2019 -June 2022), the partners were able to support 1,840 households out of 2000, i.e, 90 % of the project target. These 1,840 beneficiary households are composed of 909 men and 904 women.																				

OBJECTIVE INDICATORS	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁴	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
			<p>Through the applied household survey it was possible to observe that sustainable production has already had a direct impact on their food situation and strengthened the capacity of beneficiaries to be food self-sufficient throughout the year;</p> <p>Sustainable production generated additional income for participating households, The income contributes to the purchase of rice during the lean season, school fees for children, unexpected expenses such as medicines, and the purchase of kitchen utensils.</p> <p>For DELC, 62 households need to be reached in FY23, for Antrema 195 and DPRIDD 132. The project team has identified beneficiary households in Antrema and DPRIDD.</p>

OBJECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION
S	The IP progress rating for FY21 is Satisfactory (S). The project continues to make progress in achieving the Objective Indicators. Most notable is the number of households that are directly benefiting from sustainable production activities; in FY22, the project was able to support an additional 1011 households. The team has identified tangible measures to reach the 2000 target before the end of the project. The average METT score for the 5 protected areas has increased by 18%. As noted by the project team, the income from the USD 4.5M invested in the FAPBM is expected in 2023.

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:	Increased management effectiveness of 5 targeted PAs of the Northwestern Landscape
Outcome 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	The average of the increase of METT score for the 5 Protected Areas is 18%.	IS	<p>The evaluation of the METT takes place at the end of each year, i.e. in December, in the presence of the members of the Orientation and Monitoring Committee of each PA. During the discussion, it was noted that most PAs have input problems (field implementation team staffing, budgets) and with achievement of activities in the field. The project will identify strategies improve these problems. There is also a need for field verification of project effects and impacts because the METT evaluation does not measure effects and impacts. The Ministry of Environment is developing another tool that will measure effects and impacts.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1199 599 2018 899"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Baseline METT Scores</th> <th>FY21 METT Scores</th> <th>FY22 METT Scores</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Baie de Baly</td> <td>78%</td> <td>79%</td> <td>79%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bombetoka</td> <td>20%</td> <td>58%</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Antrema</td> <td>77%</td> <td>85.3%</td> <td>87%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Complexe Mahavavy-Kinkony</td> <td>52%</td> <td>76%</td> <td>75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ankarafantsika</td> <td>67%</td> <td>78%</td> <td>80%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Baseline METT Scores	FY21 METT Scores	FY22 METT Scores	Baie de Baly	78%	79%	79%	Bombetoka	20%	58%	65%	Antrema	77%	85.3%	87%	Complexe Mahavavy-Kinkony	52%	76%	75%	Ankarafantsika	67%	78%	80%
	Baseline METT Scores	FY21 METT Scores	FY22 METT Scores																									
Baie de Baly	78%	79%	79%																									
Bombetoka	20%	58%	65%																									
Antrema	77%	85.3%	87%																									
Complexe Mahavavy-Kinkony	52%	76%	75%																									
Ankarafantsika	67%	78%	80%																									
Outcome indicator 1.2.: Amount of long-term financing available annually for the 5 targeted PAs	USD 137,000 additional funding available annually for the 5 targeted PAs	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> <p>Revenue generated by the USD 4.5 million is on schedule to begin in January 2023. This funding will be in addition to the existing allocation from the FAPBM.</p> <p>CI Global Conservation Fund (GCF) works to maintain an oversight of FAPBM and thus monitoring the disbursement of funds made. Overall, CI GCF</p>																								

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
				reported that there have been no red flags and the investment performance has been performing well.
Outcome indicator 1.2.: Financing gap (expressed as % of total need defined in management plans) of the 5 targeted PAs during 2022-2025	Financing gap for 2022-2025 reduced to 25 % of total need as defined in management plans	0	IS	<p>FAPBM has initiated work on fundraising activities in January 2022. FAPBM plans to add Bombetoka in 2023. FAPBM has received an endowment from KfW on December 2021 of USD 51.6 million. As a result, all 5 PAs will receive an increase in funding starting 2023.</p> <p>The project showed strong progress towards improving financial sustainability of 5 targeted PAs, with no challenges reported. The MTR team found that despite some early delays in signing an agreement with FAPBM, future financing mechanisms are on track to generate revenue beginning in January 2023. At the output level, CI-GEF reported that FAPBM will also initiate work on fundraising activities (Activity 1.2.3.1) in January 2022.</p>

COMPONENT 1 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND
S	The project continues to make progress in increasing the average METT score for the 5 Protected Areas (FY22 increase is 18%. While the two outcome indicators linked to the protected area financing are still unchanged, it is recognized that these indicators will change in 2023 due to the recognition of the revenue generated from the USD 4.5M investment and an increase in funding from FAPBM in 2023 due to their successful fundraising efforts. CI will continue to monitor FAPBM in 2023.	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	8%	IS	<p>A group of consultants was hired on February 2022 to conduct the household survey. The project baseline was 72% of households (total of households surveyed: 395), self-reporting as food insecure. The end of project target will be 52% , i.e. 20% reduction in the number of households reporting that they are food insecure. The end of year status is 64% i.e. 8% reduction in the number of households reporting that they are food insecure.</p> <p>According to the results of the household survey conducted in March 2022, the households interviewed did not speak directly about food insecurity. Households interviewed in Baie de Baly, for example, responded that market gardening has already had a direct impact on their food situation.</p> <p>In Mahavavy-Kinkony, beneficiaries of the Improved Rice System SRA and marketing gardening said that the activities provided by the GEF 6 project have strengthened the capacity of beneficiaries to be food self-sufficient throughout the year. On the other hand, beneficiaries of market gardening in one locality mentioned the low price of market garden crops on the market. Beneficiaries have to turn to other agricultural or non-agricultural activities and often face hunger periods from March to May.</p> <p>Other beneficiaries of SRA, still in Mahavavy-Kinkony, mentioned the problem of the dam built by another project, which is not very effective because it is still difficult to control the management of water and there is also the silting of rice fields. The difficulties encountered in rice production make the beneficiaries vulnerable and make it very difficult to live during the lean season from February to June. During this period, the beneficiaries only have resources from the sale of handicrafts and the salaries of patrols.</p> <p>For Bombetoka and Ankarafantsika, the food insecurity is mostly felt from February to April. For the two PA, impacts on food security result from the advantages households perceived from both components 1 and 2 . Yet, activities developed under GEF 6 project did not contribute that much to it for the following reasons: Bombetoka Silk: still in practical training stages and search for market;</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
				Beekeeping of Ankarafantsika: yield is decreasing as results of repetitive forest fires favoring the development of parasites that harm the bees. Raffia crafting has encountered difficulties in commercialization of the products due to COVID-19.
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	3.5 months	IS	The baseline for the median number of months households are food insecure is 4 months. The indicator was collected during the household survey 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 sustainable production initiatives supported by the Project	20%	IS	<p>The project baseline of household income was MGA 1,297,465. The end of project target is 15% increase in average annual household income i.e MGA1,492, 084. The end of year status is 20% increase i.e. MGA 1,618,819.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Baie de Baly, only market gardening generated additional income for participating households, with an average income of 78,400Ar. The income contributes to the purchase of rice during the lean season, school fees for children, unexpected expenses such as medicines, and the purchase of kitchen utensils. The other two activities, SRA and Apiculture, have not yet generated any income. - In Mahavavy-Kinkony, onion production is new to the local population and has become a significant source of income for the beneficiaries. Beneficiaries of SRA and market gardening in some localities have been able to improve and diversify their production and have the capacity to sell part of their product to improve household income, as well as for beneficiaries of handicraft and beekeeping. - In Antrema, among the activities chosen by the communities, the sale of salt, handicrafts, SRA, and cattle rearing have generated income for the communities. - In Ankarafantsika, income-generating activities such as beekeeping and handicrafts are not yet well developed and need to be revitalized. The Livelihoods Manager developed an action plan with the Protected Area Manager to improve income-generating activities in Q1/Q2 of FY23. - In Bombetoka, In Bombetoka, for the silk, the project will seek marketing channels to sell the products of the associations.

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁶	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
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	433 ha	IS	The target surface area for each year was determined with PA managers during the planning process and were communicated to partners. Each protected area has already planned activities to achieve this target.

COMPONENT 2 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND
S	The project has made significant progress in achieving the outcome targets under Component 2. This is the first year where a decrease in the number of households reporting food insecurity, in the median number of months households are food insecure and an increase in the average annual income. It is important to highlight that the project continues to work with these households on income generating activities while exploring options for markets to ensure sustainability after the project ends. The project has also increased the number of hectares where sustainable production practices have been adopted.	Unchanged

c. Overall Project Results Rating

OVERALL PROJECT RESULTS IMPLEMENTATION RATING

OVERALL RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND ⁷
S	The project continues to make progress in all of its outcome indicators. This is the first year where the project has seen an increase in income and a slight decrease in the number of months of food insecurity from the target households. The project's request for a NCE until December 2023 was approved. With this extended period, the project should be able to achieve all its targets.	Unchanged

⁷ Rating trend: Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

d. Recommendations

CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE
1. Seek opportunities for funding for the SACs for the 2 remaining communes.	Project team	FY23
2. Continue to monitor FAPBM to ensure that the financing gap for the 5 protected areas is reduced by the end of the project.	CI-GEF	FY23

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

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 FY22 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 becomes less dependent on political influence.	Civil society participated in several activities within the protected areas, such as patrols (Mixed brigades), awareness-raising, capacity building, and sustainable production.	IS	<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>In addition, projects like EDEN project and PAGE GIZ have supported Ankarafantsika for the supply of firefighting equipment like water bags, a motorcycle pump, and tanks</p> <p>Regarding the restoration of burned areas, AKFis working with EDEN Project to restore an area of 1250ha. Patrol</p>	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 FY22 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ⁹
				activities will be carried out in the restoration areas. Communities will participate in the establishment of nurseries.			
Risk 2: Weak institutional capacities for planning, management, and governance	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 5 PAs.	Capacity of implementing partners and other stakeholders at local and regional level for planning, management, and governance will be strengthened	IS	<p>The PMU supported each implementing partner to develop the WP for FY22 during the supervision mission.</p> <p>The M&E manager has continued to work with the implementing partners on the use of datasheets, database and report development. Updating of the database with each implementing partner. The grants manager and grants coordinator supports the grantees. The livelihood manager provided technical support for the implementation of activities in Component 2.</p> <p>Additional trainings include: strengthening the capacity of managers and other actors on the texts governing Protected Areas; an implementation mission of the "Vectors of Transmission of Community Development" (VTDC) in environmental management with a view to Sustainable Development in rural areas; Strengthening the capacity of teachers in environmental education for sustainable development; and PA governance and Judicial Police Officer training carried out in Mahajanga as part of the establishment of penal chain for the environment.</p>	Substantial	Modest	Decreasing

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ⁸	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY22 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ⁹
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 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.	<p>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).</p> <p>The CI-GCF team is responsible for the assessment of investment risk.</p>	IS	<p>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.</p> <p>FAPBM has initiated work on fundraising activities in January 2022. FAPBM plans to add Bombetoka in 2023. FAPBM has received an endowment from KfW on December 2021 of USD 51,6 million. As a result, all 5 PAs will receive an increase in funding starting 2023. The Project showed strong progress towards improving financial sustainability of 5 targeted PAs, with no challenges reported. The MTR team found that despite some early delays in signing an agreement with FAPBM, future financing mechanisms are on track to generate revenue beginning in January 2023.</p>	Modest	Modest	Unchanged
Risk 4: Uncertainty due to regional government shift in priorities	The project will strengthen political commitment by supporting the regional government and	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	IS	22 /24 SACs completed. The SAC of 2 communes Antsakoia Mileka et Andranomavo in the Baie de Baly NP were not elaborated because the budget of PAGE 1/GIZ project was very limited, The PAGE2/GIZ project	Modest	Modest	Unchanged

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ⁸	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY22 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ⁹
and/or policy change	municipal plans (SRAT and SAC) by developing sustainable production systems/practices and demonstrating the value-add of integrative approaches.	<p>zoning and strategic axes for biodiversity. conservation and economic development.</p> <p>Several activities of the PAs funded by GEF- 6 contribute to the strategies and activities of the PRD and SACs .</p> <p>In addition, the representative of the Boeny Region is a member of the steering committee and participated to the third meeting of the steering committee.</p>		<p>supported the implementation of the existing SACs.</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. The representative of the GEF-6 projet, the livelihood manager attended the Regional Coordination Meeting organized by the Boeny region.</p>			
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.	Consideration of climate change in the METT tool	IS	Each PA now considers Climate Change in the planning and adapts PA management to CC, including the avoidance of carbon loss	Modest	Modest	Unchanged
Risk 6: Weak results on the	Risk Rating included during	(N/A in FY22)		The project was not impacted by COVID in FY22.	High (from FY20)	Modest	Decreasing

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ⁸	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY22 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ⁹
ground due to COVID-19	implementation: High			The project was not impacted by COVID in FY22.			

OVERALL RATING OF PROJECT RISKS	JUSTIFICATION	RISK RATING TREND ¹⁰
M	Overall, the project has been able to successfully implement risk mitigation efforts. Even though there was a slowdown in activities due to COVID-19, the project team was able to find appropriate measures to ensure that project activities were not severely impacted. As the project is entering the close-out period, it is important to continue monitoring and implementing the risk mitigation activities. CI-GEF, with the CI- Global Conservation Fund team will continue to monitor FAPBM, on market volatility and potential impact on the financial sustainability of the protected areas.	Decreasing

Recommendations

MITIGATION AND CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE
N/A	N/a	N/A

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

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

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved ESMF plans, as well as recommendations to improve the implementation of the ESMF plans, when needed. This section is divided into six parts:

- a. Progress towards complying with the CI-GEF Project Agency’s ESMF
- b. Information on Progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement
- c. Information on the progress towards achieving gender sensitive measures/targets
- d. Lessons learned and Knowledge Management products developed and disseminated
- e. Overall Project ESMF Implementation Rating
- f. Recommendations

a. Progress towards complying with the CI-GEF Project Agency’s ESMF

MINIMUM ESMF INDICATORS	PROJECT TARGET	END OF YEAR STATUS	CUMULATIVE STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ¹¹	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
ACCOUNTABILITY AND GRIEVANCE MECHANISM					
1. Number of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project’s Accountability and Grievance Mechanism	Not established	0	0	IS	<p>Concerning the AGM, the MTR team recommends increased outreach and awareness activities so that project beneficiaries are more aware of existing grievances mechanisms.</p> <p>The hiring of the group of consultants who will work on AGM started last year. The Association Jary was selected after the evaluation. The association has conducted the visit in the 5 PAs since May 16, 2022.</p> <p>According to the results, very few written complaints were recorded. More than 90% of the complaints are transmitted orally (verbally) during sensitizations (quarterly), meetings (GA), site agent visits (monthly) and by telephone (focal point number known by the beneficiaries). Complainants are afraid</p>

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

					<p>to write down the complaints (accusing or making a complaint against the project or the focal point). The fact of writing constitutes, according to the respondents' own conviction, a denunciation of the person who wrote it.</p> <p>The Action Plan for FY23 developed so that project beneficiaries are more aware of existing grievances mechanisms and also to facilitate the implementation in the field. The Action Plan will be discussed with protected area managers and AGM Focal Points.</p>
2. Percentage of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism that have been resolved	100%	N/A (0 received)		IS	Most of the grievances are not eligible under the GEF-6 project. They are not really grievances related to meeting the GEF minimum standards for environmental and social safeguards and gender policy
GENDER MAINSTREAMING					
1. Number of men and women that participated in project activities (e.g. meetings, workshops, consultations)	Men 1300 Women 1300	FY22 Q1 (Jul -Sept 2021): 1044M and 816 W FY22 Q2 (Oct -Dec 2021): 486 M and 304 W FY22 Q3 (Jan-Mar 2022): 158 M and 167 W FY22 Q4 (Avril 2022-Juin 2022): 582M and 240W For a total of FY22: 2317 (1330M, 987W)	FY20+FY21+FY22 = 3750 (2086M, 1664W)	IS	It was found that the number of women and men who participated in trainings on income-generating activities and meetings were almost the same in FY22.
2. Number of men and women that received benefits (e.g.	Men 1300 Women 1300	FY22 Q1 (Jul -Sept 2021): 457 M and 236 W FY22 Q2 (Oct -Dec 2021): 885 M and 408 W	FY20+FY21+FY22 = 2671 (1435 M, 1236 W)	IS	Most beneficiaries are men because they participated in ecological monitoring and patrols, beekeeping, fisheries, SRA

employment, income generating activities, training, access to natural resources, land tenure or resource rights, equipment, leadership roles) from the project		FY22 Q3 (Jan -Mar 2022): 819 M and 358 W FY22 Q4 (Apr-June 2022): 353 M and 110 W For a total of FY22: 1830: 1074 M, 756 W			
3. 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 relevant projects)	5 management plans	01		0	<p>The development of the Management Plan and the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) of the Bombetoka (71,943 ha) finalized. The validation of the documents at the regional and national completed in Q4 FY22.</p> <p>The Environmental and Social Management Plan has considered the gender aspect for the Optimization of Positive Impacts. As potential impacts, there is the progressive acquisition of gender by the local local population. As an optimization, implication of vulnerable groups in the decision-making mechanism at the the NAP and peripheral zone.</p> <p>In the social safeguard plan, for the improvement of the basketry sector, as indicators, 100% of the women who practice basketry are trained and Women dominate the use of modern materials.</p>
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT					
1. Number of government agencies, civil society organizations, private sector, indigenous peoples and	10 government Agencies/2000 Households/03 private Sectors/07 (PA managers, CI, FAPBM)/02 universities/	FY22 Q1 (Jul -Sept 2021): Government agencies: 1 New government agency Decentralized Territorial Collectivities: 0 New CSO: 4 New CSO Private sector: 0 Number of households: 859	FY20+FY21+Fy22 = Government agencies: 26 Decentralized Territorial Collectivities: 11 CSO: 58	IS	The stakeholders involved in Year 1 and 2 have continued to participate in the implementation of the project in Year 3.

<p>other stakeholder groups that have been involved in the project implementation phase on an annual basis</p>	<p>02 other partners</p>	<p>FY22 Q2 (October – December 2021): Government agencies: 0 New government agency Decentralized Territorial Collectivities: 0 New CSO: 1 New CSO Private sector: 0 Number of households: 636</p> <p>FY22 Q3 (January – March 2022): Government agencies: 1 New government agencies Decentralized Territorial Collectivities: 0 New CSO: 0 New Private sector: 0 New Number of households: 567</p> <p>FY22 Q4 (Apr-June 2022) Government agencies: 1 New government agencies Decentralized Territorial Collectivities: 1 New CSO: 9 News Private sector: 4 New Number of households: 463</p> <p>Total number for the FY 23:</p> <p>Government agencies: 3 new government agency Decentralized Territorial Collectivities: 1 new CSO: 14 new CSO Private sector: 4 new Number of households: 1,445</p>	<p>Private sector: 11 Number of household: 2,471</p>		
--	--------------------------	---	---	--	--

<p>2. Number persons (sex disaggregated) that have been involved in project implementation phase (on an annual basis)</p>	<p>1300 female 1300 male</p>	<p>FY22 Q1 (Jul -Sept 2021): 1151 M and 628 W FY22 Q2 (Oct -Dec 2021): 1218 M and 391 W FY22 Q3 (Jan- Mar 2022): 823 M and 418 W FY22 Q4 (Apr-June 2022): 592 M and 232 W</p> <p>For a total of FY22: 2,531 (1481 M and 1,050 W)</p>	<p>FY20+FY21+Fy22= 3,988 (2,243M; 1745W)</p>	<p>IS</p>	<p>Even though the target has been achieved, this number is expected to increase because during FY23 several activities will be undertaken, especially in component 2.</p> <p>Those persons were involved in ecological monitoring, establishment and maintain firewalls, conduct patrols, forest restoration, communication and awareness raising, demarcation of the parks and maintenance of the existing park boundary, monitoring of the management plan implementation and activities within each PA, trainings of PA managers on PA legislation, SMART monitoring, application of METT, monitoring of PA managers, meetings of governance structure, capacity building of teachers and communities on education for sustainable development, promotion of income generating activities, development of Raphia, beekeeping, salt, fisheries bovine and poultry breeding sectors.</p>
<p>3. Number of engagement (e.g. meeting, workshops, consultations) with stakeholders during the project implementation phase (on an annual basis)</p>	<p>05</p>	<p>FY22 Q1 (July -September 2021): Capacity building/Training: 20 Awareness raising: 11 Meeting: 5 Festival: 1</p> <p>FY22 Q2 (October -December 2021): Capacity building/Training: 8 Meeting: 3 Awareness raising: 3</p> <p>FY22 Q3 (Jan- March 2022): Capacity building/Training: 4 Awareness raising: 1 Meeting: 2</p> <p>FY22 Q4 (April 2022- June 2022):</p>	<p>FY20+FY21+Fy22= Consultation: 2 Capacity Building/training: 91 Awareness raising:31 Meeting:27 Exchange visit:5 Workshops: 5 Socio eco survey: 1 Festival:1</p>	<p>IS</p>	<p>Even though the target has been achieved, this number is expected to increase because during FY23 several meetings, workshops, consultations with stakeholders will be undertaken, especially in component 2.</p> <p>Training on METT, ecological monitoring, SRA, CUMA, beekeeping, handcrafts, sustainable development and charcoal production were conducted. Awareness raising and sensibilization on firefighting and mangrove protection and. finally, meetings of COSAP, Orientation and Monitoring Committee conducted during FY22</p>

		Capacity building/Training: 8 Awareness raising: 4 Socioeconomic survey: 5 For a total of FY22 Capacity building: 40 Awareness raising: 19 Meeting: 15 Festival: 1			

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, 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. Government agencies, Decentralized Territorial Collectivities and Civil society and private sector are also stakeholders. The achievement of the project targets depends on the support and participation of these different stakeholders. The same stakeholders in Year 1 and Year 2 have been involved in the project implementation in Year 3. 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 almost the same as the number of women. ..

FY22 Q1 (Jul -Sept 2021): 1151 M and 628 W (65:35)

FY22 Q2 (Oct -Dec 2021): 1218 M and 391 W (75:25)

FY22 Q3 (Jan- Mar 2022): 823 M and 418 W (65:35)

FY22 Q4 (Apr-June 2022): 592 M and 232 W

For a total of FY22: 2,531 (1481M and 1,050 W)

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.

Number of engagement (e.g. meeting, workshops, consultations) with stakeholders during the FY22: 40 Capacity buildings/trainings, 19 meetings, 15 awareness raising and 1 Festival.

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

All activities anticipated by the GMP were implemented.

At the end of FY22:

1. Number of men and women that participated in project activities (meetings, workshops, and consultations with local persons):

FY22 Q1 (Jul -Sept 2021): 1044M and 816 W

FY22 Q2 (Oct -Dec 2021): 486 M and 304 W

FY22 Q3 (Jan-Mar 2022): 158 M and 167 W

FY22 Q4 (Avril 2021-Juin 2022): 582M and 240W

For a total of FY22: 2317 (1330M, 987W)

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:

FY22 Q1 (Jul -Sept 2021): 457 M and 236 W

FY22 Q2 (Oct -Dec 2021): 885 M and 408 W

FY22 Q3 (Jan -Mar 2022): 819 M and 358 W

FY22 Q4 (Apr-June 2022): 353 M and 110 W

For a total of FY22: 1830 (1074 M, 756 W)

Challenges faced by the project to implementing GMP as initially proposed:

COVID-19 restrictions disproportionately impacted women's participation and income generation. Livelihood activities were more affected than conservation activities, which mostly involves men in these PAs. For example, women handicraft producers in the Ankarafantsika PA were unable to sell their products as the markets were closed and tourism was restricted on account of COVID-19 limitations.

Women were also reported as having little to no representation at the decision-making levels. For example, in Ankarafantsika, members of the Local Committees of Parks are all men; similarly in Complex Mahavavy Kinkony, the members of the Community-Based Resources Natural Management Tambahra are also all men. Furthermore, women were not involved in conservation activities as implementing partners deemed patrolling activities to be physically intensive and thus most suitable for men. Women

expressed willingness to participate in patrolling activities as they could then be eligible to receive compensation. Recommendations have been issued to continue advancing gender sensitive targets.

Unintended outcomes

However, beyond the challenges faced by COVID-19 restrictions, livelihood activities are more likely to continue beyond the end of the project as activities such as basket weaving, rice cultivation, market gardening etc. have a strong chance of being sustainable. Moreover, impact of livelihood activities is more tangible as it generates income and develops new skills for the project beneficiaries. Women can benefit from the promotion of livelihood activities supported by the project, which will significantly contribute to women's financial and economic empowerment.

Recommendations for the next FY to continue advancing towards gender sensitive targets:

- Promote the participation of women in the realization of patrols. Establish a 'short circuit' that allows women to participate in patrols (just for one day and they can return)
- Seek opportunities to sell raffia and silk products, and ensure that the payment is immediate (to a national or international reseller)
- Promote the participation of women in the beekeeping sector. During the first two years, it was mostly men who participated in this activity. During the field surveys, some women wanted to participate in this activity. They will benefit from training and the necessary technical support.

d. Lessons learned and Knowledge Management products¹² developed and disseminated

AGM

The main results show that each site has a focal point who has been appointed. The level of progress/achievements varies from site to site. Observations show that there is no uniformity in the appointment of focal points at each site. In this sense, the focal point is an independent external person who is not a member of MNP for the BBL and AKF sites. Conversely, the focal point belongs to the staff within the management body for the other three sites (Antrema, CMK, BOMBETOKA). It was found that it would be better if the Focal Point belongs to the staff within the management body to facilitate the organization of activities.

Posters

The posters were not visible at the PA managers' office. Approximately 1% of the people surveyed said they had seen and read the poster. More than 90% of the respondents (beneficiaries) do not know the content and message of the posters (have not read them). The main problem/concern is the fact that there were no sufficient sensitization sessions with the beneficiaries. At the beginning of the project, Managers of Protected Areas recommended spaces such as municipalities, offices of the Fokontany, Managers' office.

Grievance book:

There is no uniform grievance book whereas there is a form already established. The grievance book in the hands of the actors is a simple unstructured book (no heading, logo...). Normally, it is the FPs who should hold the notebooks. The main finding is that none of the focal points (sites) have used the form.

Grievances:

Very few written complaints have been recorded. See summary below:

¹² Knowledge Products are those that are both intended to transmit knowledge but at the same time enable action by their audiences. For example, a lessons learned report, compilation of good practices and recommendations, etc.

Seven grievances were received and screened. The 7 received were not determined to be eligible and don't need to resolve. More than 90% of the complaints are transmitted orally by the people concerned during sensitizations (quarterly), meetings, site agent visits (monthly) and by telephone (focal point number known by the beneficiaries). Most of the grievances are not eligible for the GEF-6 Project. No written report sent to the CI. +90% of complaints are oral due to: (a) fear of generating social conflict prevents complainants from filing their grievances and/or (b) high rate of people not knowing how to write and read (written complaints are very few because the majority of the population cannot write). However, there are complaints that are deemed unfounded.

The Action Plan for FY23 developed so that project beneficiaries are more aware of existing grievances mechanisms and also to facilitate the implementation in the field. The Action Plan will be discussed with protected area managers and AGM Focal Points.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

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. 40 Capacity buildings/trainings, 19 meetings, 15 awareness raising and 1 Festival. New government agencies, civil society organizations, private sector, indigenous peoples and other stakeholder groups have been involved in the project implementation.

GENDER

Women were not involved in conservation activities as implementing partners deemed patrolling activities to be physically intensive and thus most suitable for men. Women expressed willingness to participate in patrolling activities as they could then be eligible to receive compensation. However, beyond the challenges faced by COVID-19 restrictions, livelihood activities are more likely to continue beyond the end of the project as activities such as basket weaving, rice cultivation, market gardening etc. have a strong chance of being sustainable. Women can benefit from the promotion of livelihood activities supported by the project, which will significantly contribute to women's financial and economic empowerment.

Recommendations for the next FY to continue advancing towards gender sensitive targets:

Promote the participation of women in the realization of patrols.

Establish a 'short circuit' that allows women to participate in patrols (just for one day and they can return)

Search for an opportunity to sell raffia and silk products, and make sure that the payment is immediate (to a national or international reseller)

Promote the participation of women in the beekeeping sector

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.

Number of persons (sex-disaggregated) that participated in project activities, it was found that the number of women is about the same as the men.

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, it was found that the number of men is higher than women. The project has worked on recommendation to continue advancing on the gender sensitive targets.

The project has started to develop lessons learned briefs that could be of interest to the wider PA community in Madagascar, based on the experiences during the implementation of the project. 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 was completed in FY22 Q2 projetboeny-gef6.mg. The general objective is to make the shared and updated data for learning and knowledge management available and accessible to users.

e. Overall Project ESMF Implementation Rating

SUMMARY: PROJECT ESMF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY TYPE OF PLAN

ESMF PLAN REQUIRED BY THE PROJECT (delete those not applicable)	CURRENT FY22 IMPLEMENTATION RATING	RATING TREND
Accountability and Grievance Mechanism	MS	Decreasing
Gender Mainstreaming Plan (GMP)	MS	Decreasing
Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)	HS	Increasing

OVERALL PROJECT ESMF IMPLEMENTATION RATING

RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND
MS	The project made an effort to diagnose their AGM and identify weaknesses and opportunities for improvement. Nevertheless, the PIR doesn't provide evidence on actions taken during this FY, but mostly actions projected for the next FY. The project team had struggle to provide exact data on grievances, the percentage of them that were eligible and how they have dealt with ineligible ones. On the GMP front, the project has underachieved on the sex-disaggregated targets (in terms of proportion of women participating and benefiting from the project), but in terms of numbers, the project is performing well. Regarding the last indicator of the GMP: "3. Number of strategies, plans (e.g. management plans and land use plans) and policies derived from the project that include gender considerations" the target is 5, but the project clarified that they are not working on any strategies or plans that include gender considerations. This suggests an alert as the project might not be able to achieve this target. Finally, the project has exceeded all the targets set for the SEP.	Decreasing

f. Recommendations

CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project must engage women interested in participating in patrols in workshops and focus groups to determine which are the main challenges to engage in this activity, and their differentiated needs to participate from this activity. The project has already identified an alternative of designing a shorter route, but further validation and feedback from the voices of interested women will increase the chances of success. 	Project Management Unit (PMU)	December 2023
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to promote gender equality in the livelihood activities (that will more intensely take place now that Covid 19 measures were flexibilized), it is important that all implementing partners receive awareness raising and training on how to mainstream gender, and that they have knowledge of practical tools to promote women's participation. 	PMU	December 2023
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project team needs to make sure that all weaknesses identified in the diagnosis of the AGM are addressed by the FY AGM Plan, and should closely monitor that all proposed actions are being implemented. 	PMU	June 2023

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 3, several activities were carried out within the knowledge management framework.

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

- The project has started to develop lessons learned briefs that could be of interest to the wider PA community in Madagascar, based on the experiences during the implementation of the project. 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. Lessons learned and document sharing with stakeholders will be presented during the close out workshop.
- The creation of the website projetboeny-gef6.mg for the project was completed in FY22 Q2. The general objective is to make the shared and updated data for learning and knowledge management available and accessible to users.

Improve stakeholder knowledge: Training workshops, festival, awareness raising sessions and meetings are additional opportunities to share experiences in PA management and improve stakeholder knowledge.

- The DAPRNE conducted training workshops in FY22 to improve stakeholder knowledge on essential PA legislation (the Code des Aires Protegees, COAP), on management tools, and to standardize the monitoring of species and threats using new technologies and approaches, SMART monitoring tools. There is some positive feedback from Protected Area managers and other stakeholders. The training courses on the Code of Protected Areas were very useful for them because they strengthened their capacity related to the management of protected areas, reminded regional actors of the responsibility chart and their roles in Protected area management. It was also an opportunity to discuss the problems encountered by managers and to find solutions together. The training workshop on SMART was also very useful for Protected area managers because they strengthened their capacity for the collection, processing and reporting of data to improve the quality of protection and promote transparency and good governance. During the coordination meeting, protected area managers asked if it is possible to organize another training workshops, Concerning the impact on future strategy, the two trainings contributed to the improvement of Protected areas management especially regarding the application of the law to crimes and offences and the governance.
- Angonoky festivals: Mass awareness was carried out during the celebration of ANGONOKY Festival during the month of August 2021. Two Festivals in the Fokontany of Baly and Anjiamoloto were held. The theme of this celebration was "recognition of the collaboration of the fokonolona" for 38 villages in both Fokontany and other targets which are the 10 schools of the peripheric villages.
- Participation of the GEF-6 project in the International Mangrove Day in July 2021 to present the project's activities and realizations in the 5 target protected areas, and for the project visibility. International Magrove Day was celebrated in Bombetoka, one of the targeted Protected Areas.
- The DIREDD carried out OPJ training in Mahajanga as part of the establishment of penal chain for the environment.

- The DPRIDD carried out a training on environmental management with a view to Sustainable Development in rural areas to the "Vectors of Transmission of Community Development" (VTDC). In addition, the DPRIDD strengthened also the capacity of teachers on environmental education for sustainable development

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
6. Trainings on finance management and procedures have been conducted for the three directorates of the Ministry of the Environment. The three directorates (DAPRNE, DIREDD, DPRIDDD) of the MEDD are not typically used to project financial management and accountancy. This led to a delay in the submission of the financial report and therefore a delay in the release of funds for the implementation of activities. Additional training has been carried out to strengthen their abilities regarding managing the funds and using different financial tools and documents (accounting documents, financial report framework). In addition, it was recommended that they submit their accounting documentation while submitting their financial report to assure that both give accurate views of the transactions. The financial audit of the project subgrantees for fiscal year 20 and fiscal year 21 has been conducted by the QUALEX audit firm. The auditors made controls at grantees level in Antananarivo and Mahajanga regions. Feedback meetings have been held with the subgrantees. And the final audit reports are available and shared to the subgrantees.
7. Project institutional arrangements, including project governance
8. Capacity building

The project aims at improving livelihoods while promoting subsistence production approaches that help conserve or sustainably use key biodiversity. Activities to reduce food insecurity and increase household incomes have been prioritized during project planning. The project targeted households where occupants rely highly on natural resources for their livelihoods. Priorities identified during the PPG stage by local communities and PA managers for support differ in each of the PAs but include nature-based businesses providing Raphia products (baskets, hats etc.), ecotourism, bee-keeping and agricultural products. During FY22, 40 Capacity buildings/trainings organized by the executing partners.

For component 1,

- Training workshops to improve stakeholder knowledge on essential PA legislation (the Code des Aires Protegees, COAP), on management tools, and SMART monitoring tools carried out by DAPRNE,
- Training on environmental management to the "Vectors of Transmission of Community Development" (VTDC) and strengthening the capacity of teachers on environmental education for sustainable development carried out by DPRIDD,
- Training on the participatory ecological monitoring conducted by the Protected Area managers
- **Training on the use of drones in Antrema**
- Training of OPJ in Mahajanga as part of the establishment of penal chain for the environment

For Component 2:

- Training on SRA,
- Training on market gardening
- Training on beekeeping
- Training on silk value chain
- Training on raffia handicrafts

The results of the household survey carried out in March 2022 revealed that communities were still asking for capacity building especially in income generating activities such as beekeeping, market gardening.

9. Implementation of safeguard policies, including gender mainstreaming, accountability and grievance mechanisms, stakeholder consultations (cf. Section IV/d)
10. Factors that improve likelihood of long term sustainability of project impacts
11. Factors that encourage replication, including outreach, dissemination of lessons learned, and communications strategies

SECTION VI: PROJECT GEOCODING

This section of the PIR documents the precise and specific geographic location(s) of activities supported by GEF investments based on information provided in the Project Document. The following information should be contained in this section:

- a. Geo Location Information of Project Location(s) for the current fiscal year
- b. Project Map and Coordinates from Project Document

Geo Location Information of Project Location(s) for the current fiscal year (add additional columns as needed)

Geo Location Information	Location No. 1	Location No. 2	Location No. 3	Location No. 4	Location No.5
CLASSIFICATION <i>Indicate whether the site is new or already existing in the previous PIR or indicate whether the site is included at CEO Endorsement/Approval or not. Please add more columns for projects with more than 3 locations.</i>	Ankarafantsika is included at CEO endorsement	Baie de Baly is included at CEO endorsement	Bombetoka is included at CEO endorsement	Antrema is included at CEO endorsement	Mahavavy-Kinkony Complex included at CEO endorsement
Note: Provide justification if the location is a new site in this line					

GEO NAME ID <i>Provide the location's Geo Name ID in a numerical format. IDs are available in the GeoNames' geographical database covering all countries and containing millions of placenames with free access at: http://www.geonames.org.</i>	1073208	7932414	1065672	11934786	Not available
LOCATION NAME <i>Name of the geographic locations in which the activity is taking place. In instance when a GeoNames ID is provided above, the name of the said ID should be reflected. Otherwise, the location name provided will be considered as an exact location.</i>	Ankarafantsika	Baie de Baly	Bombetoka	Antrema	Mahavavy-Kinkony
LATITUDE <i>Provide locations in Decimal Degrees WGS84 format, a notation expressing geographic coordinates as decimal fractions of a degree. Include at least four decimal points.</i>	-16.15	-16.08333	-15.83333	-15.74833	-16.1386
LONGITUDE <i>Provide locations in Decimal Degrees WGS84 format, a notation expressing geographic coordinates as decimal fractions of a degree. Include at least four decimal points.</i>	47.03333	45.23333	46.28333	46.16797	45.8472
LOCATION DESCRIPTION <i>(Optional field) Text description that qualifies in a sentence or so the location in which an activity is taking place, such as for example "mini-grid energy system" or "park ranger site".</i>					
ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION <i>(Optional field) Text description that qualifies in a sentence or so the activity taking place at the location, for example, "Installing a mini-grid energy system".</i>					

Please provide a justification regarding changes in location during implementation. Justifications should also be provided in the event the geographic location of key project activities cannot be provided at CEO Endorsement/Approval stage.

(Geo Name ID: Location Name)

Justification:



Project Map and Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and image map where the project interventions took place. If available, please provide attachments as appropriate such as in the case of locations presented along geometric shapes in popular formats like shapefiles, KML and GeoJSON.

(Geo Name ID: Location Name)

Map:

A large, empty rectangular box with a black border, intended for a map or image showing project intervention locations.

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:** 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 ¹³	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
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	Five PAs have their Management Plan consistent with the BOENY SRAT and take into account the SACs of the communes bordering the protected areas,	CA	The Management Plan and the ESMP) of the Bombetoka (71,943 ha) were validated at Regional and National level.
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 and one management plan validated	CA	The management plans of four protected areas have been implemented since the beginning of the project and the management plan of Bombetoka validated in July 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 Bombetoka Beleboka PA completed.	IS	2 protected areas supported governance structures, Complexe Mahavavy-Kinkony and Baie de Baly. Trainings on PA governance for community co-manager completed for Complexe mahavavy-Kinkony. Meeting with the COS at district level and Regional level completed. Management structure of Bombetoka in place.
Outcome 1.2 Improved financial sustainability of 5 targeted PAs				

¹³ O= Overdue; D= Delayed; NS= Not started on schedule; IS= Under implementation on schedule; and CA= Completed/Achieved

<p>Output Indicator 1.2.1: <i>Amount contributed to the capital of FAPBM through the Project</i></p>	<p>USD 4.5 million</p>	<p>USD 4.5 million</p>	<p>IS</p>	<p>The signature of the grant agreement between CI and Madagascar Biodiversity Fund took place on November 24, 2020. The funds were added to the portfolio and managed according to the investment policy since January 2021.</p>
<p>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></p>	<p>USD 137,000 additional annually from Year 3</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>IS</p>	<p>The revenue generated from the USD 4.5 million, estimated at approximately USD 137,000 per year, is on schedule to begin in January 2023. This funding will be in addition to the existing allocation from the FAPBM.</p>
<p>Output Indicator 1.2.3: <i>Number of funding requests submitted to potential donors</i></p>	<p>3 funding requests.</p>	<p>KfW contribution were to the portfolio and managed according to the investment policy since January 2022.</p>	<p>IS</p>	<p><u>Mobilization of international funding :</u></p> <p>Preparation and launch of the campaign and roadshow for the IUCN Congress in Marseille in September 2021.</p> <p><u>Mobilization of local development programs operating in Madagascar:</u></p> <p>Preliminary identification of potential donors: CASEF, PADAP, CEPF, DEFIS, PIC, PROSPERER, etc</p> <p>FAPBM received an endowment from KfW on December 2021 of USD 51,6 million.</p>

Output Indicator 1.2.4: <i>Number of donor databases developed</i>	Number of donor databases developed	0	D	Potential donor's database has been developed with: <table border="1" data-bbox="1591 240 1992 345"> <tr> <td>Philanthropic foundations</td> <td>17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Global initiatives funds</td> <td>34</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Multilatéral fund</td> <td>6</td> </tr> </table>	Philanthropic foundations	17	Global initiatives funds	34	Multilatéral fund	6
Philanthropic foundations	17									
Global initiatives funds	34									
Multilatéral fund	6									
Outcome 2.1 Key local communities around targeted PAs have adopted sustainable production practices										
Output Indicator 2.1.1: <i>Number of sustainable production initiatives supported to improve livelihoods</i>	16 livelihood initiatives	14 livelihood initiatives	IS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intensive rice cultivation 2. Market gardening 3. Beekeeping 4. Irrigated Rice cultivation 5. Raphia handcrafts 6. Planting of fruit trees 7. Green charcoal 8. Silk 9. Ecotourism 10. Fisheries 11. Restocking of lakes 12. Salt 13. Bovine breeding 14. Poultry breeding 15. Irrigated rice growing (pending) 16. Goat rearing (pending) 						

<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 , FY1 & FY22: 1,840 households (913 M, 927W)</p>	<p>IS</p>	<p>Cumulative status AKF: 503 households (397M, 106W)</p> <p>FY22 : 138 households (96M, 42W)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 327 households benefitted from green charcoal production project • 19 households benefitted from craft project • 94 households benefitted from beekeeping project • 42 Households benefitted from fruit trees project • 28 Households benefitted from market gardening project <p>Cumulative status Antrema: 255 households (166M, 89W)</p> <p>FY22: 151 households (112M, 39W)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 beneficiary of tourist circuits • 1 household benefitted from bovine sector • 43 households benefitted from the poultry farming sector • 116 households benefitted from the fishing industry • 20 households benefitted from the salt sector • 35 basketry beneficiaries (XX households benefitted from Raphia activities) <p>Cumulative status BBL : 648(164M, 484W)</p> <p>FY22 563(164M, 399W)</p>
--	--	---	-----------	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 68 households benefited from beekeeping • 271 households benefited from rain-fed rice cultivation • 294 households benefited from vegetable farming <p>Cumulative status BOMBETOKA : 78 households (5M, 73W) FY22 27 households (4M,23W)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 78 households from silk industry <p>Cumulative status of Complexe Mahavavy-Kinkony: 356 households (181M, 175W)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 53 households benefited from beekeeping activities • 137 households benefited from activities in improved rice-growing system (SRA) • 106 households, benefited from activities in various market gardening activities • 63 households benefited 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Beekeeping: CMK, AKF, ANTREMA 2. Raphia handcrafts:CMK, AKF, ANTREMA 3. Green charcoal:AKF <p>UGP CI achieved the analysis of these three value chains in 2020; action plans were developed and implemented by each partner.</p> <p>BEEKEEPING: Supports to beneficiaries consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kit of hives donations • theoretical and practical training • the BEE: the bee biology; a colony of bees; hives: structure and types; enemies and methods of controls • Apiary maintenance technique (weeding) • Maintenance of modern hives, repair of the constituent elements of the hive: (body, frame, roof) • Hive control: remove false ringworms • Honey harvesting technique (period, different stages, filtration, storage, wax making) • Follow-up and support given to beneficiaries • Monitoring and control of hives per week (verification of the size of the colony, presence or absence of
---	-----------------------	----------	-----------	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parasites, queen eggs, number of honeyed frame, condition of the alveoli) <p>HONEY PRODUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> on average this year, the 28 producers OF CMK harvested 44 liters that they were able to sell 572000 Ariary <p>RAFFIA VALUE CHAINS DEVELOPPMENT</p> <p>Consists of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Raffia forest restoration Raffia transformations to diversified handicrafts products. Tools donation: sewing machine, weaving tools Added value with other raw materials such as banana tree bark Continued Training on these techniques Marketing facilitation through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> connection with operators: CENAM, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRIES; opening of local sales points ie in KATSEPY and AMBOROVY; Participation in national and regional fairs Exchange visits <p>GREEN CHARCOAL PROMOTION BY AKF</p> <p>Consists of:</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none">❖ Training on improved techniques of charcoal production through partnership development such as GIZ❖ And direct support by the GEF 6 project on the tree plantation (ie eucalyptus, bamboo) for energy sources and other destinations and uses (lumber)
--	--	--	--	---