



## PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)

for the project:

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

**FY23**

*July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023*

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			
<b>Project Title:</b>	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity in the Northwestern Landscape (Boeny Region) – Madagascar		
<b>Country(ies):</b>	Madagascar	<b>GEF ID:</b>	9606
<b>GEF Agency(ies):</b>	Conservation International	<b>Duration In Months:</b>	55
<b>Executing Agency(ies):</b>	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	<b>Actual Implementation Start Date:</b>	06/10/2019
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Biodiversity	<b>Expected Project Completion Date:</b>	6/30/2022 NCE: 12/31/2023
<b>GEF Grant Amount:</b>	\$6,817,431	<b>Expected Financial Closure Date:</b>	06/30/2024
<b>Expected Co-financing:</b>	\$9,719,868	<b>Date of Last Steering Committee Meeting:</b>	September 16, 2022
<b>Co-financing Realized as of June 30, 2023:</b>	\$7,609,697	<b>Mid-Term Review-Planned Date:</b>	01/15/2021
<b>Date of First Disbursement:</b>	06/10/2019	<b>Mid-Term Review-Actual Date:</b>	09/01/2021
<b>Cumulative disbursement as of June 30, 2023</b>	\$6,293,262	<b>Terminal Evaluation-Planned Date:</b>	02/01/2023
<b>PIR Prepared by:</b>	Michele Andrianarisata	<b>Terminal Evaluation-Actual Date:</b>	09/01/2023
<b>CI-GEF Project Manager:</b>	Orissa Samaroo	<b>CI-GEF Finance Lead:</b>	Elizabeth Mast

Minor Amendment Categories	Minor Amendment Justification
	Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5%. Please select the box that is most applicable for FY22 and include an explanation for the minor amendment request.
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 2023
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"/>	For final PIRs only, a decrease in 10% or more of co-financing from amount in approved Project Document
Location of project activity <input type="checkbox"/>	No
Other <input type="checkbox"/>	No

### MINOR AMENDMENT RESPONSE FROM CI-GEF

Provide approval or reject minor amendment request along with a justification

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**

Key updates: The Monitoring and Evaluation Manager resigned in July 2021, and his successor was 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 grievance 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 Mahajanga (DIREDD and DELC) while the remaining 6 (six) are based in Antananarivo (DPRIDD, DAPRNE, MNP/AKF, MNP/BBL, MNHN/ANTREMA, ASITY/CMK).

**CURRENT PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS (FY23) (FINAL PIR)**

Key updates: The third meeting of the Steering Committee was held in Mahajanga on September 16, 2022. Some partners asked for No cost extension of the project from January 2023 to June 2023. ASITY completed activities on June 2022 and DELC in December 2022. The CI-GEF team, Orissa Samaroo, Charity Nalyanya, Director, Project Management and Technical Oversight, Africa, Free De Koning, Vice President, Project Development, and Impact, visited Madagascar from September 11 to 22, 2022. The objective was to carry out the technical supervision visit for the Madagascar portfolio.

This is the final PIR for the project and all activities were completed and almost all the targets achieved.

Component 1: In FY23, protected area managers implemented activities according to their approved workplans for Year 4. These activities include ecological monitoring, fire breaks/firefighting, patrols with communities, rangers, and "mixed brigades" (police/gendarme, forestry agents, local community representatives), forest restoration, 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 grantees have progressed well since July 2022 except for the DIREDD. Activities were suspended from July 2022 until December 2022 because of potential misuse of funds. There was an official investigation by the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Environment that confirmed that GEF funds/the GEF project were not involved in this allegation. DIREDD resumed its activities in January 2023 with new key persons appointed. Activities were completed by the end of the FY.

In FY23, revenue was generated from the \$4.5 million investment in 2023 and increased funding for FAPBM due to their successful fundraising funding, particularly from KfW, whose contributions were received in January 2022. As a result, all five PAs will receive an increase in funding starting in 2023. In 2022, the funding from FAPBM was \$362,195. In 2023, the funding is \$384,950. The increase of funding is \$22,755 due to KfW. The increase from the revenue generated from the \$4.5 million investment is \$144,459 in 2023. In total, the increase is \$167,214.

Component 2: In FY23, partners continued and completed 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 the value chain of sustainable products such as Raphia, beekeeping, salt, fisheries, bovine, poultry breeding and silk sectors. The purchase of materials as In-Kind Grants for the grantees started in January 2021 and continued in FY23.

The PMU team supported the finalization of the workplan and budget FY23 of Ankarafantsika, Antrema, Baie de Baly, Bombetoka, DIREDD, DAPRNE and DPRIDD and conducted supervision missions/provided technical and financial supports to our partners

regularly. The contract with ASITY Madagasikara, which is the manager of the Mahavavy Kinkony Complex Protected Area, was scheduled for renewal in June 2022.

**Safeguards:** After the plan drawn up by the Grievance Mechanism consultant, it was agreed with the park managers that.

- Each meeting should be preceded by an awareness campaign concerning the AGM mechanism.
- Verbal complaints raised during each meeting will be noted in minutes.
- In addition to the complaint books already in place, the AGM datasheet is placed on the ground to facilitate the accessibility of the beneficiaries to the complaint's mechanism.
- A new series of AGM posters were displayed on the field.
- The database is established and updated monthly.

**Household survey:** The Data Collection Team (DCT) conducted field surveys to collect data on the indicators to measure the impacts of the GEF-6 project at the end of the project (July 2023), 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. The survey was conducted around the 5 protected areas supported by the project and at the rural commune of Katsepy which is the intervention zone of the DPRIDDD (Intervention outside protected areas).

**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 FY22. The intervention was carried out in Ankarafantsika, DIREDD Boeny Betsiboka (Mahajanga), DELC (Mahajanga), Baie de Baly (Soalala), DAPRNE, DPRIDD, MNHN (Antananarivo). In general, the expenses statements present fairly the financial position of the 8 subgrantees in accordance with the project grant agreements. The final audit reports are available.

### SUMMARY: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS

PROJECT PART	PRIOR FY22 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	CURRENT FY23 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING <sup>1</sup>	RATING TREND <sup>2</sup>
OBJECTIVE	S	HS	Increasing
COMPONENTS AND OUTCOMES	S	HS	Increasing
ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS	MS	S	Increasing

### PROJECT RISK RATING<sup>3</sup>

RISKS	M	L	Decreasing
-------	---	---	------------

<sup>1</sup> **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

<sup>2</sup> **Rating trend:** Improving, Unchanged, or Decreasing

<sup>3</sup> **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.

<b>PROJECT OBJECTIVE:</b>	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 <sup>4</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION								
Indicator a: 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	<b>CA</b>	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 Bombetoka (71,943 ha) were validated at National level on August 24, 2022. The completion of these documents secured the decree of definitive creation of Bombetoka.								
Indicator b: Number of protected areas in the northwestern landscape that improve their management effectiveness (5)	5 Protected Areas	<b>CA</b>	<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. 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%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 30%;"></th> <th style="width: 15%;">Baseline METT Scores</th> <th style="width: 15%;">2021 METT Scores</th> <th style="width: 15%;">2022 METT Scores (final)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Baie de Baly</td> <td style="text-align: center;">78</td> <td style="text-align: center;">79</td> <td style="text-align: center;">79</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Baseline METT Scores	2021 METT Scores	2022 METT Scores (final)	Baie de Baly	78	79	79
	Baseline METT Scores	2021 METT Scores	2022 METT Scores (final)								
Baie de Baly	78	79	79								

<sup>4</sup> **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 <sup>4</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION																				
			<table border="1" data-bbox="1455 173 2030 407"> <tr> <td>Bombetoka</td> <td>20</td> <td>65</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Antrema</td> <td>77</td> <td>87</td> <td>90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Complexe Mahavavy-Kinkony</td> <td>52</td> <td>75</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ankarafantsika</td> <td>67</td> <td>78</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average</td> <td>59</td> <td>77</td> <td>78</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="1455 444 2030 662">The objective of the project is to increase the average METT score of the Protected Areas by 15%. At the beginning of the project, the average METT score of the 5 protected areas involved in the project was 58.8%. The average METT score in 2022 is 78%. The average of the increase of METT score for the 5 Protected Areas is 19%.</p>	Bombetoka	20	65	65	Antrema	77	87	90	Complexe Mahavavy-Kinkony	52	75	76	Ankarafantsika	67	78	80	Average	59	77	78
Bombetoka	20	65	65																				
Antrema	77	87	90																				
Complexe Mahavavy-Kinkony	52	75	76																				
Ankarafantsika	67	78	80																				
Average	59	77	78																				
Indicator c. Number of protected areas in the northwestern landscape with improved financial sustainability (5)	5 Protected Areas	<b>CA</b>	In 2022, the funding for FAPBM was \$ 362,195. Financial sustainability for 5 protected areas was achieved since FAPBM was able to deploy \$ 384,950 of funding to the protected areas in 2023. FAPBM increase f funding to the PAs by \$22,755 due to KfW. The increase from the revenue generated from the \$ 4,5 million investment is \$144,459 in 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	<b>CA</b>	<p data-bbox="1455 914 2030 1170">The SAC of 2 communes Antsakoa 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. The project only achieved 22/24 SACs.</p> <p data-bbox="1455 1208 2030 1461">One of the recommendations of the fourth COPIL was to seek funding opportunities for the SAC of the remaining 2 communes. After contacting PAGE Boeny, the Spatial Planning Department of Majunga, the Head of the MATSF Department Tana and finally CASEF in Majunga concerning the legal steps for the development of SAC, activities require a lot of work, coordination with other entities and supervision by</p>																				



OBJECTIVE INDICATORS	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>4</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
			CI. According to GIZ's experience, the development of a SAC takes 8- 9 months. In addition, accessibility to the two municipalities is very difficult in the rainy season (December until April). Total costs are between Euros 11, 000 and 15, 000 in 2019-2020. Looking at the work to be done, it is very challenging to finish the two SAC before June 2023 – the end of the project. It was agreed with CI-GEF during the supervision visit in September 2022 that no further work on the SACs will continue.
Indicator e: Number of households directly benefitting from sustainable production initiatives linked to the target protected areas (2000)	2570 (6816M, 7094W)	CA	During Year 1, 2, 3 and 4 (July 2019 -June 2023), the partners were able to support 2570 households out of 2000, i.e, 129% of the project target. These 2570 beneficiaries' households are composed of 6816 men and 7094 women. Households have an average size of 5.4 persons, with a gender distribution of 49% men and 51% women. Our partners have surpassed the number of households assigned to them.

OBJECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION
HS	This is the last fiscal year of implementation for this project. Overall, the project has achieved 4/5 objective-level indicators. The final indicator could not be achieved due to the lack of budget from co-financing and the time that it takes to conduct the stakeholder consultations to complete the two pending SACs. The 5 protected areas with the hectare target 588,494 were included within the national protected area system. The METT scores for these 5 protected areas improved throughout the period of performance of the project and the financial sustainability increased due to the interest from the \$4.5M funding transferred to the Madagascar Biodiversity Fund.

### 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.

<b>COMPONENT 1</b>	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)
--------------------	---

<b>Outcome 1:</b>	Increased management effectiveness of 5 targeted PAs of the Northwestern Landscape
-------------------	--

<b>Outcome 2:</b>	Improved financial sustainability of 5 targeted PAs
-------------------	---

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>5</sup>	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 19%.	<b>CA</b>	<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. Recommendations were made regarding the METT questionnaires during the coordination workshop for the 2022 annual METT evaluation and were shared with the staff of DAPRNE. Recommendations summarized below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Break down the headings in the questionnaires with as much detail as possible. For example, for questions on threats, more detail on measures maintained for all threats (migration, fire, charring, etc.), status of PAs, law enforcement.</li> <li>- Review the METT tool to not only measure the outcome but also to get an overview of the impacts.</li> <li>- Document the supporting elements of the METT scores (score attachments)</li> </ul>
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	USD 144,459 additional funding available for the 5 targeted PAs in 2023.	<b>CA</b>	Grant agreements with each protected area manager have been signed in 2023. In addition of the funding from FAPBM, each of the 5 Protected Areas received \$144,495 from the interest of the USD 4.5 million from GEF-6. Most of the activities funded in Year 1 are a continuation of activities implemented during the GEF-6 project.

<sup>5</sup> **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 <sup>5</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
Outcome indicator 1.3.: 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	15%	IS	<p>FAPBM has received an endowment from KfW in December 2021 of USD 51.6 million. As a result, all 5 PAs receive an increase funding starting 2023 in addition to the GEF funding. The financial gap of the protected areas has already been reduced. The expected funding for the 5 PAs in Boeny and their needs for the 2019-2022 period are respectively \$2,199,751 for the project period (without the GEF project) and the funding needed to cover recurrent costs is \$4,008,118. The financial gap is estimated at about \$ 1,808,367.</p> <p>The total funding from GEF-6 Project for the 5 protected areas (in USD) during the project (2020-2023) is USD 815, 890. Over time, GEF funding has reduced the financial gap by 45%. The expected funding for the 5 PAs in Boeny for the 2023-2025 is <b>\$2,161,016</b> for the project period (without the GEF project).</p> <p>From 2023-2025, the funding needed to cover recurrent costs in USD for the 5 PAs in Boeny is <b>\$5,564,682</b>.</p> <p>From 2023-2025: The financial gap is estimated at about \$3,403,666. The total funding from GEF-6 Project for the 5 protected areas (in USD) during 2023-2025 is \$433,820. The increase from KfW funding is \$22,755 for 2023. During 2023-2025, the total funding is \$68,265. Over time, KfW and GEF funding have reduced the financial gap by 15% .</p>

COMPONENT 1 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND
HS	The project was successful in achieving the targets under Component 1. Notably, the average METT score increased by 19%, the financial sustainability increased by \$144,594 and the financing gap reduced to 15% of total need. Recommendations were also provided on how to improve the collection of the METT score in future exercises.	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 <sup>6</sup>	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	20.6%	CA	A group of consultants was hired in early 2023 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 was 52%, i.e., 20% reduction in the number of households reporting that they are food insecure. At the end the project (FY23), 51.4% of the surveyed household self-report food insecure resulting in 20.6% reduction compared to the baseline.
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	2 months	CA	The baseline for the median number of months households is food insecure is 4 months. The analysis of the data from the household survey indicates that the median number of months households are food insecure is reduced to 2 months.
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	28%	CA	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 analysis of the data from the household survey affirms that the average income of the households is MGA 1,811,205. Compared to the baseline the average income of the household has increased to 28%.
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	642	CA	The target surface area for each year was determined with PA managers during the planning process and were communicated to partners. Each protected area had already planned activities to achieve this target.

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

COMPONENT 2 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND
HS	The project surpassed the targets for 3 out of the four indicators for this component. Most notable is that due to project activities, there has been an increase in household income and a reduction in food insecurity. During the supervision visit in FY23, the CI-GEF team visited several project sites in multiple protected areas where we noted the evidence of livelihood activities and spoke directly to beneficiaries of these activities.	Increasing

**c. Overall Project Results Rating**

**OVERALL PROJECT RESULTS IMPLEMENTATION RATING**

OVERALL RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND <sup>7</sup>
HS	The final implementation progress rating is Highly Satisfactory. Overall, the project exceeded its' targets and provided significant support to the 5 protected areas in the Boeny Region. Key results include an increase in income for project beneficiaries, diversified livelihood opportunities and secured income for the 5 protected areas contributing to the financial sustainability of these areas.	Increasing

**d. Recommendations**

CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE
N/A	N/A	N/A

<sup>7</sup> 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

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

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>8</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>9</sup>
<b>Risk 1:</b> 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.	<b>CA</b>	<p>In FY23, Civil society participated to several activities in component 1 and component 2 in the 5 Protected Areas.</p> <p>The DPRIDD, which works outside the PAs, also works with CSOs and the private sector.</p> <p>In FY23 Q1, there were two new private sectors and two new CSO working with our partners.</p> <p>In FY23 Q3, there were one Private sector and 4 New CSO.</p> <p>In FY23Q4, there was 1 new CSO which trained PA manager in GIS (Geographic information system)</p>	High	High	Unchanged
<b>Risk 2:</b> 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).	Capacity of implementing partners and other stakeholders at local and regional level for planning, management, and governance will be strengthened	<b>CA</b>	<p>The project Management Unit supported continuously each partner for the financial and technical aspects of the project.</p> <p>At the beginning of FY23, the M&amp;E Manager and the livelihood Manager</p>	Substantial	Decreasing	Decreasing

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

<sup>9</sup> **Rating trend:** Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>8</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>9</sup>
	The project also includes activities to support the governance structures of the 5 PAs.			<p>provided technical support for the implementation of AGM action plans.</p> <p>In September, DAPRNE organized a training workshop on MIRADI for PA managers.</p> <p>A complementary training session to the MIRADI training was carried out by DAPRNE in October, to <b>integrate climate change</b> into the planning of protected areas.</p> <p>3 COSAP support mission was carried out during this quarter at Baie de Baly.</p>			
<b>Risk 3:</b> 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	<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>	<b>CA</b>	<p>Grant agreements with each protected area manager have been signed in 2023. In addition of the funding from FAPBM, each of the 5 Protected Areas received MGA 116, 0000, 000 from the interest of the USD 4,5 million from GEF-6. Most of the activities funded in Year 1 are a continuation of activities implemented during the GEF-6 project.</p>	Modest	Decreasing	Decreasing

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>8</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>9</sup>
	regularly assesses investment risk to ensure that its investments remain appropriate.						
<b>Risk 4:</b> 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 production systems/practices and demonstrating the value-add of integrative approaches.	<p>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.</p> <p>Several activities of the PAs funded by GEF- 6 contribute to the strategies and activities of the PRD and SACs. 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>	<b>CA</b>	<p>In FY23, the project through the Management Plan of each PA continue to contribute to the strategic axes and activities of the PRD.</p> <p>Mr. DDR of the Region participated in the fourth meeting of the COPIL of the GEF-6 Project and mentioned that the GEF-6 project is a trusted partner for the Boeny Region. During the meeting, he shared the projects and programs underway in the region to combat forest degradation. He also gave recommendations for the further implementation of the project.</p> <p>During the steering committee meeting, it was demonstrated the value add of integrative approaches. It was also confirmed during the field visits.</p> <p>The GEF-6 project also participated in various meetings organized by the Boeny Region such as the celebration of World Soil Day and the revitalization of the Dinan'i Boeny MIRAY DIA for its subsequent implementation.</p>	Modest	Decreasing	Decreasing
<b>Risk 5:</b> Impacts of global climate change	The project will work with PA staff, regional institutions, and grassroots	Consideration of climate change in the METT tool Training concerning the integration of climate	<b>CA</b>	Each PA now considers Climate Change in the planning and adapts PA management to CC, including the avoidance of carbon loss.	Modest	Modest	Unchanged



PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>8</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>9</sup>
	organizations to share experiences related to climate change adaptation and resiliency for production systems.	change into the planning of protected areas.		<p>During field visits, beneficiaries of income-generating activities mentioned the impact of climate change on production.</p> <p>A complementary training to the MIRADI training was carried out by DAPRNE in October, to <b>integrate climate change</b> into the planning of protected areas.</p>			
<b>Risk 6:</b> Weak results on the ground due to COVID-19	<b>Risk Rating included during implementation:</b> High	<b>(N/A in FY23)</b>					

OVERALL RATING OF PROJECT RISKS	JUSTIFICATION	RISK RATING TREND <sup>10</sup>
L	In the last year of implementation, the project was able to mitigate almost all risks. An important point to note is that in previous PIRs, the impacts from COVID were included as a project risk. However, the project was able to carefully mitigate the impact of COVIDs. In the final year of implementation, COVID was removed as a risk affecting project implementation. With the success of the investment income generated from the \$4.5M grant to FAPBM and the additional fundraising efforts, the financial sustainability of the 5 protected areas will be maintained for the near future.	Decreasing

## Recommendations

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

<sup>10</sup> **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 <sup>11</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<b>ACCOUNTABILITY AND GRIEVANCE MECHANISM</b>					
1. Number of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project’s Accountability and Grievance Mechanism	Not established	15	15		<p>5 grievances were collected through AGM during Q1. All are anonymous but two of them were eligible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An anonymous person has reported there is a different pay for equal work: MNHN explained to their beneficiaries that the amount of money received by the beneficiaries depends on the donor.</li> <li>- An anonymous person has reported that the selection of the patroller is not inclusive: MNHN selects patrollers according to their participation in voluntary activities. Those who participate more in voluntary activities have more chances to be selected as patrollers. An official note from MNHN was displayed to the sector concerned to explain to the community the selection of the patrollers and the amount paid for the activity concerned.</li> <li>- FY23 Q3: 10 complaints were received. Those complaints are all about asking additional trainings, agricultural tools, seeds, permanent support for law</li> </ul>

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

					enforcement patrols from the project . So those complaints were categorized all as ineligible.
2. Percentage of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism that have been resolved	100%	100% 2 of the 2 eligibles griefts collected are resolved	100%		Only 2 of the 15 complaints reported to the project's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism are eligible and were resolved.
3. Number of times the Accountability and Grievance Mechanism is communicated/ disseminated to stakeholders (for projects approved after November 2020)3.		7 times	9 times		After the establishment of the AGM Action plan, awareness-raising sessions were organized for the managers of 4 targeted PAs, DAPRNE, DPRIDD and DIREDD.
<b>GENDER MAINSTREAMING</b>					
1. Number of men and women that participated in project activities (e.g., meetings, workshops, consultations)	Men 1300 Women 1300	<b>For a total of FY23: 1179 (677M,502W)</b>	FY20+FY21+Fy 22+FY23 = 4319 (2423M, 1896W)		It was found that the number of women who participated to trainings, workshops and consultations is slightly less than the number of men. With 56% men against 44% women. Women have mostly participated in market gardening training, Silk handcrafting training, Handcrafting Training
2. Number of men and women that received benefits (e.g employment, income generating activities, training, access	Men 1300 Women 1300	<b>For a total of FY23: 2693 (1741M,952W)</b>	FY20+FY21+Fy 22+FY23 = 6261 (3555M, 2706 W)		Most beneficiaries are men because they participated to more activities with 57% men against 43% women. The number of men participants is also higher than women. Women rarely participate in the following activities: ecological monitoring, patrol, fish farming and beekeeping training, firewall maintenance, tourist circuit development and demarcation of parks. To promote higher participation of women, our partners carried out awareness-raising campaigns before starting training in income-generating

to natural resources, land tenure or resource rights, equipment, leadership roles) from the project.					activities. Consultations were also held on activities of interest to all communities.
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	Policies 01			The GEF-6 project did not fund the updating of the Management Plan and the Environmental and Social Management Plans of the 5 PAs. The Environmental and Social Management Plan for the Bombetoka Protected Area were updated during the GEF-6 project implementation period and considered the gender aspect for the optimization of positive impacts. Plans have also been made to develop SACs for the two remaining communes in the Soalala Protected Area. Looking at the work to be done, it is very challenging to finish the two SAC before June 2023 – the end of the project. It was agreed with CI-GEF we're not going to develop the SACs.
<b>STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT</b>					
1. Number of government agencies, civil society organizations, private sector, indigenous peoples and other stakeholder groups that have been involved in the project implementation	10 government Agencies/2000 Households/03 private Sectors/07 (PA managers, CI, FAPBM)/02 universities/ 02 other partners	<b>Total FY23:</b> Government agencies: 9 Decentralized Territorial Collectivities: 0 CSO: 8 Private sector: 4 Number of households: 3988	FY20+FY21+Fy 22+FY23 =  Government agencies: 35 Decentralized Territorial Collectivities: 11 CSO: 65 Private sector: 16 Number of households: 6770		The stakeholders involved in Year 1, 2 and 3 have continued to participate in the implementation of the project in Year 4. New partners have been involved in the implementation phase during FY23, especially the CSO and private sector.

phase on an annual basis					
2. Number persons (sex disaggregated) that have been involved in project implementation phase (on an annual basis)	1300 female 1300 male	<b>For a total of FY23: 3682 (2294M, 1388W)</b>	FY20+FY21+FY22+ FY23=7402 (4187M, 3215W)		<p>The target has been achieved. The number of women is lower than the number of men, but both numeric targets were surpassed.</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 MIRADI and climate change integration, 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>
3. Number of engagement (e.g., meeting, workshops, consultations) with stakeholders during the project implementation phase (on an annual basis)	05	<b>For a total of FY23:</b> Capacity building/training: 27 Awareness raising: 6 Exchange visit / fair: 7 Consultancy: 2 Workshop: 1 Meeting: 1 Total: 44 engagements	FY20+FY21+FY22+ FY23= Capacity Building/training: 118 Awareness raising: 37. Exchange visit: 12 Consultation: 4 Workshops: 6 Meeting: 28 Socio eco survey: 1 Festival: 1 Total: 207 engagements		<p>The target has been achieved and surpassed.</p> <p>Training on MIRADI and climate change integration, consultation on silk value chain monitoring, training on environment and sustainable development, fish farming, beekeeping, silk/raffia handcrafting, poultry farming and market gardening, exchange visit</p> <p>conducted during FY23.</p>

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

### Challenges:

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 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.

Concerning the number of persons (sex-disaggregated) that have been involved in the project implementation phase, it was found that the number of women is almost half of men. This is because women have participated in very limited activities and their numbers are mostly lower than the number of men.

### **For a total of FY23:**

**FY23 Q1 (July – September 2022): 1717 (1131M, 586W)**

**FY23 Q2 (October – December 2022): 1338 (971M, 367W)**

**FY23 Q3 (January- March 2023): 2709 (1923M, 786W)**

**FY23 Q4 (April-June 2023): 881 (621M, 260W)**

### **For a total of FY23: 3682 (2294M, 1388 W)**

### Good practices:

Our grantees continued to engage relevant stakeholders in the implementation of their activities in the fields. The same stakeholders in Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3 have been involved in the project implementation in Year 4. The different stakeholders cited in the CEO endorsement/approval are involved in the project implementation phase. The number of CSOs and private sectors involved in the implementation of the project has always increased. Civil society participated in several activities within the protected areas, such as patrols (Mixed brigades), awareness-raising, capacity building, and sustainable production. Private sectors have been especially involved in developing markets for products such as honey, raffia, salt, fisheries and silks.

### Lessons learned:

- The project strengthens collaboration with the regional forestry direction (DIREDD), which has legal authority to enforce PA and other environmental regulations.
- The involvement of the regional directorates of other sectors concerned is very important in the realization of the project, as it facilitates the tasks of the PA manager.
- A Project Steering Committee (PSC) chaired by MEED facilitates successful project coordination and execution. Members of the PSC were the heads of organizations leading the project execution (i.e. the ultimate supervisors of the individuals who are in the project management unit): the Director Generals of DGDD, DAPRNE, DPRIDD, MNP, CI Madagascar, and the Executive Director of FAPBM; Representatives from other relevant ministries (M2PATE- responsible for land-use planning, Min Agri- responsible for agriculture, MPRH - responsible for fisheries); Heads of other NGOs working on PA management in Madagascar; and finally, representatives from the DIREDD and Region.

Number of engagements (e.g., meeting, workshops, consultations) with stakeholders during the FY23: 27 Capacity building/training, 6 Awareness raising, 7 Exchange visit / fair, 2 Consultancy, 1 Workshop, 1 Meeting. It was found that the number of women who participated to trainings, workshops and consultations is slightly less than the number of men. With 56% men against 44% women.

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

All activities anticipated by the GMP were implemented. At the end of FY23:

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

**For a total of FY23: 1179 (677M, 502W)**

**FY23 Q1 (July – September 2022): 282 (173M, 109 W)**

**FY23 Q2 (October – December 2022): 636 (315M, 321W)**

**FY23 Q3(January – March 2023): 208 (132M, 76W)**

**FY23 Q4 (April-June 2023): 397 (276M, 121W)**

It was found that the number of women who participated to trainings, workshops and consultations is slightly less than the number of men. With 56% men against 44% women.

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:

FY23 Q1 (July – September 2022): 1054 (794M, 260W)

FY23 Q2 (October – December 2022): 1211 (834M, 377W)

FY23 Q3 (January– March 2022): 2256 (1670M, 586W)

FY23 Q4 (April-June 2023): 765 (565M, 200W)

**For a total of FY23: 2693 (1741M, 952W)**

Most beneficiaries are men. Women were not often involved in conservation activities such as ecological monitoring, patrol, firewall maintenance, demarcation of parks and in fish farming, tourist circuit development. These activities require more effort for women. Patrol activities are particularly difficult for women. The offenders are dangerous, and there are threats to the patrollers' lives. In addition, a patrol lasts 4 days, and the women cannot leave their homes for that long. Therefore, the integration of women through their involvement in the patrol is challenging .

At the beginning of FY23, the team worked with the protected area managers on including more women in project activities. There were some successes in adding women to the patrols. Women were involved in patrols activities in Antrema, Baie de Baly and Bombetoka.. In the fishing community in Antrema, most fishers are men with some women also fishing. However, the women are involved in other activities outside of fishing (e.g., elling fish). Women also participated to beekeeping sectors.

Challenges faced by the project to implementing GMP:

The participation of women in most of the activities were low compared to men. They were mainly involved in market gardening, Silk handcrafting, handcrafting and salt production. Women were not often involved in conservation activities such as ecological monitoring, patrol, firewall maintenance and demarcation of parks. Even if the targets are met for GMP, the number of women is still low.

Unintended outcome: Women start to be interested in other activities like beekeeping, patrol, and fishing.

Good examples were observed during the supervision mission. In CMK, women are very active in CUMA activities, for example onion cultivation in Bemahazaka and market gardening by the Soamasoandro association. There are also women artisans in CMK and Antrema and finally the production of salt in Antrema. These three sectors are already well developed.

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 future projects to continue advancing towards gender sensitive targets. To promote the participation of women in the various activities funded by the project through sensitization, training, professionalization, improvement of the conditions of evacuation of the products and endowment of materials.

#### **d. Information on the implementation of the accountability and grievance mechanism**

The MTR team recommended to increase outreach and awareness activities so that project beneficiaries are more aware of existing grievances mechanisms.

##### **AGM:**

After the development of Action Plan by the AGM consultant, it was agreed with the park managers that

- Each meeting should be preceded by an awareness campaign concerning the AGM mechanism.
- Verbal complaints raised during each meeting will be noted in a Minutes. If the complainant chooses anonymity, the identity will not be recorded in the minutes
- In addition to the complaint books already in place, the AGM datasheet is placed on the ground to facilitate the accessibility of the beneficiaries to the complaint's mechanism.
- A new series of AGM posters were displayed on the field.

A meeting with Juliana Ross, Manager Environmental and Social management Framework, was organized in December 20, 2022 to discuss the progress of the AGM within the framework of the Boeny Project. The Coordonitor of the project and the M&E Manager participated to the meeting. Recommendations and guiding questions to receive oral complaints in meetings were sent by Juliana Ross to improve the implementation of the AGM. The recommendation from the meeting was shared to the partners.

5 grievances were collected through AGM during Q1. All the griefs are anonymous. Two of them were eligible.

- An anonymous person has reported that there is a different pay for equal work: MNHN explained to their beneficiaries that the amount of money received by the beneficiaries depends on the donor.

- An anonymous person has reported that the selection of the patroller is not inclusive: MNHN Select the patroller according to their participation in voluntary activity. Those who participle more in voluntary activity has more chance to be selected as patroller. An official note from MNHN was displayed to the concerned sector to explain to community the selection of the patrollers and the amount pay for the concerned activity.

10 complaints were received in Q3. Those complaints are all about asking more advantages from the project. So those complaints are all ineligible.

Only 2 of the 15 complaints reported to the project's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism were eligible and resolved.

2 of the 2 eligibles griefs collected were resolved (resolution ratel: 100%)

For the ineligible grievances, protected area managers were in charge to communicate to the grievants,.

In FY23, project beneficiaries are more aware of existing grievances mechanisms and to facilitate the implementation in the field. The Action Plan was discussed with protected area managers and AGM Focal Points.

#### **e. ESMF lessons learned and Knowledge Management Products (KMPs) developed and disseminated**

##### **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. During its implementation the project conducted 107 Capacity Building/training, 37 Awareness raising, 12 Exchange visit, 4 Consultation, 6 Workshops, 28 Meeting, 1 Socio eco survey, 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 such as Madagascar National Parks in Ankarafantsika and Baie de Baly, deemed patrolling activities to be physically intensive and thus most suitable for men. In addition,. members of the Local Park Committee are men. Conservation activities require more effort for women. In FY22, women expressed willingness to participate in patrolling activities as they could then be eligible to receive compensation. The participation of women in most of the activities were low compared to men. They were mainly involved in market gardening, Silk handcrafting, handcrafting and salt production. In FY23, there are women involved in the patrols in Antrema, Baie de Baly and Bombetoka. Also, women start to be interested in other activities like beekeeping, patrol, and fishing.



Women are very active in CUMA activities, artisans, and production of salt in Antrema. These three sectors are already well developed. 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 future project to continue advancing towards gender sensitive targets.

To promote the participation of women in the various activities funded by the project through sensitization, training, professionalization, improvement of the conditions of evacuation of the products and endowment of materials.

For 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. For the number of persons (sex-disaggregated) that participated in project activities, it was found that the number of women is slightly under the number of men. For the 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.

List KM products developed by the project and how/where/when they were distributed and to whom. Indicate the type of product (e.g. brochure, newsletter/newspaper article, web post, radio announcement, and any special measures (e.g. KM translated into local languages, catered to marginalized/vulnerable groups) taken to ensure that the product is accessible to stakeholders.

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](http://projetboeny-gef6.mg). The general objective is to make the shared and updated data for learning and knowledge management available and accessible to users.

The livelihood Manager shared also technical documents on agriculture and livestock to livelihood managers in each PA.

## f. 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 FY23 IMPLEMENTATION RATING	RATING TREND
Accountability and Grievance Mechanism	HS	Increasing
Gender Mainstreaming Plan (GMP)	MS	Unchanged
Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)	HS	Unchanged

### OVERALL PROJECT ESMF IMPLEMENTATION RATING

RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND
--------	---------------	--------------

<b>S</b>	<p>After taking on an in-depth diagnosis of their AGM, during this year, the project has provided evidence of implementing actions to improve their AGM, both in terms of socializing the existence of the AGM, accessibility for all stakeholders, adequate registration, and a clear route to receive anonymous grievances. The project has also registered and resolved eligible grievances throughout this fiscal year, at the same time of communicating the classification as ineligible grievances to stakeholders. All these actions represent outstanding efforts to improve the project's AGM. On gender, despite surpassing the numeric target, the project was not able to achieve parity between women and men beneficiaries and participants (which was the target for the project). The project did adopt measures to adapt and promote women's participation in livelihood activities and in traditionally male-dominated activities, such as the patrols in some protected area. Despite the efforts, and changes which started to happen this fiscal year, the project was not able to achieve the parity target. The project was also not able to achieve the target on strategies/plans/policies that incorporate gender considerations. On the SEP, the project out-performed in all targets set.</p>	<b>Increasing</b>
----------	--	-------------------

**g. Recommendations**

CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE
NA	NA	NA

## **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.

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

The project Team is going to finalize the three lessons learned briefs 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 other documents will be shared with stakeholders during the close out workshop.

The creation of the website [projetboeny-gef6.mg](http://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. The M&E Manager continues to update the website. The hosting of the website has been renewed in May 2023 for one year.

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

#### **DAPRNE:**

MIRADI training was carried out during the month of September 2022. The number of participants was in the training 25(19M, 6W). The training was provided by HAY TAO USAID and was an opportunity to build the capacity of DAPRNE agents and Protected Area Managers in the use of MIRADI for good data collection in the context of the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in the landscape. from northwestern Madagascar.

The objectives of the training were to:

- Introduce PA managers to the PA management planning process.
- Train managers on the MIRADI management planning tool.
- Collect feedback from managers on the outline of the PAG.

The training enabled the PA manager to master the planning tools including the conceptual diagram, the theory of change, and the chain of results, the viability analysis, and the assessment of the threats using the open-source conservation planning software "MIRADI 4.5.0 »; to establish the "MIRADI" file for each AP drawn up with the basic information and ready to be completed and improved.

A complementary training session to the MIRADI training was carried out, to **integrate climate change** into the planning of protected areas.

The elements of the training are:

- Analysis under MIRADI as direct threats to the climatic variables on the conservation targets (Evaluation in percentage of the scenarios on Climate Change within the Protected Area.
- Separate analysis of vulnerability from community resilience and livelihoods.
- Modeling analysis which requires an expert in Climate Change.

## **DPRIDD:**

Celebration of the local World Environment Day in June 2022: The first day of the celebration was dedicated to environmental education, conference and “vakodrazana” competition. The World Environment Day was celebrated with an opening ceremony, exhibitions organized by Protected Area managers (MNHN Antrema, Bombetoka, Complexe Mahavavy-Kinkony).

Regarding the impact of this event for the population in Katsepy, 10 associations participated to the Vakodrazana competition, all schools also participated to the environmental education sessions. 323 persons (133M, 190W) attended this event and were mobilized during the two days.

### **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. Project institutional arrangements, including project governance.
7. Capacity building
8. Implementation of safeguard policies, including gender mainstreaming, accountability and grievance mechanisms, stakeholder consultations
9. Factors that improve likelihood of long-term sustainability of project impacts

Sustainability of project activities has been an over-riding consideration during the design stage of the Project. The Project focus on both financial sustainability and technical sustainability to ensure that the impact of the project continues to improve management of the protected areas. Improved financial sustainability is an important outcome for the project, as encapsulated in the results framework.

- The sustainable financing of five protected areas (PAs):

To date, none of the five targeted PAs is fully funded and a major part of the funding that they do receive is short-term and project based. To improve this situation, the FAPBM started allocating funding to four of the five PAs.

To help decrease the funding gap of the targeted PAs, the project invests USD 4.5M to further capitalize the FAPBM endowment. The signature of the grant agreement between CI and the Madagascar Biodiversity Fund was received on November 24, 2020. FAPBM 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).

Grant agreements with each protected area manager have been signed in 2023. In addition of the funding from FAPBM, each of the 5 Protected Areas received MGA 116, 000, 000 from the interest of the USD 4,5 million from GEF-6. Most of the activities funded in Year 1 are a continuation of activities implemented during the GEF-6 project. FAPBM has received an endowment from KfW in December 2021 of USD 51.6 million. As a result, all 5 PAs receive an increase funding starting 2023 in addition to the GEF funding. The financial gap of the protected areas has already been reduced. FAPBM pursue the fundraising campaign. Donor database is also available.

- Beneficiary ownership:

Principles to be followed for the implementation of livelihood activities:

- Consult with stakeholders before making decisions on subsistence activities supported by the project.
- Complement and scale- up on-going local initiatives for sustainable production under the framework of the SACs and PA Management Plans and better conservation of the PAs' surrounding areas.
- Provide technical support to local community groups, diversify the production, and enhance value chains for each production.
- Involve target beneficiaries in the development activities and avoid free approach to donations without the contribution of beneficiaries which is unproductive and unsustainable.
- Tangible results of sustainable production: reduction in the number of households reporting that they are food insecure, number of months households are food insecure is reduced, increase in average annual household income for participants in sustainable production initiatives supported by the Project.
- Increase in income for households. With this additional income, households can pay for daily needs.

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

- Exchange visits.:

The development of rural communities begins with the opening of their horizons through exchange visits. Many exchange visits have been organized in the framework of the project.

- An exchange visit on beekeeping was organized to see the modern production equipment, the techniques of use of the different material, breeding and production techniques, marketing and marketing techniques.
- An exchange visit on crafts was organized to see the production quality of other craftswomen, the production techniques (materials, rhythm, productive behavior), the marketing and commercialization techniques.

The exchange visits allowed the participants to see the best practices and the results obtained and encouraged them to do even better.

- Involvement of representatives of the local and regional authorities so that they can be aware of the activities conducted in each Protected Area.
- The Boeny Region participated in activities in Protected Areas funded by GEF. The Region donated looms to women's associations working in the silk industry in the Bombetoka PA.
- The Deputy of Mitsinjo invited economic operators to visit the regional fair of Mitsinjo in 2021. The objective was to ensure the visibility of the district which is a very productive agricultural area.
- Participation in fairs and events.

This has been seen with beneficiaries of ANTREMA NAP, who participated in the 'fier mada' in 2021: they could establish partnerships to help them develop their market capacities in handcraft, salt, and honey productions.

## 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
<b>CLASSIFICATION</b> <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
Note: Provide justification if the location is a new site in this line				
<b>GEO NAME ID</b> <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: <a href="http://www.geonames.org">http://www.geonames.org</a>.</i>	1073208	7932414	1065672	11934786
<b>LOCATION NAME</b> <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
<b>LATITUDE</b> <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
<b>LONGITUDE</b> <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
<b>LOCATION DESCRIPTION</b> <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>				

<b>ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION</b>				
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--

*(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".*

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:**





## 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 <sup>12</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<b>Outcome 1.1:</b> Increased management effectiveness of 5 targeted PAs of the Northwestern Landscape				
<b>Output Indicator 1.1.1:</b> <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 August 24, 2022
<b>Output Indicator 1.1.2:</b> <i>Number of management plans up-to-date and implemented in targeted PAs</i>	5 protected areas	Five management plans of five protected areas implemented.	CA	The management plans of four protected areas have been implemented since the beginning of the project and the management plan of Bombetoka have been implemented since August 24, 2022
<b>Output Indicator 1.1.3:</b> <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)	5 Protected Areas have local management structures.	CA	Four (04) COSAP support missions were carried out by COSAP members in Baie de Baly. The purpose of the missions being to raise awareness among the local population to protect biodiversity together as well as do not make fire and cut wood.
<b>Outcome 1.2</b> Improved financial sustainability of 5 targeted PAs				
<b>Output Indicator 1.2.1:</b> <i>Amount contributed to the capital of FAPBM through the Project</i>	USD 4.5 million	USD 4.5 million	CA	
<b>Output Indicator 1.2.2:</b> <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	USD 144, 459 USD from year 3	CA	Grant agreements with each protected area manager have been signed in 2023.

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

<b>Output Indicator 1.2.3:</b> <i>Number of funding requests submitted to potential donors</i>	3 funding requests.	All KfW's contributions were fully received on 2022 and starting from this date, managed according to the investment policy.  One funding request submitted to potential donor.	IS	Thanks to KfW contribution to the capital, financial gap of the protected areas has already been reduced, as a result, funds for the 5 PAs have been increased for 2023 (FAPBM 2023).  FAPBM pursue its fundraising campaign.						
<b>Output Indicator 1.2.4:</b> <i>Number of donor databases developed</i>	Number of donor databases developed	One	IS	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1591 404 1887 472"><i>Philanthropic foundations</i></td> <td data-bbox="1887 404 1992 472">101</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1591 472 1887 508"><i>Global initiatives funds</i></td> <td data-bbox="1887 472 1992 508">17</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1591 508 1887 544"><i>Multilatéral fund</i></td> <td data-bbox="1887 508 1992 544">23</td> </tr> </table>	<i>Philanthropic foundations</i>	101	<i>Global initiatives funds</i>	17	<i>Multilatéral fund</i>	23
<i>Philanthropic foundations</i>	101									
<i>Global initiatives funds</i>	17									
<i>Multilatéral fund</i>	23									
<b>Outcome 2.1</b> Key local communities around targeted PAs have adopted sustainable production practices										
<b>Output Indicator 2.1.1:</b> <i>Number of sustainable production initiatives supported to improve livelihoods</i>	16 livelihood initiatives	19	CA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Intensive rice cultivation</li> <li>2. Market gardening</li> <li>3. Beekeeping</li> <li>4. Irrigated Rice cultivation</li> <li>5. Raphia handcrafts</li> <li>6. Planting of fruit trees</li> <li>7. Green charcoal</li> <li>8. Silk</li> <li>9. Ecotourism</li> <li>10. Fisheries</li> <li>11. Restocking of lakes</li> <li>12. Salt</li> <li>13. Bovine breeding</li> <li>14. Poultry breeding</li> <li>15. Irrigated rice growing (pending)</li> <li>16. Goat rearing (pending)</li> <li>17. Dry culture (groundnut crop)</li> <li>18. waterfowl breeding</li> <li>19. Lemon transformation</li> </ol>						

<p><b>Output Indicator 2.1.2:</b> <i>Number of people (gender-disaggregated) participating in sustainable production initiatives supported by the Project</i></p>	<p>1300 women; 1300 men; 2000 households</p>	<p><b>FY120, FY21, FY22 and FY23 :</b>  <b>2570</b> households (6816M, 7094 W)</p>	<p>CA</p>	<p>Cumulative status AKF: 762 Households (406M, 356W)</p> <p>FY23: 619 Households (341M, 278W)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 68 Households (53M, 15W) Benefited from bee keeping project.</li> <li>• 401 Households (321M, 80W) Benefited from tree fruit planting project.</li> <li>• 23 Households (0M, 23W) Benefited from handcrafting project.</li> <li>• 220 Households (52M, 168W) Benefited from market gardening project.</li> <li>• 52 Households (14M, 38W) benefited kiosk renovation.</li> </ul> <p>Cumulative status Antrema:459 Households (256M, 203W)</p> <p>FY23: 281 Households (171M, 110W)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 126 Households (101M, 25W) Benefited from fisheries activity.</li> <li>• 53 Households (15M, 38W) Benefited from handcrafting activity.</li> <li>• 191 Households (102M, 89W) Benefited from poultry farming activity.</li> <li>• 10 Households (7M, 3W) Benefited from dam reestablishment (owner of the irrigated rice fields)</li> </ul>
---	--	--	-----------	---

				<p>and beneficiary of the seed endowment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 36 Households (15M, 21W) Benefited from the development of tourist circuit.</li> </ul> <p>Cumulative status BBL: 720 Households (296M, 425W)</p> <p>FY23: 214 Households (148M, 66W)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 91 Households (42M, 49W) Benefited from market gardening.</li> <li>• 111 Households (98M, 13W) Benefited from bee keeping.</li> <li>• 15 Households (11M, 4W) Benefited from dry culture (groundnut crop)</li> </ul> <p>Cumulative status BOMBETOKA: 143 Households (5M, 138W)78 households (5M, 73W)</p> <p>FY23: 65 Households (0M, 65W)27 households (4M,23W) benefited from silk industry.</p> <p>Cumulative status of Complexe Mahavavy-Kinkony: 356 households (181M, 175W)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 53 households benefited from beekeeping activities.</li> <li>• 137 households benefited from activities in improved rice-growing system (SRA)</li> <li>• 106 households benefited from activities in various</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>market gardening activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 63 households benefited from Raphia activities.</li> </ul> <p>Cumulative status of DPRIDD: 129 Households (68M, 61W)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 43 Households (31M, 12W) benefited from fish farming.</li> <li>• 24 Households (16M, 8W) benefited from bee keeping.</li> <li>• 23 Households (13M, 10W) benefited from poultry farming.</li> <li>• 37 Households (6M, 31W) benefited from handcrafting.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Output Indicator 2.1.3:</b> <i>Number of value chains developed and executed</i></p>	<p><i>3 value chains</i></p>	<p>7 value chains</p>	<p>CA</p>	<p>Initially the project planned to support three value chains-: Beekeeping, Handcrafts, Green charcoal but during its implementation the project supported other value chains: Silk, Salt, Market gardening, lemon transformation. So, the project supported in total 7 value chains.</p>