



## UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2023

1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

### 1- Identification

#### 1.1 Project details

GEF ID	5352	SMA IPMR ID	S1-32GFL-000617
Project Short Title	COKETES	Grant ID	32773
		Umoja WBS	SB-006895
Project Title	Conservation of Key Threatened, Endemic and Economically Valuable Species		
Project Type	Full Sized Project (FSP)	Duration months	Planned 60
Parent Programme if child project			Age 74.0 months
GEF Focal Area(s)	Biodiversity	Completion Date	Planned -original PCA 31 june 2021
Project Scope	National		Revised - Current PCA 30 September 2022
Region	Africa	Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval	7-Nov-16
Countries	Madagascar	UNEP Project Approval Date (on Decision Sheet)	8-May-17
GEF financing amount	USD 5,650,000	Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force)	9-May-17
Co-financing amount	USD 15,889,740	Date of First Disbursement	12-Jul-17
		Date of Inception Workshop, if available	20 June 2017
Total disbursement as of 30 June	USD 5,616,750	Midterm undertaken?	Yes
Total expenditure as of 30 June	USD 5,614,290	Actual Mid-term Date, if taken	1-Dec-20
		Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken	
		Expected Terminal Evaluation Date	31-Dec-23
		Expected Financial Closure Date	30-Jun-24

## 1.2 EA: Project description

The COKETES project has three components reflected in the formulation of its objective, "To promote the conservation and sustainable use of Biodiversity based on the "species approach" by developing, implementing, and disseminating local participatory strategies for key endemic, threatened and economically valuable species":

It brings together the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD) as the Executing Agency and as technical Partners with Governmental and Decentralized institutions, national and international NGOs, representatives of local organizations, and State Universities.

**Component 1:** It includes the approach based on the local strategies designed for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. The participatory approach for the implementation of the project will consider different measures combining conservation aspects of key species and living conditions of local populations (awareness raising, scientific research of the 21 target species, and development of national strategy and signing of collective agreements).

**Component 2:** This component concerns the effective conservation of 21 key species. It logically follows the action of the first component, building engagement of stakeholders in the implementation of the Project. These actions mainly concern support to the communities through the Transfer of Natural Resource Management (TRNM) involving Regional Directorates, Commune and local communities, efforts in the management of pressures, implementation of economic and incentive promotions for the conservation actions of the target species, community monitoring, preservation of the Ardeola idae habitat, multiplication and planting of the target species. The people involved are the communities, the RDES, the Communes and Fokontany as well as other sectors (Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries).

**Component 3:** The third and final component will ensure the sustainable valorization of the project's achievements. It consists of the sustainability and replication of the project. Adequate management of information from the different actions of the Project by implementing a broad communication campaign to different target groups to achieve the conservation of key species

## 1.3 Project Contact

Division(s) Implementing the project

Ecosystems Division

Executing Agency(ies)

Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD)

Name of co-implementing Agency

Names of Other Project Partners

Asity Madagascar  
Association pour la Valorisation de l'Ethnopharmacologie en Région Tropicale Et Méditerranéenne (AVERTEM)  
Comité Multi-Local Tandavanala (CMP Tandavanala)  
Direction de Communication et du Système d'Information/Ministère de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable (DCSI/MEDD)  
Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust (DWCT)  
Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques –Forêts (ESSA/LRA)  
Madagascar Fauna and Flora Group (MFG)  
Madagascar National Parks (MNP)  
Missouri Botanical Garden (MBG)  
Parc Botanique et Zoologique de Tsimbazaza (PBZT)  
Silo National des Graines Forestières (SNGF)  
The Peregrine Fund (TPF)

TM: UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)

TM: UNEP Task Manager(s)

TM: UNEP Budget/Finance Officer

Ersin Esen (a.i)

Daniel Pouakouyou

George Saddimbah

EA: Manager/Representative

EA: Project Manager

EA: Finance Manager

MEDD

Eric Rabenaslo

Raharinjatovo Tsiry

## 2- OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

2.1 UNEP PoW & UN

TM: UNEP Current Subprogramme(s)

TM: PoW Indicator(s)

EA: UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages

EA: Link to relevant SDG Goals

Ecosystem Management

SP3: EAa (i,iii) and EAb (i,ii)  
2018-2019 PoW and the 2018-

TM: UNEP previous Subprogramme(s)

Healthy and productive ecosystems

Objective 1 of UNDAF Madagascar (2015-2019) "Vulnerable populations in the intervention areas have access to income and employment opportunities, improve their resilience capacities and contribute to inclusive and equitable growth for sustainable development». The strategic objective is "to reduce the extreme poverty rate from 52.7% (2012) to 40% by 2019"

SDG Goal 15: Sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, halt and reverse land degradation, halt biodiversity loss

EA: Link to relevant SDG Targets

Target 15.2: By 2020 promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forest and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally. Target 15.5: take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt loss of biodiversity and by 2020 protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species

2.2. GEF Core or Sub Indicators

TM: GEF core or sub indicators targeted by the project as defined at CEO Endorsement/Approval, as well as results (GEF 5 project with no core indicators defined)

Indicators	Targets - Expected value			Materialised to date
	Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target	

Implementation Status 2023

6th PIR

FY 2023

FY 2022

FY 2021

PIR #

6th PIR

5th PIR

4th PIR

Rating towards outcomes (DO) (section 3.1)

HS

S

S

Rating towards outputs (IP) (section 3.2)

HS

S

S

Risk rating (section 4.2)

L

M

M

2.3 Implementation status & Risk

FY 2020	3rd PIR	S	S	M
FY 2019	2nd PIR	S	S	M
FY 2018	1st PIR	S	S	M
FY 2017				
FY 2016				
FY 2015				

The reporting period between July 2022 and December 2023 corresponds to the closing phase of the COKETES project activities. The project has been successfully implemented thanks to the effective participation of stakeholders in the conservation of key species following the various awareness-raising and capacity-building campaigns. The trigger for success is the integration of socio-economic factors to the benefit of target species protection. The project's main achievements are listed below, with additional information by outcome:

- Validation of the national strategy for the conservation of the Madagascar Pond Heron (*Ardeola idae*) in Madagascar 2023-2032;
- Validation of the national strategy for the conservation of threatened plant species in Madagascar (2022-2027)
- IUCN assessment of 19 plant species
- Submission of COKETES final report with deliverable key

During the passage of the powerful tropical cyclone Cheneso, half of the nesting site of Madagascar Pond Heron in Ambondrobe Lake was flooded for a week, resulting in the mortality of reeds and some seedlings in the nurseries. As well, all the market garden crops in Pointe à Larrée were destroyed by flooding during the passage of Cheneso and Freddy in 2023. Farmers have now started planting again. A decline in the number of bees colonizing hives was noted during the 2023 period, due to varroa infestation and termite attacks at the same site. It is worth noting that a technique for biological control of varroa mites has already been passed on to beneficiaries, but some have not applied it.

**Outcome 1.1** : Partners continued awareness-raising campaigns on the protection of Madagascar-Pond Heron during the reporting period and after project closure: awareness-raising in 50 "Fokontany", the smallest administrative unit, around the urban Park-PBZT gathered 8834 persons . Brochures and plaques were produced during the awareness-raising campaigns. In addition, the messages on communication media on Madagascar Pond Heron conservation produced (poster, panels) during project implementation are still visible to reinforce community awareness at COKETES sites (Tsimembo Manambolamaty PA). The awareness campaigns on firefighting were limited to one project target village due to available funding (Complexe Mahavavy Kinkony PA).

For the flora component, the partners contributed to social mobilization activities. After the end of the project, A total of 22 campaigns of awareness raising and environmental education were organized by MBG (NPA Agnalazaha), as well as two sessions of nature outings for children. The legalization of associations at the district level of Vakoan'ala and Zahatampolo Associations and the creation of a platform bringing together associations working in environmental protection and sustainable development were the main results for NPA Tampolo.

**Outcome 2.1** : The Madagascar Pond Heron is included as a conservation target or integrated target in the management and development plan of the Protected Areas where the COKETES Project has intervened. The periodic monitoring of the species stipulated in these plans were thus ensured; about 200 nesting individuals were observed in Sofia Lake and an increase in the number of individuals was observed between January and March (case of Ambondrobe PA and Sofia Lake). Local communities continued to take part in monitoring campaigns for the Madagascar Pond Heron and waterbirds. In addition, research on waterbirds was carried out with the partner's own funding (Complexe Mahavavy Kinkony PA).

Flora component: conservation of target species is included in the renewed Management Plan for three Protected Area (NPA Agnalazaha, NP Ranomafana, SR Manombo). To pursue the objectives of the COKETES project, the species *Dupuya haraka* has been selected as one of INR Betampona conservation targets, in addition to the *Dalbergia* genus, which has been part of it for years. Ecological and phenological monitoring of conservation target species were carried out (NPA Agnalazaha, NP Ranomafana, SR Manombo, NPA Pointe à Larrée, INR Betampona), as well as community patrols and monitoring of forest restoration (e.g. Agnalazaha, NP Ranomafana).

Phenological monitoring was carried out specifically on the two target species (*Canarium lamianum* and *Dupuya haraka*) in the Tampolo NPA, and particularly on the genera *Dalbergia* and *Diospyros* (with MBG and the G3D project). Six patrol missions undertaken by the community-based management (VOI) of Rantolava and Andapa and 20 patrol missions by the agents of the NPA Tampolo were carried

**EA:** Summary of status  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

**EA:** Planned Co-finance

15,889,740

**EA:** Actual to date:

14,540,318 (91.5% as of Dec 2022)

2.4 Co-finance

**EA:** Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges.

The Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development in all level of the project fields, has contributed to the implementation of the project in terms of in-kind co-financing: time allocated by several agents for the project tasks, premises, logistical support, vehicles and office equipment used for the project...As well as the project's partners with their huge contributions in terms of in-kind and cash co-financing by their own funds and co-financing from other donors. This contribution was particularly significant during the completion phase of the project, as a part of the fund was only disbursed upon acceptance of the final reports

2.5. Stakeholder

**EA:** Date of project steering committee meeting

Project closed pending Terminal evaluation

**EA:** Stakeholder engagement  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

The significant mobilization of the stakeholders described in the CEO Endorsment (MESD, DCSI, RDESD, SNGF, The Peregrine Fund, local partners and communities), the involvement of local authorities and other technical services (Ministry of Higher Education, Directorate of Fisheries and the Blue Economy, Directorate of Agriculture and Livestock, Gendarmerie) are fundamental to the successful implementation of the COKETES Project. The said involvement of the parties is marked by the empowerment of stakeholders, respect for commitments, regulations and instructions from the Administration in the vicinity of the Protected Areas by local communities to minimize pressures and threats, and the enhancement of existing management structures. During the reporting period, the following activities required the involvement of stakeholders: assessment of PA management effectiveness using the METT tool, validation of conservation strategies for 21 key species.

2.6. Gender

**TM:** Does the project have a gender action plan?

Yes

**EA:** Gender mainstreaming  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

The gender approach is still taken into account in the partners' conservation actions throughout the Project and even after the Project: equal numbers of participants in nursery training in Ambondrobe PA, women's participation in fruit tree cultivation training in Ankarafantsika NP, beneficiaries of income-generating activities, case of Sofia Lake. Women from associations formalized during the COKETES project are still active; they have been trained to be independent (as in Ankarafantsika NP). But women's participation remains low despite the gender training provided (Complexe Mahavavy Kinkony PA).  
Flora component: MBG (Agnalazaha NPA) mentioned highlights during the reporting period, including the active participation of women (33%), the formation of a new association (Mahampy/Basketry) and the recruitment of new women nursery workers. For SR Manombo, a reforestation project was undertaken by the CMP Tandavanala team with the women's groups of Maropagnahy in March 2023. As results, 10,000 seedlings were planted for a restoration session. 176 women (representing about 39%) were mainly involved in activities such as the removal of invasive species and post-removal planting (Niaouli), quarterly ecological monitoring, community patrols and planting in ecological restoration plots in NPA Pointe à Larrée.

iSM

**TM:** Was the project classified as moderate/high risk at CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage?

No

**TM:** If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?

**TM:** Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period?

No

**TM:** If yes, please describe the new risks, or changes

**TM & EA:** Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential ) during the reporting period?

No

2.7. ES

**TM & EA:** If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail including the status, significance, who was involved and what actions were taken.

**EA:** Environmental and social safeguards management  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

Improving the financial situation of the target communities plays a decisive role in strengthening the conservation of the 21 species and maintaining the integrity of the ecosystems in the project sites. Environmentally-friendly income-generating activities have been implemented to meet community needs. The consequent provision of inputs to beneficiaries has led to a significant improvement in local community incomes, and health and education infrastructures have been built to ensure the well-being of the population (renovation or new construction). The General Direction of CMP Tandavanala has also agreed to provide additional equipment for the local hospital Takoandra, an infrastructure built with the project (06 metal beds and 06 mattresses) during the reporting period.

2.8. KM/Learning

**EA:** Knowledge activities and products  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

COKETES has capitalized on information on the project's 21 target species, as well as actions for their future protection, through publications of the conservation strategy for Madagascar pond heron and the 19 other plant species. A 50-minute film recounting the species approach and the main achievements of the COKETES project during the project implementation period was produced. In addition, three 15-minute documentaries on the achievements of the Partners in the intervening sites of the Sofia Region for wildlife component and the Analanjirofo and Atsinanana Regions for flora were produced by DCSI. They are scheduled for screening on national television in October 2022. The Project Implementation Unit capitalized on lessons learned and best practices from the COKETES Project following the various workshops organized.

*Please attach a copy of any products*

**EA:** Main learning during the period

The involvement of the 14 Focal Points from the Regional Direction for the Environment and Sustainable Development, established following the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation, has been effective. This involvement has contributed to the success of the project.

2.9. Stories

**EA:** Stories to be shared  
(section to be shared with communication division/  
GEF communication)

Malagasy natural heritage is under threat from excessive use in the face of growing poverty and limited support for natural resource governance. The use of the 21 target species approach, including 20 plants and one migratory bird species in the COKETES Project, has enabled the implementation of concrete local strategies for their conservation through the integration of social and environmental factors. The Project's enhanced performance is based on the effective participation of local authorities and grassroots communities in the conservation of key species, following various awareness-raising and capacity-building campaigns. The key to success is the integration of socio-economic factors into the protection of target species. Local grassroots communities play a crucial role in the sustainable management of biodiversity. The development of participatory approaches should not be a step to be missed in this case. These approaches must not and cannot be set in stone; on the contrary, they must be site-specific and targeted. On the other hand, the value of the joint approach, reflected in the technical support combined with the supervision of managers, is a rich and undeniable experience of the project. The aim of this approach is to integrate communities, one of the project's key success factors, into the implementation of the conservation plan's actions. The person in charge may be a person with decision-making authority at site level, or may be the site manager.

### 3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE

3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes (Development Objectives)

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	EA: Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	TM: Progress rating
<b>Objective</b>							
	1.Number of PA and Forest Management plans incorporating and implementing specific actions focused on the conservation of the targeted species	Biodiversity conservation essentially at ecosystem level between 3 to 5 of other target species, mainly fauna species, but not the project threatened and economically valuable target species	Specific actions focusing on the conservation status of the target species are incorporated into 13 PA management plans and or Action Plan covering 611,669 ha, 4 forest management plans covering 37,154 ha and 2 urban parks covering 34ha	Specific actions focusing on the conservation status of the target species are implemented into 13 PA management plans or Action covering 611,669 ha, 4 forest management plans covering 37,154 ha and 2 urban parks covering 34ha	100%	Indicator reached: the key species are considered as target and/or integrated targets in the management plan of the PA, action plan nd urban park. A total of six PAs have renewed their management plans (2 PA for wildlife component and 4 for flora)	HS
	2. Number of key threatened species with increased conservation status	Conservation status: 16 out of the 21 key species are threatened -5 key species are data deficient (Baseline values of each target species population size will be determined at project start)	Baseline values of each target species population size will be determined and validated	10% increase of 21 Key species population size - Eventual improved status approved by national specialist groups of the 16 species and status update provided on the 5 other species			

“To promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity using the species approach, complementing the ecosystem approach, by developing, implementing and disseminating participatory local strategies on key endemic, threatened and economically valuable species

<p>3.Number of stakeholder groups that take action for conservation of key species as result of the awareness activities</p>	<p>Baseline levels of awareness to be measured through surveys at project start</p>	<p>At 4 stakeholder groups (local communities, authorities, technical agents from the public service and NGOs) representing at least 25% of the population in the project sites, including in 56 villages are made aware of key species conservation and sustainable use</p>	<p>At 4 stakeholder groups (local communities, authorities, technical agents from the public service and NGOs) representing at least 75% of the population in the project sites, including in 56 villages are made aware of key species conservation and sustainable use</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>HS</p>
<p>4. Number ha of forests enriched/ restored with the 20 target plant species.</p>	<p>Low density of the target species per hectare (&lt;10) due to overexploitation and habitat destruction</p>	<p>All technical aspects related to the restoration and enrichment of Forest are known by stakeholders and seedling are available</p>	<p>100 ha of restored / enriched forests (Year5). Forests restored with the 20 species, maintained and developed by local stakeholders (long-term)</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>HS</p>
<p>5. Number of ha of Agroforestry plots and home gardens (including with legumes species) based on the 20 species</p>	<p>Absence of endemic species planted by the farmers (0 plot)</p>	<p>20 ha of agroforestry plots and home gardens including the 20-target species and about 05 agroforest species</p>	<p>Agroforestry system by using key species developed in the project sites</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>Completed</p>	
<p>6. % increase of Ardeola idae individuals identified during the population census</p>	<p>Lack of knowledge about population size of Ardeola idae  Baseline survey of population size to be determined in year 1</p>	<p>Baseline survey of Ardeola population size and Habitat restoration in all target sites and sensitization of local communities</p>	<p>25% Increased from the base line population size of <i>Ardeola idae</i></p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>It is worth noting that the population increased by 21.2% from the baseline, the number of juveniles and immatures were not taken into account in the assessment</p>	<p>HS</p>



	7. Number of measures taken to ensure sustainable conservation and use of all target species	Forms and levels of uptake exceed levels of biological and productive sustainability	Sustainable measures for use of target species developed and agreed with stakeholders	At least 3 sustainable measures of use of all target species are adopted	100%	Completed	HS
	8. % increase of households of the project area with increased incomes	Baseline data of local population livelihood to be measured through surveys at the project start	20% increase of incomes of the inhabitants (men and women) of 56 targeted villages of the project	50% increase of the number of households (male and female) benefiting from economic and incentives from conservation efforts	100%	Completed	HS

Outcome 1

Outcome 1.1: Biodiversity conservation based on a species-based approach is known by all stakeholders	% of key stakeholders aware of viable approaches to conservation of the key species in their localities	Capacity on conservation at ecosystem level for only protected areas managers Capacity on conservation of scientists limited on some taxa or species groups Limited involvement of the different stakeholders in the conservation efforts (few members of local communities working in protected areas enforcing control activities, actions of stakeholders limited to participation at different meetings)	50% of habitants in 56 targeted villages aware of key species conservation	80% of habitants in 56 targeted villages aware of key species conservation			
---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>Outcome 1.2: Social and economic values, technical and scientific knowledge on the 21 key species is available.</p>	<p>Numbers of key stakeholder groups with regular access to information on the 21-key species</p>	<p>Scattered knowledge on the selected key species Scientific publication without concrete impact on species conservation</p>	<p>4 target groups such as local communities, local authorities and technicians, forest administration, technical and financial partners receiving the research results and exploit them for conceptualization of key species local conservation strategies</p>	<p>All national stakeholder representatives' partners receiving the research results and exploit them for conceptualization of key species local conservation strategies</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>HS</p>
<p>Outcome 1.3: A local collective convention is implemented, with support from local stakeholders, for the conservation of the 21 targeted species in the project intervention sites</p>	<p>Numbers of collective agreements for species conservation provided with "Dina", signed by village chiefs, and supported by local stakeholders</p>	<p>Convention restricted to some actors Selective /or ineffective application of the Dina</p>	<p>16 Collective agreements for species conservation, provided by « Dina » and by "promotion of economic and incentives for conservation actions" 64 village chiefs have provided signatures and/or fingerprints for the collective agreements</p>	<p>75% of stakeholders in the target communities express support to the local collective conventions</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>HS</p>
<p><b>Outcome 2</b></p>							
<p>Outcome 2.1: Enabling conditions created for the participation of local people in the conservation of the key species</p>	<p>Numbers of people with increased knowledge of strategies for the conservation of key species</p>	<p>Inefficiency of local stakeholder's involvement in conservation actions due to lack of training Strategies and action plan related to environment and/or Biodiversity conceived at central level Local development plan not incorporating the conservation aspects of Biodiversity and species</p>	<p>At the 16 sites of the project 224 members of local communities, rural extension agents (20 forestry, 10 agriculture, 10 fisheries, 10 livestock, 32 agents from technical partners) have increased knowledge to implement strategies for key species conservation</p>	<p>75% of stakeholders in the target communities express support to the local collective conventions</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>HS</p>

	<p>Number of people or communities' representatives involved in key species conservation actions</p> <p>Number of women involved in the project actions</p>	<p>Non-inclusive conservation actions (only a few privileged and /or motivated COBA members are involved)</p> <p>Baseline information on local stakeholders' involvement in conservation actions to be completed through surveys at project start</p>	<p>The population of 4 villages per site (a total of 64 villages for the 16 sites) involved in key species conservation actions</p>	<p>Involvement of 80% of populations in the project intervention site and 50% of them are women</p>	100%	Completed	HS
<p>Outcome 2.2. Improved livelihood of local communities resulting from their support to conservation actions</p>	<p>% of beneficiaries of economic incentives for species conservation actions</p> <p>Number of women beneficiaries</p>	<p>Unknown benefits to local populations from conservation actions - Baseline information on local benefits from conservation actions to be measured through surveys at project start</p>	<p>The incentives and mechanism to deliver these incentives in support conservation efforts are identified</p>	<p>75% of habitants in the project targeted villages would get benefits from economic incentives from conservation actions (50% are women)</p>	100%	Completed	HS
<p>Outcome 3.1. New information related to species approach in Biodiversity conservation are documented, shared and disseminated to conservation actors</p>	<p>Numbers of target groups informed on species-based approach for biodiversity conservation</p>	<p>Lack of information shared on species conservation</p> <p>Information on biodiversity conservation focused mainly on ecosystem approach</p>	<p>Tools and materials for dissemination of species-based approach for biodiversity conservation are developed</p>	<p>6 target groups (local communities, decision makers, researchers, protected areas managers, funding partners, environmental NGOs) involved in Biodiversity conservation in 10 regions through the country, informed on species-based approach for Biodiversity conservation</p>	100%	Completed	HS

Outcome 3.2 The importance of species conservation is recognized in the Biodiversity sustainable management at different levels	Numbers of target species whose conservation and sustainable use is supported by regulatory texts	Local, regional and national Biodiversity management too limited to ecosystem approach	Analysis of policy, legal and legislative framework related to species conservation	Conservation and sustainable use of 21 target species governed by regulatory texts (long-term) - Inclusion of the 21 target species conservation and sustainable use in different policy documents	85%	85% of the indicator has been achieved. Conservation aspects of target species are already integrated into national legislation, international conventions and the IUCN red list. New projects focusing on the conservation of key species have been submitted to funding partners, and new funding is already being mobilized by some project partners to ensure the conservation of key species.	HS
--	---	--	---	---	-----	--	----

**Outcome 4**


For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

**3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress)**

Output	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	EA: Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	TM: Progress rating
<b>Under Comp 1</b>					
Output 1.1.1: Awareness raising programme for different actors ( local communities, technical agents, local authorities) in support of the conservation of important species	30 September 2022	84.71%	100%	All stakeholders were informed of the conservation of the 21 target species. 94.18% of the population in the target participated in the awareness raising campaigns. 81.13% of the population were aware of key species conservation. It exceeds the value indicated to reach at the end of the project which is 80%. Awareness raising campaigns have determined positive influence on the target species conservation referred to the involvement of stakeholders in their protection.	HS
Output 1.2.2: A Research plan on biological, physical, ecological on the 21 target species to support their conservation actions	30 September 2022	100%	100%	Social and economic values, technical and scientific knowledge on the 21 key species are available	HS
Output 1.2.3: A completed sector-based economic analysis of the services and derived products of the 21 global and national significant species	30 September 2022	100%	100%	18 safeguard plans including gender dimensions elaborated. The plan for the Zoo of Tsimbazaza consists of creating financing mechanism that supports financial sustainability for maintaining periodically the nesting habitat of the bird.	HS
Output 1.3.1: Conservation strategies of the species to complete ecosystem management (prepared in participatory manner with the involvement of the local community representatives)	30 September 2022	100%	100%	The local consultations have enabled to formalize the commitments of stakeholders on the conservation actions of the key species.	HS
Output 1.3.2: Technical and administrative tools for the application of the collective conventions	30 September 2022	100%	100%	Tools were developed to relate the collective implementation of the conservation actions related to key species.	HS

Output 1.3.3: Model of collective convention for species conservation strategies	30 September 2022	100%	100%	100% of stakeholders in target communities expressed support for local collective agreements. It exceeds the value indicated to reach at the end of the project which is 75%	HS
<b>Under Comp 2</b>					
Output 2.1.1: Management contracts transferred to local communities for implementation	30 September 2022	100%	100%	For the wildlife component, all 25 (Locally based Communities) (VOIs) have been committed to contributing to Madagascar-Pond Heron's conservation actions. All of the VOIs in the Flora intervening sites were committed for conservation of natural resources in particular the plants targets species in their areas. An annual workplan under RDES supervision about the conservation of targets species have been included in their management tools.	HS
Output 2.1.2 Effective involvement of all stakeholders in the project sites for target species conservation	30 September 2022	100%	100%	The project activities were implemented in 148 villages; it exceeded the number of target villages indicated in the project document which is 56.  A total of 13,136 households representing about 52,544 persons involved in the conservation actions. This value confirms that the Project is intervening outside the target villages to ensure the conservation of the species.	HS
Output 2.1.3 Enhanced species conservation in protected areas	30 September 2022	99.42%	100%	Data collected at the site level contribute to improve the scientific knowledge of the plant target species and their national conservation strategy /The conservation actions of the Madagascar Pond-heron have also contributed to the conservation of other waterbirds species through their annual monitoring. They have helped to strengthen the conservation of 13 threatened bird species according to the IUCN Red List	HS
Output 2.2.1: Economic incentives/conservation-friendly alternative livelihood models	30 September 2022	98.50%	100%	43,268 inhabitants of the target villages benefited from the income-generating activities. This value confirms that the Project is intervening outside the target villages to ensure the conservation of the species. The beneficiaries represent 52.48% of women. Then, the indicators set by the project were achieved. The increase in income is on average 30% ± 15	HS
Output 2.3.1. Ability of local stakeholders for key species conservation	30 September 2022	94.21%	100%	The results obtained are satisfactory, the majority of the target group members were able to correctly identify the target species and practice the monitoring methods. The communities in the 148 target villages participated in the following conservation actions	HS
<b>Under Comp 3</b>					
Output 3.1.1 Project Database managed by the MEDD Information System Department and recorded in other databases	30 September 2022	88.89%	100%	New information related to species approach in Biodiversity conservation are shared and disseminated effectively to conservation decision-makers Online database is accessible via the URL <a href="http://102.16.25.129/coketes">http://102.16.25.129/coketes</a>	HS
Output 3.1.2. National and Regional (Africa) networks allowing to capitalize and exchange information on Ardeola idea	30 September 2022	75%	100%	Sharing information on the Madagascar-pond heron at national, regional and international level	HS
Output 3.1.3. Different tools and methods developed to disseminate the application of the collective conventions on key species conservation approach	30 September 2022	100%	100%	The Project reached 11 target groups in 14 Regions during the project period	HS

Output 3.2.1. Species conservation approach included in reference documents and funding programs related to Biodiversity	30 September 2022	0%	85%	<p>A national strategy on the conservation of the white crab heron for a period of 10 years (2023-2032) is available</p> <p>A national strategy of conservation of 19 plants targets species is available</p> <p>Up to the reporting period, 13 Management Plans of Protected Areas that consider the protection of COKETES key species are available.</p>	HS
<b>Under Comp 4</b>					
<b>Under Comp 5</b>					

The Task Manager will decide on the relevant level of disaggregation (i.e. either at the output or activity level).

#### 4 Risk Rating

##### 4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

Please refer to the Risk Help Sheet for more details on rating

Risk Factor	EA's Rating	TM's Rating
1 Management structure - Roles and responsibilities	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
2 Governance structure - Oversight	Moderate: Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC provides direction/inputs. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC provides direction/inputs. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
3 Implementation schedule	Low : Project progressing according to original work plan and Adaptive management is practiced and regular monitoring. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Project progressing according to original work plan and Adaptive management is practiced and regular monitoring. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
4 Budget	Low : Activities are progressing within planned budget and Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Activities are progressing within planned budget and Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
5 Financial Management	Low : Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
6 Reporting	Low : Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
7 Capacity to deliver	Low : Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners and Capacity gaps were addressed before implementation or during early stages. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners and Capacity gaps were addressed before implementation or during early stages. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.

If any of the risk factors is rated a Moderate or higher, please include it in Table B below

##### 4.2 Table B. Risk-log

Implementation Status (Current PIR)

6th PIR

Insert ALL the risks identified either at CEO endorsement (inc. safeguards screening), previous/current PIRs, and MTRs. Use the last line to propose a suggested consolidated rating.

Risk	Risk affecting:	Risk Rating							Variation respect to last rating	
	Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	PIR 6	Δ	Justification
Risk 1 : Climate change and variability (notably increased cyclones) damages critical sites. Intense storms may damage sites and critically damage populations of flora species	Outcome 1-3	M	Not Applicable	M	Not Applicable	M	M	M	=	
Risk 2: Local poverty undermines conservation efforts. The project seeks participatory methods, but if local populations are extremely poor, finding a balance between conservation and sustainable use is a challenge.	Outcome 2.2	L	Not Applicable	M	M	L	L	L	=	
Risk 3: Political instability undermines project implementation. The current political instability makes it difficult to secure long-term commitment and to develop institutional capacities.		L	Not Applicable	L	Not Applicable	L	L	L	=	
Risk 4: population illiteracy		L	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	L	L	L	=	

Risk 5: Reference data on the conservation status of target species are so inadequate that they provide no basis for conservation. Data is lacking for many target species, and if, after data collection, the "conservation status" proves "threatened", the project may not have the means (or the time) to preserve them.
Risk 6: Weak administrative commitment and capacity to support project activities and long-term sustainability
Risk 7: Potential risk of introducing new species (e.g. legumes) to pilot sites
Risk 8: No conservation measures for <i>Ardeola idae</i> in other African countries of migration (Kenya, Mozambique and Central African Republic).
Outcome 2.3

L	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	M	L	L	=	
M	Not Applicable	M	Not Applicable	L	L	L	=	
M	Not Applicable	M	Not Applicable	M	M	L	↓	No new species introduced to pilot sites
M	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	M	L	L	=	

Consolidated project risk

	Not Applicable	M	M	M	M	L		This section focuses on the variation. The overall rating is discussed in section 2.3.
--	----------------	---	---	---	---	---	--	--

### 4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks

List here only risks from Table A and B above that have a risk rating of M or higher in the current PIR

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIR-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	Additional mitigation measures for the next periods		
			What	When	By whom
Risk 1: Climate change and variability (notably increased cyclones) damages critical sites. Intense storms may damage sites and critically damage populations of flora species	Climate change and variability (including increased cyclones) damage critical sites. Intense storms can damage critical sites and populations of flora species. This risk, especially variability (reduced or no rainfall), has disrupted some activities such as plant production or restoration and necessitated additional measures such as watering. For plantations and other types of crops, changes in planting season following the trend (variability) are adopted. The project's efforts on restoring degraded ecosystems also contribute to climate change mitigation. Integration of the climate dimension in the implementation of all conservation and incentives project activities) The recommendations were followed (e.g., cultivation calendar, beginning of reforestation coinciding with the rainy season)	After cyclones passage in 2023, farmers and communities have now started planting again with the supporting partners.			

**High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.  
**Significant 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.  
**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.  
**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.





Ambodihady	-20.3348	47.3272	Sandrandahy	Incentives project
Ambonifezana	-20.3351	47.3265	Sandrandahy	Incentives project
Marovalona	-20.3347	47.3065	Sandrandahy	Incentives project
Ankafotra	-20.3322	47.3019	Sandrandahy	Incentives project
Itanjona	-20.3245	47.3228	Sandrandahy	Restoration/forest Enrichment
Andreba	-18.1703	47.5427	Ambongamarina	Nurseries/seedlings production
Ambohimahatrinjo	-18.2116	48.0018	Ambongamarina	Nurseries/seedlings production
Ambongamarina	-18.1719	47.5656	Ambongamarina	Nurseries/seedlings production
Anjozorovola	-18.2117	48.0017	Ambongamarina	Nurseries/seedlings production
Ambohimahatrinjo	-18.2116	48.0018	Ambongamarina	Beekeeping
Anjozorovola	-18.2117	48.0017	Ambongamarina	Beekeeping
Andreba	-18.1703	47.5427	Ambongamarina	Beekeeping
Andiambarika	-18.1722	47.5651	Ambongamarina	cash crop
Anorana	-18.1804	48.0046	Ambongamarina	cash crop
Anjozorovola	-18.2117	48.0017	Ambongamarina	cash crop
Andreba	-18.1703	47.5427	Ambongamarina	cash crop
Analamihotra	-19.2345	47.5024	Tsiazompaniry	Restoration/forest Enrichment
Iharamalaza	-19.1454	47.4715	Tsiazompaniry	Nurseries/seedlings production
Manandriana	-19.1706	47.5617	Tsiazompaniry	Nurseries/seedlings production
Ambohimadana	-19.1446	47.4629	Tsiazompaniry	Incentives project
Manandriana	-19.1706	47.5617	Tsiazompaniry	Incentives project
Analamihotra	-19.2345	47.5024	Tsiazompaniry	Incentives project
Iharamalaza	-19.1454	47.4715	Tsiazompaniry	Incentives project
Ampasimamena	-19.0648	48.1918	Bekorakaka	Incentives project
Manampana	-19.0645	48.3579	Bekorakaka	Patrols
Ville de Fenerive-Est	-17.3761	49.4000	Pointe à Larrée	Dina homologation
Village d'Antsiraka, Fokontany Antsiraka, Commune Rurale Antanifotsy	-18.8333	49.8000	Pointe à Larrée	Incentives project
Village d'Ankitrirambo, Fokontany Antsiraka, Commune Rurale Antanifotsy	-18.8333	49.7833	Pointe à Larrée	Incentives project
Village d'Ambodimanga, Fokontany Tamambao-Ambidimanga, Commune Rur	-18.8118	49.7231	Pointe à Larrée	Incentives project
Village de Manjato, Fokontany Manjato, Commune Rurale Antanifotsy	-18.8141	49.8500	Pointe à Larrée	Incentives project
Village d'Ambohisara, Fokontany Vohijiny, Commune Rurale de Manompana	-16.7667	49.6931	Pointe à Larrée	Incentives project
Foret d'Andakibe, Fokontany Tamambao-Ambidimanga, Commune Rurale Ma	-16.8145	49.7654	Pointe à Larrée	Silvicultural and invasive species treatment
Ampasimahatena, Fokontany Antsiraka, Commune rurale d'Antanifotsy (espèc	-18.8187	49.7867	Pointe à Larrée	Restoration/forest Enrichment
Sahafandano, Fokontany Vohijiny, Commune Rurale de Manompana	-16.7500	49.6667	Pointe à Larrée	Restoration/forest Enrichment
Foret d'Andriavolavo, Fokontany Tamambao-Ambidimanga, Commune Rural	-16.8145	49.7654	Pointe à Larrée	phenological monitoring
Foret d'Ampasimahatena, Fokontany Antsiraka, Commune Rurale Antanifotsy	-16.8285	49.7730	Pointe à Larrée	phenological monitoring
Foret de Sahafandano, Fokontany Vohijiny, Commune Rurale Manompana	-16.7634	49.6760	Pointe à Larrée	phenological monitoring
NAP Tampolo	-17.2923	49.4177	Tampolo	Restoration/forest Enrichment
Pépièrre Avertem Tampolo	-17.2897	49.4136	Tampolo	Seedlings Production
Pépièrre villageise Tampolo	-17.2833	49.4000	Tampolo	Seedlings Production
Pépièrre VOI Andava I	-17.2833	49.4000	Tampolo	Seedlings Production
Pépièrre VOI Rankolava	-17.2500	49.4167	Tampolo	Seedlings Production
Pépièrre VOI Takobota	-17.2000	49.4500	Tampolo	Seedlings Production
Andapa II	-17.2981	49.4000	Tampolo	Monitoring VOI
Rantolava	-17.2919	49.4167	Tampolo	Monitoring VOI
Andapa II	-17.2981	49.4000	Tampolo	Incentives project
Rantolava	-17.2919	49.4167	Tampolo	Incentives project
Takobota	-17.2144	49.4514	Tampolo	Incentives project
Tampolo	-17.2868	49.4087	Tampolo	Training Zahatampolo
Ville de Soanierana Ienpo, Fokontany Soanierana Ienpo, Commune Rurale	-16.9194	49.5833	Tampolo	JME regional
Ankaho	-19.1931	44.5605		Fire fighting
Ankaho	-19.1931	44.5605		Celebration of traditional opening of fisheries
Ankaho	-19.1931	44.5605		Sanitary control of the hives
Ankaho	-19.1931	44.5605		Income surveys
Ambondrobo Ambonara	-19.1988	44.5401		Monitoring of the target bird
Aboalimena	-19.2619	44.4311		Fire fighting
Aboalimena	-19.2619	44.4311		Patrols
Ankaho	-19.1799	44.5498		Patrols
Belobaka	-19.2003	44.6193		Patrols
Belobaka	-19.2003	44.6193		Fire fighting
Andimaky	-19.2400	44.6913		Patrols
Ankilitato	-19.3127	44.7110		Patrols
Ankaho	-19.1931	44.5605		Sanitary control of the hives
Ambatomanjaka	-19.1924	44.5607		Sanitary control of the hives
Soarano	-19.1873	44.5492		Sanitary control of the hives
Antaratsy	-17.5635	44.0622		Sylviculture maintenance
Antaretsy	-19.1871	44.5439		Waterbird census
Ankapoahy	-19.2037	44.3395		Waterbird census
Ambondrobo Ambonara	-19.1988	44.5401		Waterbird census
Andranotomendry	-16.2489	46.9555		Income surveys
Bealana	-16.3927	46.6578		Income surveys
Andranohobaka	-16.3101	46.7464		Income surveys
Anjakely	-15.9069	45.7845		Income surveys
Botromena	-15.9499	45.8488		Income surveys
Ambaninjanahary	-16.0035	45.8469		Income surveys
Bevary	-15.9643	45.9178		Income surveys
Andranomany	-15.9897	45.8686		Income surveys
Namaka	-15.9181	45.8422		Income surveys
Mbaavatana	-15.9728	45.9419		Income surveys
Antongomena Bevary	-15.9550	45.9464		Income surveys
Ambararatabe	-16.1927	45.9662		Income surveys
Bekofafa	-15.9619	45.9464		Income surveys
Antongomena Bevary	-15.9550	45.9464		Income surveys
Andranomany	-15.9897	45.8686		Income surveys
Bemokotra	-15.9276	45.9448		Income surveys
Bemakamba	-15.9512	45.9514		Awareness against bushfires
Bemokotra	-15.9276	45.9448		Awareness against bushfires
Anjakely	-15.9069	45.7845		Awareness against bushfires
Antongomena	-16.1486	45.8717		Awareness against bushfires
Antongomena Bevary	-15.9550	45.9464		Awareness against bushfires

Masoarivo	-19.0297	44.3416		Awareness
Ambalakazaha	-18.8328	44.3770		Awareness
Ambondro	-18.8361	44.4172		Awareness
Bemamba	-18.8396	44.3731		Awareness
PBZT	-18.9304	47.5271		Captive rearing of Madagascar pond heron chick
PBZT	-18.9304	47.5275		Development of IEC tools
PBZT	-18.9309	47.5268		Maintenance of lakes and infrastructure set up by COKETES
Petit Lac	-18.9306	47.5264		Monitoring of aquatic plant restoration
Petit Lac	-18.9306	47.5264		Planting of a few specimens of the project's target plants at the edge of the lake
PBZT	-18.9310	47.5270		Planting of some specimens of target plants near the greenhouse
Petit Lac	-18.9306	47.5264		Scientific monitoring of the biology, ecology and distribution of the target species
Petit Lac	-18.9306	47.5264		Waterbird census
				Awareness raising in 50 fokontany (Ambodirano, Androndrakely, Ivarija, Alasora, Amboarary, Amboato, Amboditanety, Ambodivoanjo, Ambodivahiny, Ambohinanambola, Ambohimangakely, Amboho, Ambohiroy, Ambohitanety, Idoho, Ambohitrakaza, Imoronakona, Ampahibato, Ampamanatana, Andohoranofotsy, Andralanitra, Andranovory, Andranovory, Androndrakely, Ankaditratombo, Ankadilalamotsy, Ankadinandriana, Ankaditoha, Ankadivato, Ankarobato, Ankazolava, Antsahaso, Fiadanana, Mahanoro, mandrosea, Ifarily, Ikiarja, Mahazoarivo,
	-18.9304	47.5275		
PBZT				
Marotalana	-14.6116	49.0284		Elaboration to a participatory annual work plan
Marotalana	-14.6116	49.0284		Monitoring of beekeeping, basketry and sewing incentive projects
Marotalana	-14.6116	49.0284		Festival Ardeola idae
Lac Sofia	-14.6033	49.0081		Monitoring of the target bird
Marotalana	-14.6116	49.0284		Patrols
Lac Ambondrobo	-19.1923	44.5384		Monitoring of the target bird
Lac Sofia	-14.6033	49.0081		Monitoring of the target bird
Lac Mandrozo	-17.5625	44.0953		Monitoring of the target bird
Lac Andranovaobe	-17.6060	44.0654		Monitoring of the target bird
Lac Marovava	-17.6259	44.0663		Monitoring of the target bird
Marais d'Anosinomy	-17.5476	44.0658		Monitoring of the target bird
Andeja	-17.5356	44.0427		Monitoring of the target bird
Marais Ampisahambohitra	-17.5317	44.0406		Monitoring of the target bird
Ambatofotsy	-17.5774	44.0662	Freshwater lake	Monitoring of the target bird
Marovava	-17.6161	44.0775	Freshwater lake	Monitoring of the target bird
Andeja	-17.5397	44.0388	Grassy marshes	Monitoring of the target bird
Ampisahambohitry	-17.5209	44.0413	Freshwater marshes	Monitoring of the target bird
Lac Ankerika	-19.0413	44.4557		Monitoring of the target bird
Lac Soamaligo	-19.0219	44.4360		Monitoring of the target bird
Lac Befotaka	-19.0389	44.3988		Monitoring of the target bird
Lac Belinta	-19.0529	44.4328		Monitoring of the target bird
Lac Betangirika	-19.0550	44.4001		Monitoring of the target bird
Lac Andranolava	-19.0086	44.3508		Monitoring of the target bird
Lac Antsamaky	-19.0444	44.3605		Monitoring of the target bird
Beanalavilo	-19.0109	44.2807		Monitoring of the target bird
Riziere Soatanà	-19.0680	44.4738		Monitoring of the target bird
Lac Bemamba	-18.8351	44.4058		Monitoring of the target bird
Ambato	-18.8435	44.3588		Monitoring of the target bird
Lac Masamà	-18.8546	44.4600		Monitoring of the target bird
Antsamaky	-19.0434	44.3617		Monitoring of the target bird
Matsaborimaitso	-14.3272	48.5802	permanent lake	Monitoring of the target bird
Andriakanala	-14.3556	48.6080	permanent lake	Monitoring of the target bird
Maramaratsaregy	-14.3456	48.5876	permanent lake	Monitoring of the target bird
Matsaborimena	-14.3311	48.6080	permanent lake	Monitoring of the target bird
Namaka	-19.2009	44.5394		Monitoring of the target bird
Ambondrobo	-19.1988	44.5401		Monitoring of the target bird
Ambondrobo	-19.1988	44.5401		Monitoring of the target bird
Budapest	19.0667	47.5000		Participation MOP 8
Mauritius	-20.2847	57.4506		Participation of the training of trainers
Mandrozo	-17.5506	44.0812		Training of nurserymen
Aboalimena	-19.2619	44.4311		Training of nurserymen
Bealana	-16.3927	46.6578		Incentives survey
Ampiloroa	-16.3110	46.8112		Incentives survey
Bealana	-16.3927	46.6578		Incentives survey
Beandrazona	-14.4837	48.6776		Festival Ardeola idae

Further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate. \*

[Insert any linked geospatial file]

