MID-TERM REVIEW

Project ID:	9793
Project Name:	Conservation and Improvement of Ecosystem Services for the Atsinanana Region through Agroecology and the Promotion of Sustainable Energy Production
Countr(ies):	Madagascar
Implementing Agency:	UNEP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name Conservation and Improvement of Ecosystem Services for the Atsinanana Region through Agroecology and the Promotion of Sustainable Energy Production	
Country Madagascar	
GEF ID 9793	Implementing Agency UNEP
Executing Entity Ministry of Environment, Ecology and Forestry (General Directorate of Environment and General Directorate of Ecology) and the National Association of Environmental Action (ANAE)	
Trust Fund GET	Project Type FSP
Objective To optimise sustainable land use management, biodiversity conservation, and access of local communities to renewable household energy security and climate change mitigation in Madagascar.	

B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval 5/19/2020	Agency Approval 9/20/2020
Implementation Start 8/28/2020	First Disbursement 9/7/2020
Expected MTR 9/2/2024	MTR Submission 9/11/2025
Actual MTR 4/15/2023	Expected Completion 7/31/2025

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Main MTR Findings

Overall Relevance: The project is deemed relevant as its actions align with the needs of the beneficiary communities and contribute to the objectives of territorial planning tools (PCD and PRD Atsinanana). Its activities also support national policies and strategies across key sectors like energy, agriculture, and land-use planning. The project's activities do not compete with other initiatives in the same intervention areas, and financial expenditures are proportionate to technical and operational achievements.

Effectiveness: At this mid-term stage, the objectives defined in the project's logical framework have not yet been fully met, and medium-term indicators are only partially achieved. Quantitative objectives related to areas of land under sustainable management and preserved biodiversity habitats are not yet measurable, primarily because most activities are still in progress. The observed impacts are currently more 'soft' (e.g., behavioral changes, motivation) than 'hard' (physical impacts).

Sustainability: Sustainability is already predictable, largely due to the early and continuous involvement and mobilization of the Deconcentrated Technical Services (STD) and Decentralized Territorial Collectivities (CTD) from the project's inception.

Progress Rate: The overall implementation progress of the PIA project at the mid-term evaluation is estimated at **54%** of all activities.

Component 1: 63% completion.
Component 2: 42% completion.
Component 3: 42% completion.
Coordination and Monitoring: 69% completion.

Despite some challenges, the project's progress is considered on track

B. Stakeholder Engagement

The project involves a wide range of stakeholders from national to local levels.

Stakeholder Engagement and Roles:

    - The Steering Committee, composed of representatives from various ministries, technical partners, and local authorities, serves as the project's decision-making body.
- The Project Coordination Unit (UCP), representing the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD), is the primary national executing agency, responsible for overall coordination, planning, and monitoring. The UCP is described as open to dialogue and has effectively managed coordination from Antananarivo.
- Implementing partners (ANAE for Component 2 and AIDES for Component 3), along with MEDD's DPRIDD (for Component 1 and transversal), are responsible for detailed activity implementation according to agreed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs).
- Decentralized Territorial Collectivities (CTD), including regions, districts, and communes, facilitate project interventions on the ground and are involved in project events. Their collaboration with the project is consistently good.
- Direct beneficiaries (farmers, nursery operators, artisans, charcoal producers) are diverse and typically engage through contracts. They are generally highly motivated and interested in the project's activities, appreciating that commitments are largely respected. They

understand the importance of resource degradation and are motivated by the valorization of degraded lands.

Progress in Engagement:

- A multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism is in place and operational.
- A roadmap integrating sustainable land management, biodiversity, and sustainable energy has been developed and adopted at the regional level.
- The relationship between the project team and beneficiaries is highly appreciated. Information and awareness meetings ensure communities understand the project's mission.
- The project actively communicates its activities and achievements through various channels, including national and regional events and specific communication tools.

Challenges in Engagement:

- Internal communication gaps exist between the UCP and implementing partners, and particularly between partners themselves (AIDES and ANAE), often leading to independent work and occasional overlaps in activities or uncoordinated field visits.
- A lack of a common monitoring-evaluation framework shared with partners means each partner uses their own monitoring methods.
- There's a discrepancy in understanding the project's start date between the UCP (referring to the initial project document) and partners (referring to their MOU signature dates, which were later), impacting activity deadlines.
- Local mayors sometimes exert excessive influence over beneficiary selection, potentially leading to favoritism.
- The project's per diem and local allowances are higher than other actors, raising concerns that some participants may be motivated by compensation rather than genuine interest.

Outcomes & Recommendations for Engagement:

- Improve internal project communication (UCP-Partners and inter-partner) by establishing common communication channels for sharing mission schedules and meeting dates.
- Maintain systematic quarterly coordination meetings to ensure ongoing exchanges and information sharing.
- The UCP and partners should revisit the overall project timeline and agree on clear milestones, addressing the discrepancies in project start dates.
- Ensure beneficiary selection is based on project interests and technical motivation, not on compensation or favoritism. Project management should supervise grassroots interventions.
- Strengthen the presence of technicians in the field for follow-up, especially for agroecology activities in remote areas.
- Involve all local authorities at the Fokontany level and ensure project technicians present themselves to local chiefs to foster involvement.

C. Gender Equality

- The PIA project has a transversal component dedicated to gender integration, aiming for an involvement/participation rate of at least 50% women in all activities.
- A strategy document for gender integration and a stakeholder engagement plan are available.
- Training and awareness manuals on gender and its integration into Sustainable Land Management (GDT), biodiversity, and sustainable energy promotion have been developed and used in training sessions.
- Awareness workshops on the importance of gender integration have been conducted.
- Women are participating in project activities and are among the beneficiaries. They are active and involved in land valorization, including bamboo development and agroecological arrangements.
- Among the 150 identified farmers benefiting from SLM or biodiversity value chains, 35% are women.
- In the bamboo planting activities (part of the energy value chain), women's participation is over 10%. However, their involvement in nursery activities is described as 'occasional'.
- It is noted that there were no women among the participants in the training on improved cookstoves.
- Data on the proportion of women landholders is not yet determined.
- While multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms are in place, the sex-disaggregated data on participation is not well highlighted to show gender balance in identified structures.

Recommendations: The integration of gender needs to be strengthened in the project's continued efforts. Specific planned activities include training women entrepreneurs to empower them and integrate them into the energy-efficient stove value chain (manufacturing, management, sales/marketing).

D. Knowledge Management

The project is expected to generate several communication and knowledge products, including a manual on Sustainable Land Management (SLM) technologies and a community-level training manual on improved stoves, both of which are still under development. Additionally, marketing messages and communication tools to support local distribution of efficient stoves are in early stages, with limited progress and low dissemination.

III. Core Indicators

Indicator 3 Area of land and ecosystems under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	5600	301	

Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
Cropland		4,800.00	0.00	

Indicator 3.2 Area of forest and forest land under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	500.00	301.00	

Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and woodland under restoration

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
Woodlands		300.00	0.00	

Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	296500	5050	

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	3,500.00	5,050.00	

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	293,000.00	0.00	

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value or other forest loss avoided

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported

Name of the OECMs	WDPA-ID	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

Documents (Document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title

Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (direct)		1013805	389805	
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (indirect)				

Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (direct)		1013805	389,805	
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting			2024	
Duration of accounting		20	1	

Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Total Target Benefit	Energy (MJ) (At PIF)	Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)
Target Energy Saved (MJ)				

Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Technology	Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		7,000	6,840	
Male		8,000	4,560	
Total	**0**	**15,000**	11,400	**0**

IV: Co Financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Anticipated at CEO($)	Materialized at MTR($)
Civil Society Organization	International Network for Bamboo and Rattan (INBAR)	Grant		1,000,000.00	400,000.00
Civil Society Organization	Professionals for Fair Development (GRET)	Grant		7,000,000.00	7,000,000.00
Civil Society Organization	National Association of Environmental Action (ANAE)	In-kind		1,000,000.00	157,648.00
Civil Society Organization	PROSPERER - Programme de Soutien aux Pôles de Micro-Entreprises Rurales et aux Economies Régionales de Madagascar	Grant		2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00
Civil Society Organization	Appui aux investissements durables (AIDES)	In-kind		100,000.00	32,052.00
Recipient Country Government	FID – Development Investment Fund	Grant		17,800,000.00	7,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment, Ecology and Forests (MEEF)	In-kind		1,000,000.00	700,000.00
Total Co-financing				**29,900,000.00**	**17,289,700.00**

Comments

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
		Low	

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

The project addresses the degradation of ecosystem services by promoting agroecology, sustainable energy, and the restoration of at least 500 hectares of degraded land using native species and bamboo. It targets reduced deforestation and improved land management across 4,800 hectares of production landscapes through sustainable practices such as agroforestry and GDT. Anticipated environmental impacts include the reduction of over 1.6 million tons of CO_2 emissions over 20 years from land-use change, bamboo gasification, and improved cookstoves. Despite some delays, an environmental impact study for the bamboo gasification plant is planned. Socially, the project is deeply rooted in local needs—particularly those related to energy and agriculture in a context of high poverty—and supports community-led conservation, agricultural productivity, and income generation. It also empowers local populations, including women and youth, through skill-building, renewable energy training, and inclusive participation in ecosystem management, contributing to both environmental sustainability and socio-economic development.

VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category	Title
M and E Document	Rapport_Revue_Mi-parcours