

Inclusive conservation of sea turtles and seagrass habitats in the north and north-west of Madagascar

Basic Information

GEF ID

10696

Countries

Madagascar

Project Title

Inclusive conservation of sea turtles and seagrass habitats in the north and north-west of Madagascar

GEF Agency(ies)

UNEP

Agency ID

UNEP: 01833

GEF Focal Area(s)

Biodiversity

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

The project cannot be developed under the BD1.5 objective (this objective was set up for a specific initiative). Please only focus on BD 1.1 and BD 2.7.

October 16, 2020:

Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

Agency Response

16Oct2020

Thank you for the clarification. Table A has been reviewed accordingly.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 2, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 2, 2020:

1. We understand the limitations of consultations in the current COVID-19 situation. However, we would welcome a higher level of investment mobilized from LMMAs, private sector, and CSOs. Please, continue working with the identified partners to confirm the expected additional engagements at PPG stage.

2. Would the GEF Agency be able to also mobilize core financing for this project?

October 16, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification and further work to improve co-financing at PPG stage. Cleared.

Agency Response

16Oct2020

Thank you for your understanding. We agree. We have included some co-financing from UNEP at this stage and will be looking to increase co-financing during PPG, including from UNEP.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 2, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 2, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 2, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 2, 2020:

Yes, the PPG requested in Table E is within the allowable cap. Cleared.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines?

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

We take note of the proposed targets under the core indicator 2 (Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use), justifying the BD 2.7 objective. At PPG level, eventually consider the opportunity to include areas of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity out of protected areas to justify the BD1.1 objective (core indicator 5). Cleared.

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers

... does the project program address the greater environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

1. The Theory of Change is welcome, proposing a pathway for change, including assumptions and intermediate states. However, the impression stays that the GEF activities are stand-alone. Please clarify how the baseline situation and co-financing opportunities are contributing to the result framework of the proposal.

2. The established MPAs and LMMAs in the preliminary target areas provide a baseline for the project. Nevertheless, there is no clear presentation of what they are concretely. Please provide a concise description of what MPAs and LMMAs means in terms of existing framework, capacities and tools that will be useful or the project.

October 16, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

16Oct2020

The baseline scenario and Theory of Change text has been revised to better present the MPAs and LMMAs and to make those critical connections more evident. respectively. Please note that the text in the proposed alternative scenario provides further detail as it describes

...the work envisaged under each component including references to how the project will apply lessons from recent/ongoing projects and/or collaborate with relevant ongoing/future projects. This annex is attached as part of the overall UNEP project document.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

1. Component 1 is focused on strengthening the policy, legal and institutional framework. Nevertheless, the baseline description mentions that a Decree related to the protection of Seagrass was drafted in 2018 but has not yet been adopted, a Blue Economy National Strategy has also been drafted but it is still yet to be adopted, and with support from a GEF-5 project, Madagascar also drafted a National Policy and Strategy for the conservation and the protection Dugongs and Seagrass. It seems that the work made on policy reforms is not followed by concrete actions and decisions. Please explain the reason of this situation and why it would be different with this new proposal.

2. Component 2 and 3 require multi-stakeholders collaborations on the ground. Please, explain what kind of platforms that will be used at local level to install the multi-stakeholder dialogue.

3. Insufficient human and financial resources are mentioned as barriers to achieve the conservation objectives. As the expected financial mechanism are targeted to the local communities, it is unclear how this project will face these barriers at a broader scale including the monitoring and management of the MPAs and LMMAs (new governance structures, community patrols,...). Please clarify.

4. As the description rightly says, the active involvement of coastal communities and stakeholders will be critical for the success of the project. While the Component 3 focusses on developing and promoting incentives for local communities, the sustainable financial mechanisms considered appears very uncertain as presented. Please elaborate further on the "incentive-based models", the local conditions that would enable their effective adoption and why the project developers think they could effectively be applied in the targeted areas.

October 16, 2020:

1, 2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

3 and 4. We don't see the additional information as announced in the response to the comments. The added information in component 1 is about knowledge management, in component 3 it is very limited, and in section 7 there is no change in the text. Please complete the description as needed in the project description and further explain the communities' motivation to allocate a percentage of their revenue to support community seagrass/sea turtle monitoring. In general terms, the incentives for the communities and other involved stakeholders to change their habits need to be clearly explained as they are key to demonstrate the project is doable as proposed. Please consider this important aspect.

October 21, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification and additional inputs. Cleared.

Agency Response

16Oct2020

1. Indeed, the adoption of reforms requires complex procedural processes and is heavily dependent on political will. The mentioned period in Madagascar was marked by the 2018-2019 elections, followed by the changes in key government positions and related institutions. The proposed project period is therefore favorable, with increased political stability, high level interest in the blue economy and the structure of the ministry organized according to (a dedicated Department has been recently put in place). The strategic documents are now available and ready for adoption in this conducive environment and this project is designed accordingly to take sea turtle and seagrass conservation to the next level.

2. At the regional level, a dialogue platform will be set up to bring together key stakeholders: fishing communities, private operators, conservation partners, local/regional authorities, and other project partners identified in the PIF. Adequate participation of women will be ensured in line with recommendations from the gender analysis as the platform is set up. Best practice from successful experiences in Madagascar will be applied. These experiences demonstrate that multi-stakeholder platforms are most efficient towards decision-making in sustainable natural resource management. The project will build on the regular meetings between LMMA/MPA managers and the STD (Technical Decentralized Services). It will also build on the annual area meetings (Diego, Nosy Be/Sahamalaza, Analalava) that involve key local stakeholders: Regional Institutions responsible for Fisheries, Environment and Sustainable Development, MIHARI, LMMA/MPA managers, private sector and development project partners. The project will also explore and define the best way to build on the existing MIHARI regional forum during PPG. By operationalizing such platforms, the project will support the continuity of knowledge exchanges through these networks after EOP. This text has also been included under the Stakeholder section 2.

- 3&4. Although currently focused on local communities given their critical role, the scope of the financial mechanism is at this stage not fully defined. While the budgets for National Parks MPAs (e.g. Nosy Hara and Sahamalaza) are relatively limited, basic investment and recurrent costs are effectively guaranteed through government budgets and other funds provided to the parent organization. The other MPAs and LMMAs are dependent largely on project funding secured by promoter NGOs (under the baseline scenario). The "incentive-based models" are based on the principle of setting up a local fund from income-generating activities promoted by the project, where the communities allocate a percentage to support community seagrass/sea turtle monitoring. This concept is currently showing great potential in fishing communities in the Southwest and will be improved and adapted to the north/north-western context in line with the recommendations from the assessments envisaged under outcomes 1 and 2. Further assessment is required during PPG and early stages of implementation to explore a higher level of ambition, including collaboration with MPA and LMMA governance structures to understand their potential participation in a range of options, including payment for ecosystem services schemes, income-generating activities, donations, and grants from private sector CSR/development projects. The project will explore the feasibility of cost recovery for management costs such as patrolling and monitoring and the appropriate mechanisms. These efforts will be complemented through close coordination with the GEF-6 SWIOFish2 and WWF projects (among others identified in the baseline) to join forces to ensure the inclusion of sea turtle and seagrass conservation in the development of in their envisaged financial mechanisms, management toolkits, and related training. These steps represent a relatively small but significant contribution to MPA/LMMA financial sustainability, recognizing that broader solutions at the national scale are beyond the scope of the project. Further detail on the envisaged financial mechanism and addressing the monitoring and management structures have been provided under the description for components 1 and 3, and section 7 on innovation, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.

19Oct2020

Apologies for the oversight. The text has now been revised to include the points made on 16 October and to provide further detail on the envisaged incentives for the communities and other involved stakeholders to change their behavior in support of sea turtle and seagrass

encouraged incentives for the communities and other involved stakeholders to change their behavior in support of sea turtle and seagrass conservation under the alternative scenario description of components 2 and 3.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

As mentioned above, we invite the project developers to focus the justification on the BD objectives BD 1.1 (Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through biodiversity mainstreaming in priority sectors) and BD 2.7 (Address direct drivers to protect habitats and species and Improve financial sustainability, effective management, and ecosystem coverage of the global protected area estate).

October 16, 2020:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

16Oct2020

Table A and section 4 have been revised to focus on the BD 1.1 and BD 2.7 objectives.

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

There is no text under the section 5. incremental/additional cost reasoning. Please complete as needed.

October 16, 2020:

The table provided under this section is unclear, we don't know which item of the baseline scenario is linked to which item from GEF

support. Please provide a clearer explanation on what the GEF project will create, in addition and building on the existing baseline, and addressing the identified problems, root causes and barriers.

October 21, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification and added information. Cleared.

Agency Response

16Oct2020

Apologies, the table that had been prepared to combine both sections. The table has been split now to respond to sections 5 and 6 separately.

19Oct2020

A description has been provided for section 5 to explain more clearly the incremental/additional cost reasoning and what the GEF project will create, building on the existing baseline (see page 19 on the PIF).

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

The result framework itself is coherent with a logical reasoning from outcomes to outputs and activities. Cleared.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

1. Beyond the local communities, the financial sustainability of the integrated management framework put in place by the project is unclear. Please elaborate further on this aspect.
2. Component 4 doesn't exist. Please amend the project accordingly so that the project description is consistent throughout the PIF.

October 16, 2020:

1. The response to comment 3 under point 3 is not clearly addressed in the project description.
2. Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

October 21, 2020:

Thank you for addressing comment 3 under point 3 above about sustainability. Cleared.

Agency Response

16Oct2020

1. Please refer to the response to your comments 2 and 3 under point 3.
2. Thank you for pointing out. The right component has now been referred to as relevant.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

A map is provided but the coordinates of the targeted areas are missing. Please provide geo-reference coordinates of the intended locations.

October 16, 2020:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

16Oct2020

The requested coordinates have been added and the revised maps include the seagrass areas.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

We take note of the difficulty of consulting IPLCs, CSOs and private sector entities because of the COVID-19 situation and the related impossibility to conduct fieldworks. These consultations and resulting analysis will have to be implemented during the PPG phase. Nevertheless, at this stage, please elaborate in the stakeholders table on what could be the future engagements of these stakeholders, even in general terms, and mentioning that this will be confirmed and adjusted after consultations during the PPPG phase.

October 16, 2020:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

16Oct2020

The mandates and roles of the different stakeholders have been clarified in the revised table.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

1. Gender aspects are embedded in the result framework. We take note that the information is preliminary and surveys will be carried out at PPG. We recommend going beyond specific actions for women and girls, and disaggregated data. It is important to identify at PPG the potential inequalities between males and females and define a project strategy to reduce these inequalities (access to project opportunities – resources, training, decision making entities, etc.). Cleared.
2. Component 4 doesn't exist. Please amend the project accordingly so that the project description is consistent throughout the PIF.

October 16, 2020:

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response

16Oct2020

Thank you. The reference has been corrected throughout the PIF.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

1. We take note of the potential opportunities to work with the private sector but the difficulties to have it concretely engaged at this stage due to the COVID-19 crises and related travel restrictions. This dimension of the project is key for its success and we expect the engagement with the private sector to be fully identified and operational at CEO endorsement stage.
2. Again, Component 4 doesn't exist. Please amend the project accordingly so that the project description is consistent throughout the PIF.

October 16, 2020:

Thank you for this important consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response

16Oct2020

This is well understood and agreed upon. The PPG phase will certainly cover in detail the engagement with the private sector given their strategic role for the success of conservation efforts.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

1. Climate risks, and especially global warming was identified by the IUCN group as the threat #1 against marine turtles. We would like to see this climate risk better screened with 1) data and descriptions, 2) projections and expected impacts, and 3) mitigation measures (institutional, capacity building, field interventions).
2. We take note on the situation about the COVID-19 situation, but please 1) provide a more detailed description of the COVID-19 situation in the country, 2) identify the consequences and impacts in terms of generating GEB (including on the continued commitment of the identified stakeholders and co-financiers), and 3) identify opportunities for delivering GEBs, and eventually contributing toward green recovery and

BUILDING BACK BETTER.

3. We suggest completing the risk related to the “Low interest and low response from the local population” with the potential opposition from some stakeholder groups: (www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2016/09/160901125652.htm; <https://news.mongabay.com/2010/11/thousands-of-marine-turtles-slaughtered-in-madagascar-for-food/>).

October 16, 2020:

1 and 2. Thank you for the additional provided. We note that the climate risk analysis and the COVID-19 possible consequences on the project will be further monitored during the PPG phase. Cleared.

3. Thank you for adjusting the text. Cleared.

Agency Response

16Oct2020

1. Further detail has been added, noting that climate change effects are indeed a general concern, but there is still no assessment of their impacts on sea turtles or seagrass beds in Madagascar. This is one of the areas that will be addressed under Output 1.1: Key gaps in science base and necessary policy, legal and institutional frameworks identified. Findings and recommendations will inform the development of action plans/mitigation strategies that will include relevant institutional and individual capacity building and field interventions. More detail will be provided at CEO endorsement.
2. The description of the risk has been updated with the latest information and further detail provided on the impacts and opportunities for delivering GEBs, which is very much in line with the spirit of this proposal to shift towards sustainable management of the marine resources through conservation approaches.
3. The text has been revised to better reflect the centrality of this issue to the project rationale and envisaged mitigation measures.

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

1. There is a strategic approach for KM which is embedded in the result framework (outputs 1.1, 1.4, 2.1, 2.3). Nevertheless, the proposal says under the knowledge management section that the importance knowledge management is reflected in the description of Component 4 whereas there is no Component 4 in Table B nor in the proposed alternative scenario. Please clarify and amend the proposal accordingly.
2. Clarifying this point, please consider that the KM approach should include the following ingredients: an overview of existing lessons and best practices that inform the project concept; plans to learn from relevant projects, programs, initiatives & evaluations; processes to capture, assess and document the information, lessons, best practice & expertise generated during implementation; tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning & collaboration, which can include knowledge platforms and websites; identified knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders; a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project/program impact and sustainability; and plans for strategic communications.

October 16, 2020:

1. Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.
2. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

16Oct2020

1. Thank you for pointing out at this oversight. The text has been revised throughout.
2. The KM section has been revised to describe in more detail how the mentioned outputs address the recommendations. More specifically, the KM plan under output 1.4 is envisaged to ensure that an adequate system will be in place to share best practices with stakeholders, including through the planned awareness raising and capacity building activities across the components.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

The ESS risk level is considered as low and a ESS risk screening document is uploaded in the Portal. Cleared.

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 2, 2020:

Yes, the project has been endorsed by the current country's OFP Mr. Hery Andriamirado Rakotondravony on July 21, 2020, engaging a project grant of \$3,370,320, a PPG of \$100,000, and \$329,680 of fees for a total endorsed BD STAR resources of \$3,800,000. Cleared.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Secretariat Comment at PIF / WORK Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

Not yet. Please address the comments made above.

October 16, 2020:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

October 21, 2020:

Thank you for addressing the comments. The PIF and PPG are now recommended for clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

During PPG phase, please:

- continue working with the identified partners to confirm the expected additional co-financiers' engagements;
- conduct the necessary IPLCs, CSOs and Private sector consultations to develop the modalities of their engagement in the project;
- Gender: go beyond specific actions for women and girls, and disaggregated data, identifying the potential inequalities between males and females and define a project strategy to reduce these inequalities (access to project opportunities – resources, training, decision making entities, etc.)
- Further analyze the climate risk and the COVID-19 possible consequences on the project and develop appropriate mitigation measures
- Core indicators: Consider the eventual opportunity to include areas of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity out of protected areas to enhance the justification of the BD1.1 objective (core indicator 5).

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/6/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/16/2020	10/16/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/21/2020	10/19/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Context:

Madaagascar's natural resources provide important ecological, social and economic values and ensure multiple environmental goods and

services. In particular, Seagrass meadows are essential for food security because they provide essential habitat for fisheries productivity. However, the quality of the marine environment continues to deteriorate for several reasons including climate change and human activities.

As a consequence, the habitats of marine species become scarce thus leading to vulnerability or even the gradual disappearance of these species. Of particular concern are the seagrass and the sea turtles, which are also traditionally harvested by the local communities.

Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs) represent an important tool for reducing these threats and ensuring the sustainability of marine ecosystems and resources. However, there is currently insufficient information, capacity, coverage and management of these areas, despite the recent commitment of national authorities to triple the extend of marine protected areas and significantly increase their number. In addition, incentives for local stakeholders to develop improved or alternative habits are lacking.

Project:

To address this issue, in 6 key sites of the North and Northwestern Madagascar, the project will aim to develop a sustainable and inclusive management approach to sea turtles and seagrass habitats that can effectively contribute to the ecological integrity and resilience of targeted ecosystems and communities. The implementation of coherent policy, planning and regulatory frameworks from the national to the local level, paired with the establishment of a sea turtle and seagrass Observatory and further supported by the development of local incentives and a sustainable financial mechanism, will lead to improved management effectiveness of sea turtles and seagrass habitats.

The project is structured with three components: 1- Strengthen the policy, legal and institutional framework for sound management of sea turtles and seagrass habitats; 2- Effective and strategic management of sea turtle and seagrasses habitats; and 3- Developing and promoting incentives for local communities to conserve sea turtles and seagrasses and to sustainably manage their habitats.

These actions are expected to result in the active involvement of local communities and key actors in the sustainable management of marine resources and in the conservation of sea turtles and seagrass, reducing the number of sea turtle by-catches, harvesting of adults and eggs and wildlife trafficking, among other factors, and reducing pressures on the seagrass.

Global Environment Benefits:

GEF incremental funding will contribute to marine biodiversity conservation. In particular, at least 428,134 ha of marine protected areas are expected to be under improved management for conservation of sea turtles and seagrass and sustainable use of marine resources. In addition, the project will benefit to 13,000 stakeholders.

Co-financing:

The expected co-financing amount of nearly \$11 million is provided by multiple partners, mainly as in-kind from different institutions of the Government and also as grant, with \$2.1 million from the private sector. CSOs also contribute and notably the WWF with nearly \$0.9 million as grant.

