Biodiversity Conservation, Restoration and Integrated Sustainable Development of Mangoky sub-watersheds

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID
10371

Project Type
FSP

Type of Trust Fund
GET

CBIT/NGI
 CBIT **No**
 NGI **No**

Project Title
Biodiversity Conservation, Restoration and Integrated Sustainable Development of Mangoky sub-watersheds

Countries
Madagascar

Agency(ies)
FAO

Other Executing Partner(s)
Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (lead); Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock

Executing Partner Type
Government

GEF Focal Area
Multi Focal Area

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Forest, Forest and Landscape Restoration, Land Degradation, Land Degradation Neutrality, Sustainable Land Management, Sustainable Livelihoods, Community-Based Natural Resource Management, Sustainable Fire Management, Income Generating Activities, Sustainable Agriculture, Ecosystem Approach, Climate Change, Climate Change Adaptation, Community-based adaptation, Ecosystem-based Adaptation, Biodiversity, Mainstreaming, Agriculture and agrobiodiversity, Species, Invasive Alien Species, Crop Wild Relatives, Plant Genetic Resources, Threatened Species, Financial and Accounting, Conservation Finance, Payment for Ecosystem Services, Biomes, Tropical Rain Forests, Mangroves, Tropical Dry Forests, Rivers, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Productive Landscapes, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Influencing models, Demonstrate innovative approache, Deploy innovative financial instruments, Stakeholders, Communications, Education, Behavior change, Awareness Raising, Local Communities, Civil Society, Community Based Organization, Non-Governmental Organization, Academia, Type of Engagement, Participation, Partnership, Information Dissemination, Consultation, Private Sector, Financial intermediaries and market facilitators, SMEs, Individuals/Entrepreneurs, Beneficiaries, Gender Equality, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Capacity Development, Learning, Theory of change, Adaptive management, Indicators to measure change, Targeted Research, Innovation

Sector
Mixed & Others

Rio Markers
Climate Change Mitigation
Climate Change Mitigation 0

Climate Change Adaptation
Climate Change Adaptation 1

Submission Date
10/10/2019

Expected Implementation Start
4/6/2022

Expected Completion Date
4/6/2027

Duration
60In Months

Agency Fee($)
696,753.00

A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount($)	Co-Fin Amount($)
BD-1-1	Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through biodiversity mainstreaming in priority sectors	GET	1,858,009.00	12,000,000.00
LD-1-3	Maintain or improve flows of ecosystem services, including sustaining livelihoods of forest-dependent people through Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR)	GET	5,476,237.00	37,920,087.00
		Total Project Cost($)	**7,334,246.00**	**49,920,087.00**

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

Improve ecosystems services, sustainable intensification and biodiversity conservation in degraded forests and landscapes in Southern Madagascar through wide-scale implementation of forest and landscape restoration (FLR).

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing($)	Confirmed Co-Financing($)

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing($)	Confirmed Co-Financing($)
1. Strengthened Enabling Environment for FLR and BD mainstreaming	Technical Assistance	1.1 FLR priorities (integrating ecosystem services? restoration, sustainable intensification, food and economic security, and BD conservation) are mainstreamed into existing decentralized plans in three target landscapes. Indicators: (i) Area of landscapes with Integrated Landscape Plans (ILMPs) incorporating FLR priorities (contributing to GEF Core Indicator 4) Targets: (i) 58,740 ha 1.2 Decentralized CBNRM contracts, plans and regulations (by-laws) are harmonized and are effectively addressing FLR priorities (integrated landscape restoration, management and BD conservation). Indicators: (i) Level of increase in	1.1.1 ILMPs incorporating FLR priorities developed in the three target landscapes 1.2.1 Roadmap for mainstreaming FLR priorities into decentralized CBNRM plans, contracts and bylaws, developed and adopted at national and landscape levels 1.2.2 The knowledge and dissemination capacity of decentralized service providers (public administration, NGO, private) on effective CBNRM frameworks for FLR planning and implementation is enhanced.	GET	585,960.00	2,073,166.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing($)	Confirmed Co-Financing($)
2. Widescale implementation of the FLR priorities defined in the ILMPs in the targeted landscapes that respond in an integrated manner to the BD conservation, sustainable intensification and sustainable livelihoods? needs.	Investment	2.1 CBNRM organizations are capacitated to sustainably intensify agriculture and forest production following the FLR planned priorities (ER, SLM, SFM). Indicators: (i) # of ha of degraded agriculture land restored. (GEF 7 Core Indicator 3.1) (ii) # of ha of forestland restored. (GEF 7 Core Indicator 3.2) (iii) # of producer organizations receiving project resources who have effectively apply ER/SLM/SFM responding to the FLR planned priorities Targets: (i) 1,000 ha (250 ha in the LML; 750 ha in the VML and RL) (ii) 200ha (iii)100 % targeted POs effectively applied ER/SLM/SFM (50% women). 2.2 Communaute? de Base	2.1.1 A pool of public and private extension providers is trained (ToT) to provide continuous support to farmers through formal and informal pluralistic extension mechanisms. 2.1.2 Eligible agriculture and forest producer organizations have access to the necessary inputs, equipment, and guidance to effectively implement ER/SLM/SFM as defined in the FLR plans 2.1.3 Seed banks and seed fairs established to support widespread implementation of Ecological Restoration (ER)/SLM/SFM as defined in the ILM plans 2.2.1 Learning groups for forest and mangrove practitioners are established in the protected	GET	4,781,380.00	10,479,231.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing($)	Confirmed Co-Financing($)
3. Increased investment for improved FLR, BD conservation and livelihoods diversification	Investment	3.1 Promoting sustainable incentive mechanisms for commodity value chains (VC) that encourage adoption of SLM/SFM and BD conservation practices Indicators: (i) # of POs engaged in sustainable VC?s (gender disaggregated). (ii) % Increase in volume of production that meet VC requirements (e.g. derived from SLM/SFM, social-responsible, conditioned to BD conservation results, quality standards, certification, food safety, value-added accruing to producers). (iii) # of POs and/or buyer companies engaged in business incubation programmes. Targets: (i) 500 PO members (50% women) commercialize the target commodities complying with	3.1.1 POs have enhanced their capacity to develop and implement nature-based businesses for targeted VC?s through existing business incubator and accelerator opportunities. 3.1.2 At least 5 agriculture and forest green VCs are enhanced through investments around high quality diversified production and inclusive agribusiness marketing models. 3.1.3 VC platforms are promoted to facilitate public-private partnerships and attract private investment for the sustainable trade of socially responsible and economically viable VC commodities. 3.2.1: Opportunities to integrate FLR into existing public and private funds	GET	1,034,356.00	26,074,231.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing($)	Confirmed Co-Financing($)
4. Project monitoring, evaluation and knowledge management	Technical Assistance	4.1 Project M&E framework supports adaptive management and knowledge sharing Indicators: (i) # of participatory monitoring systems measuring FLR (SLM, SFM, BD conservation) in place (ii) # of people reached by the project?s communication and KM work. Targets: (i) At least 3, 1 in each target landscapes (ii) 132,000 people	4.1.1 ILMP M&E framework with national FLR indicators and targets developed, harmonized and implemented.	GET	583,300.00	5,027,413.00
				Sub Total ($)	6,984,996.00	43,654,041.00

Project Management Cost (PMC)

	GET		349,250.00		6,266,046.00	
	Sub Total($)		**349,250.00**		**6,266,046.00**	
	Total Project Cost($)		**7,334,246.00**		**49,920,087.00**	

Please provide justification

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount($)
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment and Sustainble Development (MEDD)	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	8,487,156.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment and Sustainble Development (MEDD)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	930,887.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Agriculure and Livestock (MINAE)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	514,232.00
Private Sector	Foundation of Protected Areas and Biodiversity in Madagascar (FAPBM)	Grant	Investment mobilized	439,673.00
Recipient Country Government	Madagascar National Parks (MNP)	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	290,030.00
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	4,730,698.00
Donor Agency	Conservation International (CI)	Grant	Investment mobilized	365,687.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Industry. Commerce and Consumption (MICC)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	6,010,324.00
Donor Agency	African Development Bank	In-kind	Investment mobilized	28,151,400.00

Total Co-Financing($)   49,920,087.00

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

The investment mobilized comprises the following investment projects located in the project target area identified during the PPG consultations with national partners and project teams at Antananarivo and concerned Provinces. Synergies and incrementality was discussed with project teams and institutional partners: MEDD: (i) Project ?MIONJO, appui aux moyens de subsistance r?silients dans le Sud de Madagascar? : 2022 ? 2027); (ii) Investment project in the Matsiatra Ambony Province: 2022-2027.

MICC: Projet de Zone de Transformation agro-industrielle dans le Sud-Ouest (PTASO/financed by the African Development Bank): 2022-2027. Conservation International (CI): Sustainable Landscapes in Eastern Madagascar/SLEM (financed by the GCF): 2018-2023 FAPBM: Asity Madagascar Management of Mangoky-Ihotry Protected Area: 2022-2027 MNP: Sustainable Development of natural resources in the coastal zone in Madgascar with focus on mangroves (Peche Cotiere Durable II): 2022-2025 FAO: (i) Technical assistance for the implementation of the Inclusive Agricultural Value Chains Development Programme (UTF DEFIS/financed by IFAD): 2021-2023; (ii) Resilient landscapes in the face of climate change and improved livelihoods - Forest and Farm Facility (FFF): 2019-2025; (iii) Support for improving governance and funding of the forest sector (TCP FFN): 2021-2023; (iv) Support for Madagascar's agricultural development strategy (TCP Agri): 2021-2023.

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount($)	Fee($)	Total($)
FAO	GET	Madagascar	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	1,858,009	176,511	2,034,520.00
FAO	GET	Madagascar	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	5,476,237	520,242	5,996,479.00
				Total Grant Resources($)	**7,334,246.00**	**696,753.00**	**8,030,999.00**

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required   **true**

PPG Amount ($)

200,000

PPG Agency Fee ($)

19,000

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount($)	Fee($)	Total($)
FAO	GET	Madagascar	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	50,667	4,813	**55,480.00**
FAO	GET	Madagascar	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	149,333	14,187	**163,520.00**
				Total Project Costs($)	**200,000.00**	**19,000.00**	**219,000.00**

Core Indicators

Indicator 3 Area of land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
1500.00	2100.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
1,000.00	1,000.00		

Indicator 3.2 Area of Forest and Forest Land restored

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

Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and shrublands restored

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

Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (incl. estuaries, mangroves) restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	600.00		

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)
6000.00	58740.00	0.00	0.00

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)
2,000.00	27,619.00		

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)

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)
4,000.00	31,121.00		

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided

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

Documents (Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title	Submitted

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?e (direct)	1628044	3573968	0	0
Expected metric tons of CO?e (indirect)	0	0	0	0

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?e (direct)	1,628,044	3,573,968		

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO?e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting	2021	2022		
Duration of accounting	20	20		

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?e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO?e (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 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	4,000	15,600		
Male	4,000	15,600		
Total	8000	31200	0	0

Provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided

Part II. Project Justification

1a. Project Description

1b. Project Map and Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.

1c. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

2. Stakeholders
Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase:

Civil Society Organizations

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities

Private Sector Entities

If none of the above, please explain why:

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only;

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor;

Co-financier;

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body;

Executor or co-executor;

Other (Please explain)

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Provide the gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assesment.

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;

Improving women's participation and decision making

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women

Does the project?s results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

4. Private sector engagement

Elaborate on the private sector's engagement in the project, if any.

5. Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

7. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assesments under relevant conventions from below:

NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, including a budget, key deliverables and a timeline, and explain how it will contribute to the project's overall impact.

9. Monitoring and Evaluation

Describe the budgeted M and E plan

10. Benefits

Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels, as appropriate. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

11. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks

Provide information on the identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project/program based on your organization's ESS systems and procedures

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification*

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
Medium/Moderate			

Measures to address identified risks and impacts
Elaborate on the types and risk classifications/ratings of any identified environmental and social risks and impacts (considering the GEF ESS Minimum Standards) and any measures undertaken as well as planned management measures to address these risks during implementation.

Table: Environment and Social Risks Management Plan

Risk identified	Risk Classification	Mitigation Action (s)	Indicators	Progress on mitigation action
ESS 1- NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT Tenure	MODERATE	During project implementation, the project will address tenure rights by applying an integrated landscape approach following an inclusive and participatory approach involving all relevant stakeholders. The project will strengthen the capacity of existing community-based natural resource management structures to ensure they have a legal contract with the government to sustainable manage their natural resource base. The project will promote training on land tenure and NRM management rights and regulations with a gender-inclusive focus and adhere to the principles/framework of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT) and stakeholders will be trained in its use	# of decentralized CBNRM contracts, plans and regulations are effectively addressing FLR priorities	N/A

ESS 2 - BIODIVERSITY, ECOSYSTEMS AND NATURAL HABITATS	MODERATE	The project will focus on strengthening the existing governance mechanisms, including the co-management for the Protected Areas. Through the first component useful information and data gathered to develop the ILMPs will benefit the managers of the protected areas to improve the sustainable management as well as the restoration within the PA?s and the buffer zone The project will also assist in mainstreaming integrated multi-sectoral FLR landscape plan priorities into CBNRM governance frameworks.	# stakeholders participating in capacity strengthening for enhanced and sustainable management of the landscapes (buffer zone and PA)	N/A

| ESS 3 - PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE | MODERATE | The FLR landscape planning process will assist in identifying and mapping the local crops species and varieties used by local farmers, including underutilized native species.

The project will also establish community seed banks that will serve as hubs where local communities can conserve and exchange seeds that be used for diversifying agricultural systems locally. The selected seeds and planting material will be largely derived from locally adapted crops and varieties will be suitable to local conditions and preferences of farmers and consumers.

Through associated trainings, capacities will be strengthened to conserve, restore, multiply and distribute local varieties across farming communities, with the support of Bioversity International, the Kew Gardens Madagascar Conservation Centre and FOFIFA research station to ensure about 60 species of dry and humid forest and 8 species of mangroves will be available for restoration.

Species to be used for restoration will be of high biodiversity and cultural value and woodlot planting will be carried out with fast-growing native species. The climate-suitability and adaptability of the prioritized species will also be modelled to ensure long-term sustainability.

All species/seeds to be used by the project will need to be accompanied by a certificate delivered by national institute ANCOS to mitigate risk of pests/diseases introduction. | # of beneficiaries trained on seed conservation, production and dissemination technologies

# of seeds/seedlings conserved and produced through the community nurseries

# of crops/varieties conserved and exchanged through seed banks and fairs | N/A |

| ESS 5 - PEST AND PESTICIDES MANAGEMENT | Moderate | The project will focus on promoting an agro-ecological approach to support SLM/SFM/ER practices within the targeted landscapes. The project will identify and assess the needs/options for the specific landscapes and production systems and in collaboration with technical institutions/NGOs will develop and promote trainings on specific topics. Several approached will be followed, such as Farmer Field School, Lead Farmer training and public extension support to enhance the capacities of local farmers. The project will prioritize biological control of pest and diseases to the extent possible taking into consideration traditional knowledge nd experience. In case pesticides are required, procurement and usage will follow FAO/WHO International Code of Conduct as well adhere to national policies/guidelines in place to ensure it can be promoted safely without compromising the health of the ecosystem and the local people. | # of beneficiaries trained on integrated pest management and safe usage of pesticides | N/A |

Supporting Documents

Upload available ESS supporting documents.

Title	Module	Submitted
ESS checklist	**CEO Endorsement ESS**	

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Annex A1: Project Results Framework [1]¹

Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-Term Milestone	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Objective: Improve ecosystems services, sustainable intensification and BD conservation in degraded forests and landscapes in Southern Madagascar through wide-scale implementation of FLR. **Indicators**: (i) # of people directly benefitting from project intervention (GEF Core Indicator 11); (ii) # of tCO2eq sequestered due to direct project interventions (GEF Core Indicator 6). **Targets**: (i) 31,200 people (50 %women) ; (ii) 3,573,968 tCO2eq						
Component 1: Strengthened Enabling Environment for FLR and biodiversity mainstreaming.						
Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Milestone	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Outcome 1.1: FLR priorities (integrating ecosystem services? restoration, sustainable intensification, food and economic security, and BD conservation) are mainstreamed into existing decentralized plans in three target landscapes.	(i) Area of landscapes with Integrated Landscape Plans (ILMPs) incorporating FLR priorities (contributing to GEF Core Indicator 4)	(i) No landscapes with ILMPs incorporating FLR priorities.	(i) ha of landscapes with FLR landscape plan developed and agreed by all concerned stakeholders.	(i) 58,740 ha	Minutes of meetings and workshops for ILMPs and FAPs. ILMPs plans, maps, and baseline data including reports, video footage and pictures	Buy-in and engagement of national institutions is secured. Continued political stability COVID-19 measures are followed
Output 1.1.1: Integrated Landscape Plans incorporating FLR priorities developed in the three target landscapes.						

Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Milestones	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions

Outcome 1.2: Decentralized CBNRM[4][2] contracts, plans and regulations (by-laws) are harmonized and are effectively addressing FLR priorities (integrated landscape restoration, management and BD conservation).	(i) **Level of increase in active participation** of national and decentralized counterparts in the policy revision, formulation and coordination of cross-sectoral CBNRM contracts, plans and by-laws that are inclusive of the village population/ NR users and conditional to the BD conservation needs.[5][3] (ii) # of Harmonized, cross-sectoral and inclusive by-laws (dina) for the implementation of FLR priorities at the landscape and village (fokolany) levels developed and agreed by all concerned stakeholders in the 11 villages with VPs.	(i) **Level 1** of active participation (ii) No Harmonized cross-sectoral, inclusive by-laws.	(i) **Level 2** of active participation (ii). At least 3. (1 per village)	(i) **Level 3** of active participation (ii) At least 11 (1 per village).	Reports from capacity development actions. PIP document. Policy briefs. New or modified local by-laws and regulations. Materials created and disseminated (e.g. audio-visual materials, policy leaflets, media messages).	Buy-in and engagement of national institutions is secured. Continued political stability COVID-19 measures are followed to ensure containement of transmission

Output 1.2.1: Roadmap for mainstreaming FLR priorities (ecosystem services? restoration, sustainable intensification, food and economic security and BD conservation) into decentralized CBNRM plans, contracts and bylaws, developed and adopted at national and landscape levels.

Output 1.2.2: The knowledge and dissemination capacity of decentralized service providers (public administration, NGO, private) on effective CBNRM frameworks for FLR planning and implementation, is enhanced.

Component 2: Widescale implementation of the FLR priorities defined in the ILMPs in the targeted landscapes that respond in an integrated manner to the BD conservation, sustainable intensification and sustainable livelihoods? needs.

Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Milestones	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Outcome 2.1: CBNRM organizations capacitated to sustainably intensify agriculture and forest production following the FLR planned priorities (ER, SLM, SFM[6][4]).	(i) # of ha of degraded agriculture land restored. (GEF 7 Core Indicator 3.1) (ii) # of ha of forestland restored. (GEF 7 Core Indicator 3.2) (iii) # of producer organizations (PO) receiving project resources who have effectively apply ER/SLM/SFM responding to the FLR planned priorities.	(i) TBD. (ii) TBD. (iii) TBD.	(i) 350 ha (100 ha in the LML; 250 ha in the VML and RL[7][5]). (ii) 75 ha of forest land restored. (iii) 20% targeted POs effectively applied ER/SLM/SFM (50% women).	(i) 1,000 ha (250 ha in the LML; 750 ha in the VML and RL). (ii) 200 ha (iii) 100% targeted producer organizations effectively applied ER/SLM/SFM (50% women).	List of members, ToR, and management plans of CBNRM organizations. Field data collected (reports) Charter of extension providers/partnerships established. Reports of ToT events and a learning events Applications received under Procurement Windows.	District, Commune, and village-level key stakeholders willing to join the works. Community bylaws for land tenure, use and management are adhered/enforced. COVID-19 measures are followed

Output 2.1.1: A pool of public and private extension providers is trained (ToT) to provide continuous support to farmers through formal and informal pluralistic extension mechanisms.
Output 2.1.2: Eligible agriculture and forest producer organizations have access to the necessary inputs, equipment, and guidance to effectively implement ER/SLM/SFM as defined in the FLR plans.
Output 2.1.3: Seed banks and seed fairs established to support widespread implementation of ER/SLM/SFM as defined in the ILM plans.

Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Milestones	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions

| Outcome 2.2: COBA[8][6] with GELOSE/GCF contracts in the protected landscapes areas capacitated to restore and sustainably manage mangroves and forest resources. | (i) # of ha of forests restored in COFAV and MIC areas under COBA[9][7] contracts, including rare and endangered native woody species. (GEF 7 Core Indicator 3.2)

(ii) # of ha of mangroves restored in Mangoky-Ihotry Complex. (GEF 7 Core Indicator 3.4)

(iii) # of improved COBAs (inclusive of all direct users and with management plans conditioned to the PA conservation results) that have enhanced their livelihoods through investments in the sustainable management of biodiversity.

(iv) # of PA sections under ILMPs | (i) TBD

(ii) TBD

(iii) TBD.

(iv) TBD | (i) 100 ha of forest restored (75 ha in COFAV; 75 in Mangoky-Ihotry Complex).

(ii) 200 ha of mangroves restored.

(iii) 2 COBAs operating within the Protected sections of the target landscapes have enhanced their livelihoods (50% women membership).

(iv) TBD | (i) 300 ha of forest restored including at least 20 rare/endangered native tree species (150 ha in COFAV; 150 in Mangoky-Ihotry Complex).

(ii) 600 ha of mangroves restored.

(iii) 8 COBAs operating within the Protected sections of the target landscapes have enhanced their livelihoods through investments in the sustainable management of biodiversity (50% women membership).

(iv) 52,503 ha (46,146 ha in MIC; 1,089 ha in the northern plot of Mikea; 5,268 ha in COFAV). | List of members, ToR, and management plans of CBNRM orgs.

Field data collected (including reports, video footage and pictures) by the METT appointed evaluators in the target landscapes.

USGS-Remote Sensing data collection.

Charter of extension providers/partnerships established.

Reports of ToT events and learning events.

Applications received under P Windows | Critical mass successfully built amongst extension providers.

Local farmers and forest users willing to switch from less sustainable to SLM/SFM activities

Community bylaws for land tenure, use and management are adhered by all concerned stakeholders to and enforced. |

Output 2.2.1: Learning groups for forest and mangrove practitioners are established in the protected landscapes and support the implementation of COBA plans.
Output 2.2.2: COBA investments for BD conservation, sustainable management and restoration in the MIC, Mikea NP and COFAV parts of the target landscapes.
Output 2.2.3: The genetic material of endangered plant species is locally conserved and produced to support BD restoration and management in the target protected landscapes.

Component 3: Increased investment for improved FLR, BD conservation and livelihoods diversification						
Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Milestone	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions

Outcome 3.1 Promoting sustainable incentive mechanisms for commodity VCs that encourage adoption of SLM/SFM and BD conservation practices.	(i) # of members of POs engaged in sustainable VC (gender disaggregated). (ii) % Increase in volume of production that meet VC requirements (e.g. derived from SLM/SFM, social-responsible, conditioned to BD conservation results, quality standards, certification, food safety, value-added accruing to producers). (iii) # of POs and/or buyer companies engaged in business incubation programmes.	(i) No GVC (ii) TBD during project inception. (iii) No PO and/or buyer companies attended business incubation Programmes.	(i) 200 PO members (50% women) have adopted improved production, processing and marketing systems and technologies that allow production to comply with VC requirements. (ii) 30% increase in volume of production (iii) 2 POs and/or buyer companies have attended business incubation.	(i) 500 members of POs (50% women) commercialize the target commodities complying with VC requirements. (ii) 50% increase in volume of production. (iii) A total of 4 POs and/or buyer companies have attended business incubation.	POs business plans Reports from capacity development programs. Field data collected (including reports, video footage and pictures). Equipment and inputs for GVC applications under the procurement programme. Proof of purchase and effective use of processing and marketing equipment and inputs. Attendance list and minutes of investment platforms events. Contracts and MoUs between POs and private sector buyers.	Cooperatives and producers? association and buyer companies continue to commit to SLM/SFM practices in the face of social, economic and political change Demand for the target products exists on the national and international markets.

Output 3.1.1: Producer organizations have enhanced their capacity to develop and implement nature-based businesses for targeted VCs through existing business incubator and accelerator opportunities.
Output 3.1.2: At least 5 agriculture and forest green VC?s are enhanced through investments around high quality diversified production and inclusive agribusiness marketing models.
Output 3.1.3: VC platforms are promoted in the targeted regions to facilitate public-private partnerships and attract private investment for the sustainable trade of socially responsible and economically viable VC commodities.

Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Milestone	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Outcome 3.2: Diversified and increased finance for FLR in Madagascar, responding in an integrated manner to the BD conservation, sustainable intensification and sustainable livelihoods needs.	(i) New PES financial initiatives to sustainably support forest restoration, management and conservation in the target landscapes. (ii) FLR priorities in the target landscapes are sustainably funded through a pilot partnership with existing private funds.	(i) No new financial initiative. (ii) Incomplete trust funds to effectively cover FLR priorities.	(i) At least 1 PES concept prepared. (ii) Partnership agreement with at least one existing private foundation developed.	(i) At least 1 PES bankable project in the target landscapes. (ii) FLR financing for ER/SLM/SFM beneficiaries implemented through partnership agreement.	Reports on capacity development actions. Bankable project proposals submitted and approved. Reports, publications, on-line information of trust fund results about FLR financing.	Buy-in and engagement of national and sub-national institutions is secured. Political stability

Output 3.2.1: Opportunities to integrate FLR into existing public and private funds are identified and implemented.

Component 4: Project monitoring, evaluation and knowledge management

Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Milestone	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions

Outcome 4.1: Project M&E framework supports adaptive management and knowledge sharing	(i) Participatory monitoring systems measuring FLR (ER, SLM, SFM, BD conservation) in place in each of the 3 target landscapes. (ii) # of people reached by the project?s communication and knowledge management work.	(i) No landscape FLR monitoring plans exist. (ii) No project communication and KM strategy at start of project. No people reached.	(i) Participatory FLR monitoring plans developed in the 3 target landscapes, tested and fine-tuned based on adaptive management approach. (ii) Project communication and KM strategy developed. 50,000 people reached.	(i) Lessons learned from FLR monitoring results in the 3 target landscapes produced and disseminated at decentralized, national and international level. (ii) 132,000 people reached	Reports on capacity development actions for M&E teams. Revised monitoring framework of the National FLR Strategy. Reports, publications, on-line information of monitored LDN indicators under the National FLRMF.	Buy-in and engagement of national and district institutions is secured. Political stability
Output 4.1.1: ILMP M&E framework with national FLR indicators and targets developed, harmonized and implemented in the target landscapes. **Output 4.1.2:** Communication for development and knowledge dissemination strategy developed and implemented to support FLR scaling up to meet global commitments.						

[1] Please note that output based indicators are not mandatory as long as the targets for each output are well defined.

[2] I, corresponding to the French name of SAIPs (sch?mas d?am?nagement int?gr? des paysages).

[3] Integrated landscape interventions on ecosystem services? restoration, sustainable intensification, food and economic security and BD conservation.

[5] NOTE: rating scale 1-3: **Level 1**: (i) Decentralized CBNRM contracts, plans and by-laws in targeted villages (fokontany) are not harmonized, nor inclusive of the village population/NR users, and do not guarantee cross-sectoral integration of FLR priorities (ecosystem services? conservation & restoration, sustainable intensification, food and economic security) that are conditional to the BD conservation needs; **Level 2**: (i) Guidelines for the policy revision, formulation and establishment of cross-sectoral, conditional and inclusive CBNRM contracts, plans and dina are developed and agreed by all concerned stakeholders ; (ii) Members of local stakeholder groups (e.g. municipalities, village councils, forest and agriculture services, CBOs, NGOs, producers? organizations, local leaders, etc) are aware and knowledgeable on the guidelines and have raised awareness and disseminated them among existing CBNRM organizations in the target landscapes; (iii) at least one capacity building workshop for decentralized service providers held in each of the three districts in which the landscapes are located; (iv) The CBNRM guidelines (contracts, plans and by-laws addressing FLR priorities) are piloted by existing CBNRM organizations in 11 targeted villages (fokontany) (one per each of the targeted municipality), resulting in improvements about integrated NR management plans harmonized with FLR landscape priorities, coherent regulations (e.g. among traditionally established by-laws or dinas, and dinas established under different community organizations), inclusive membership (accessible to all direct users, those with customary rights and migrants), and conditionality to BD conservation results; (iv) A PIP - including policy briefs with recommendations, awareness raising events at national and decentralised levels, and an advocacy plan for policy-makers - is developed to support the upscaling of the guidelines; **Level 3**: (i) The piloted CBNRM guidelines are fine-tuned (adaptive management approach) and upscaled to 11 villages in the targeted landscapes (Village Plans); (ii) Local population in the landscape villages are aware and enabled to apply for new CBNRM contracts and/or develop plans and by-laws based on the developed guidelines and aligned with the FLR priorities; (iii) The PIP is under implementation; (iv) lessons learned from the tested CBNRM contracts, plans and by-laws aligned with FLR priorities in the target landscapes are shared and disseminated at sub-national, national and international level.

[6] ER: Ecological restoration; SLM: Sustainable land management; SFM: Sustainable forest management.

[8] COBA: CBNRM organizations co-managing protected areas.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Annex B: Response to Project Reviews

STAP Overall Assessment and rating Comments	FAO?s reply

Minor. STAP welcomes this project from FAO to promote FLR in southern Madagascar. However, the intended benefits (60 km2 under improved practices and 15 km2 restored) appear markedly minor in comparison to the size of the GEF investment ($7.3m). Overall it is comprehensive and well-written and includes several strong components. Most notably, the focus on spatial planning using a landscape approach supported by tools such as ROAM, Diversity4Restoration, and EX-ACT to prioritize areas for restoration improves the likelihood that interventions will be more targeted and achievable. Less clear is how community organizations and small holder farmers will be incentivized to diversify their livelihoods. The project will identify and promote nature-based and sustainable VCs through business plans and marketing assistance and possibly establishing funding windows; however, few details are provided to explain how this will be accomplished. More detail should be provided prior to CEO Endorsement. In this respect, the project would be well served by developing a robust and participatory Theory of Change (ToC) to more clearly identify causal links among outputs and outcomes based on assumptions and connected more directly with the indicators 2 proposed for this project.

Intended benefits: During project design the intervention area was redefined, it now includes: (i) 111,243 ha of landscapes (including both protected and non-protected zones) covered by ILM/FLR plans; (ii) 58,740 ha of non-protected landscapes under improved management; (iii) 52,503 ha of protected landscapes under ILM/FLR plans ; (iv) 1,500 ha of land restored; (v) 600 ha of mangroves restored. The average cost per hectare for FLR planning process, for improved practices and for ecological restoration in and outside the protected sections of the three target landscapes is aligned with the costs defined in the National FLR Strategy and with the size of the GEF investment.

Incentives to diversify livelihoods: The causal pathway and linkages between projects? outputs and outcomes to overcome identified barriers explain how beneficiaries will be incentivized to diversify livelihoods based on the adoption of sustainable NRM practices and businesses: (1) the FLR planning process (Outcome 1) will be translated into guidelines supporting the effective development and implementation of harmonized CBNRM plans, contracts and by-laws that enhance inclusive NRM transfer (with special focus on vulnerable groups) and allow cross-compliant application of the sectoral priorities around restoration, management and conservation defined in the landscape plans; (ii) Community farm and forest organizations and users will be incentivized to shift to and consolidate the adoption of climate-adaptive management systems and technologies through continuous training, technical advice and monitoring support on organizational, technical and business development (provided by a critical mass of public and private extensionists trained by the project), peer-to-peer demonstrations and exchange of knowhow, investment windows for accessing innovative equipment and inputs, the promotion of inclusive agrobusiness partnerships with buyer companies, and the improvement of existing VC platforms and access to commercial infrastructures (supported by baseline investment projects and partners); (iii) an adequate combination of suitable crop/forest species/varieties and management systems (e.g. tree-crop-livestock integration) will help solve liquidity problems of vulnerable farmers to cover their basic and farming needs (main cause to the weak adoption and disadoption of innovative labor-intensive systems), and allow them to gradually invest in climate-smart production inputs and equipment.

Accomplishment of nature-based and sustainable value chains: the participatory project formulation process helped identify VC commodities with promising national and export market for bio-trade products, for instance in the areas of cosmetics (i.e. essential oils), pharmaceuticals (medicinal plants), legumes, specialty foods (i.e. honey) and fuelwood. The project will improve

STAP Comments	FAO?s reply
Re Project Outcomes: Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated? Yes, however, the total number of ha to berestored as a result of this project is not substantial (i.e. 6,000 ha (60 km2) under improved practices and 1,500 ha (15 km2) restored. As reference, Madagascar goal under the Bonn Challenge is 4 million ha by 2030. No discussion of scalability.	Please see reponse above on Intended Benefits.
What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project?s objectives? The general idea is to develop guidelines for mainstreaming BD in the forestry sector and to work with community organizations to restore and manage landscapes using climate smart ag and other practices. Less clear is the incentive for communities to engage in ?alternative livelihoods? which seems to center on investment mechanisms. These will require additional specificity to better understand the mechanics of the nature-based supply chains and various funds ? particularly if there is a drop in demand for products or tourism due to the current global pandemic. The assumptions around being able to find suitable markets for biodiversity-friendly products need to be spelled out ? a robust TOC will allow articulation of key assumptions underlying the steps in the TOC.	Please see response above on Incentives to diversify livelihoods; Accomplishment of nature-based and sustainable value chains; and Theory of Change. In addition and as far as drop in demand for products or tourism due to the current global pandemic, the project strategy to support diversified tree-crop-livestock production systems based on a diverse set of suitable species and varieties, and wood-NWFP (crustaceans & pulp) multipurpose forest and mangrove management systems, provides multiple benefits in terms of adaptability to CC, environmental sustainability, and food and economic security. The project does not have the capacity to influence the temporary closure of exports or imports due to the pandemic, but it can promote a diversified production system that ensures at least part of the products in production that respond better to potential climatic events. extremes that occur in different years and to ensure basic food for self-consumption and a local market when there is a temporary closure of markets.
Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes? No, apart from the mitigation measures in the risk section. But this falls short of incorporating adaptive management into the project design (preferably as part of a ToC).	The identification and selection of agricultural and forestry crop species and varieties will be reinforced by modeling that will analyze the impact of climate change and by proposing adaptation measures. Likewise, the production of the integrated landscape and FLR plans will analyze the vulnerability to climate change of the landscapes (environmental, social and economic) and the adaptation capacity of local communities and agro-ecological systems, and the priority interventions proposed in the Plans will define mechanisms (climate-smart systems and technologies on restoration, management and conservation) and adaptive implementation protocols. Likewise, the project monitoring framework will be defined following the principles and elements of adaptive management.

GEBs. Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment? This is questionable. Total GEF funding is $7.3 m plus an additional $32 m in co-financing. However, total ha of improved management and restoration is minimal	Please see response above on <u>Intended Benefits.</u>
Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors? No ? this is lacking. There is no plan for scaling up.	The PRODOC document includes a chapter on ?Innovativeness, sustainability (addressing social, environmental, economic and financial, and capacity development related issues), potential for scaling up and capacity development?.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place. Map provided. Should include inset to see where this location is in relation to the entire country for perspective. Degradation map is good but no information on data source. Specific location of projects will be available later. See Earth Observation and the GEF ? Section A1.0 (p. 64) for recommendations on providing georeferenced information.	The PRODOC document includes detailed GIS maps produced during formulation by a GIS expert, the analysis of satellite data, relevant information provided by MEDD, FAO and other project partners, and based on field verifications during formulation team missions.
Stakeholders: Stakeholders identified and roles explained. Beyond this, no information provided on how specifically the project plans to provide mechanisms for communication and knowledge sharing and did not identify (or even assess) any concerns around levels of conflict among stakeholders' values with respect to the intended interventions. This is problematic given that one of the risks (med) identified is the mistrust between actions in relation to conservation and development goals.	During the formulation of the project, the work team carried out participatory workshops with the different stakeholders and exercises to identify and analyze the different actors, their role and potential position vis-?-vis the project, their current / potential positive or negative interrelationships, etc. Based on these results and subsequent interviews and group discussions, the project has prepared a stakeholder engagement plan included in the PRODOC.
Gender. Yes, however the main problem for women is that they are ??disadvantaged by insecure access and property rights to forest, tree and land resources, by discrimination and male bias in service provisions like credit and technology, and by being excluded from policy formulation and decision making at the HH, community and national levels.? The gender strategy address some of this but does not factor in the issue of property rights, which is likely the most critical. The others are important but it?s not clear how many small holder farmers are women to be able to benefit from these interventions.	The GEFTF Project in Madagascar has embedded the consideration of key gender issues throughout its four components to contribute to closing the gender gap in the target districts and landscapes. A specific chapter ?Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment? and a Gender Action Plan are included in the PRODOC document., addressing key gender-related constraints.

Risks. Good table that separates risk of CC on different land use sectors. Also uses the Diversity4Restoration tool which allows user to select which CC scenario and projection year (2030, 2050, or 2070) to consider when selecting species for restoration. One of the risks (med) as well as underlying drivers is lack of clear land and resource tenure. The mitigation measures ?support the review of tenure models of relevance to restoration?? but as this is a key issue and risk, it might be better to be more specific and also incorporated into the overall strategy and components. See Local Commons for Global Benefits recommendations regarding inclusion of insecure or weak tenure into problem analyses.	The analysis of barriers and the project?s ToC specifically address the risk and underlying driver of unclear land and resource tenure. In concrete, Barrier 1 - Weak decentralized governance mechanism and planning do not enable effective, bottom-up integrated land use management and biodiversity conservation ? focused on the SWOT analysis of existing national policies and laws addressing the transfer of NRM to local community groups, and propose a strategy to overcome remaining constraints, with special consideration to inclusiveness measures addressing the specific needs of women and vulnerable groups (e.g. migrant population without historical customary rights) to have equal rights to benefit of CBNRM contracts, management plans and by-laws formulation, according to GELOSE and GCF law specifications. Project Component 1 will specifically focus on the improvement of governance constraints: ? proposals to improve current land tenure and NRM transfer policies and accompanying implementation guidelines; ? development of inclusive (gender & vulnerable groups) and responsive (addressing FLR landscape priorities in an integrated way) COBA/VOI contracts, plans and community by-laws). Project Components 2, 3 and 4 will provide the means (training, education, technical guidance, investments, etc) to materialize the effective participation of women and other vulnerable groups in land and resource tenure community-based transfer. PRODOC specifically includes a strategy and risk-reduction measures towards COVID19 risk, and an ESMP is included.

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

Annex C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

(Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

*commited amount includes: translation of the project document in french, finalization of execution partners agreement, training to execution partners on reporting requirements.

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: USD 200,000 project symbol: GCP /MAG/091/GFF ENTITY: 667165

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount ($)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
(5011) Salaries Professional			
(5013) Consultants	123,000	123,108	
(5014) Contracts	22,000	13,643	8,357
(5020) Locally Contracted Labour		244	
(5021) Travel	30,600	19,500	8,964
(5023) Training	20,000	4,001	15,999
(5054) Expendable Procurement		1,784	
(5028) General Operating Expenses	4,400	3,934	466
Total	200,000	166,214	*33,786

ANNEX D: Project Map(s) and Coordinates

Please attach the geographical location of the project area, if possible.

Detailed target area maps are available under Project Section 1.

Coordinates:

	Latitude Sud	Longitude Est
Mangoky Watersheds	20?33'00" - 23?24'36"	43?27'18" - 47?27'36"
Volanony Matsiatra Landscape	21?30'36" - 21?41'24"	47?14'24" - 47?24'36"
Ranomainty Landscape	21?34'04" - 21?47'02"	47?11'20" - 47?23'24"
Low Mangoky Landscape	21?17'53" - 21?54'11"	43?27'18" - 43?53'20"

ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

FAO Cost Categories	Unit	No. of units	Unit cost	Component 1 Total	Component 2 Total	Component 3 Total	Component 4 Total	M&E	PMC	Total GEF	OP1: MEDD	OP2: MAEP	Other executing entities	FAO Support Services	Total
5013 Consultants															
GIS/Collect Earth	Day	90	450	40500	0	0	0			40,500	40500				40500
Household Survey expert (SHARP)	Day	90	450	40500	0	0	0			40,500	40500				40500
FLR Chief Technical Adviser	Day	425	450	33750	67500	67,500	22,500			191,250	191250				191250
International markets for green value chains	Day	50	450	0	0	22,500	0			22,500		22500			22500
Agriculture economist	Day	50	450	0	0	22,500	0			22,500		22500			22500
Payment for Ecosystem Services	Day	77	450	0	0	34,650	0			34,650	34650				34650
Sub-total international Consultants				*114750*	*67500*	*147150*	*22500*	*0*	*0*	*351,900*	*306900*	*45000*	*0*	*0*	*351900*
Project Coordinator	Month	60	2,600	18,000	27,000	23,000	10,000		78,000	156,000	156,000				156,000
Execution Capacity Development and ESS Specialist	Month	30	1,800	0	0	0	0	54,000		54,000				54,000	54,000
Administrative Assistant/ Procurement	lumpsum	1	50,250	0	0	0	0		50,250	50,250	50,250				50,250
Operations Officer	lumpsum	1	50,000	0	0	0	0		50,000	50,000		50,000			50,000
M&E Officer	Month	30	1,800	0	0	0	0	54,000		54,000	54,000				54,000
LML Morombe Technical Facilitator	Month	60	1,800	18,000	54,000	36,000	0			108,000		108,000			108,000
VML Vohibato Technical Facilitator	Month	60	1,800	18,000	54,000	36,000	0			108,000		108,000			108,000
RL Lalangina Technical Facilitator	Month	60	1,800	18,000	54,000	36,000	0			108,000		108,000			108,000
LML Morombe Junior facilitator	Month	60	800	4,000	12,000	8,000	0	24,000		48,000		48,000			48,000
VML Vohibato Junior facilitator	Month	60	800	4,000	12,000	8,000	0	24,000		48,000		48,000			48,000
RL Lalangina Junior facilitator	Month	60	800	4,000	12,000	8,000	0	24,000		48,000		48,000			48,000
FLR/Biodiversity/ Forestry Expert	Month	60	2000	6000	87,000	27,000	0			120,000	120000				120000
Agriculture/Water Expert	Month	60	2000	6000	87,000	27,000	0			120,000		120000			120000
Agriculture and Forest Business development Expert	Month	60	2000	6000	87,000	27,000	0			120,000	120000				120000
Gender/Social Expert	Day	758	150	5700	81,000	27,000	0			113,700		113700			113700
Policy & Governance Expert	Day	655	150	30750	54,000	13,500	0			98,250	98250				98250
Community Engagement Facilitators: 28 men facilitators	lumpsum	1	60480	15120	30,240	15,120	0			60,480		60480			60480
Community Engagement Facilitators: 28 women facilitators	lumpsum	1	60480	15120	30,240	15,120	0			60,480		60480			60480
Sub-total national Consultants				*168,690*	*681,480*	*306,740*	*10,000*	*180,000*	*178,250*	*1,525,160*	*598,500*	*872,660*	*0*	*54,000*	*1,525,160*
5013 Sub-total consultants				**283,440**	**748,980**	**453,890**	**32,500**	**180,000**	**178,250**	**1,877,060**	**905,400**	**917,660**	**0**	**54,000**	**1,877,060**
5650 Contracts															
National Seminar on policy revision (Component 1)	lumpsum	1	50,000	50,000	0	0	0			50,000			50,000		50,000
Tany Meva/FAPBM (Outcome 2.2)	lumpsum	1	80,000	0	80,000	0	0			80,000			80,000		80,000
MAEP/FDA (Outcome 2.1, Outcome 3.1)	lumpsum	1	80,000	0	80,000	0	0			80,000			80,000		80,000
FOFIFA (Component 2, Outcome 2.3)	lumpsum	1	60,000	0	60,000	0	0			60,000			60,000		60,000
OmniVerdi (Component 2, Outcome 2.3)	lumpsum	1	60,000	0	60,000	0	0			60,000			60,000		60,000
Bioversity or Kew Garden (Component 1-2)	lumpsum	1	170,000	60,000	110,000	0	0			170,000			170,000		170,000
Audit (1per year per OP)	lumpsum	1	65,000	0	0	0	0		65000	65,000				65,000	65,000
Spot-checks (2 per year per OP)	lumpsum	1	70,000	0	0	0	0		70000	70,000				70,000	70,000
M&E Costs (Mid-term Review (30,000) + Final Evaluation (40,000) + Terminal Report (7,000))	lumpsum	1	77,000	0	0	0	0	77000		77,000				77,000	77,000
5650 Sub-total Contracts				**110,000**	**390,000**	**0**	**0**	**77,000**	**135,000**	**712,000**	**0**	**0**	**500,000**	**212,000**	**712,000**
5021 Travel															
International travel										0					
International Travels for experts recruited by MEDD	lumpsum	1	29900	22,500	0	7,400	0			29,900	29,900				29,900
International Travels for experts recruited by MAEP	lumpsum	1	19200	0	0	19,200	0			19,200		19,200			19,200
National travel															
National Travels for experts recruited by MEDD	lumpsum	1	137556	6,790	100,800	29,966	0			137,556	137,556				137,556
National Travels for experts recruited by MAEP	lumpsum	1	97230	2,730	75,600	18,900	0			97,230		97,230			97,230
Participation to business incubation programs	lumpsum	1	20000	0	0	20,000	0			20,000		20,000			20,000
National travel of M&E staff to monitor the implementation of ILMP' interventions under Component 2	lumpsum	1	15000	0	0	0	0	15000		15,000	15,000				15,000
5021 Sub-total travel				**32020**	**176400**	**95,466**	**0**	**15000**	**0**	**318,886**	**182,456**	**136,430**	**0**	**0**	**318,886**
5023 Training															
National FLR Committee members' periodical meetings (Component 1)	Lumpsum	1	56200	27,500	0	0	28,700			56200		56200			56200
Landscape Platform Committee members' periodical meetings (Component 1-2-3)	Lumpsum	1	73000	18,000	40,000	15,000	0			73000	73000				73000
Value Chain Platform members' periodical meetings (Component 2, Output 2.3.3)	Lumpsum	1	80000	0	0	80,000	0			80000		80000			80000
Inception and SC workshops (Tana + 3 landscapes)	Lumpsum	1	40000	0	0	0	40,000			40,000			40,000		40,000
Events and workshops with village-level actors to raise awareness, training, planning, formulating community-bylaws, etc (Component 1-2-3).	Lumpsum	1	77000	30,000	32,000	15,000	0			77,000			77,000		77000
FLR Landscape planning workshops with Landscape Management Committees (Component 1, Outcome 1.1) (2 workshops x each landscape for launchig and validation).	Lumpsum	1	40000	40,000	0	0	0			40,000			40,000		40,000
10 landscape-level eventws	Lumpsum	1	60000	15,000	30,000	15,000	0			60,000			60,000		60000
5023 Sub-total training				**130,500**	**102,000**	**125,000**	**68,700**	**0**	**0**	**426,200**	**73,000**	**136,200**	**217,000**	**0**	**426,200**
5024 Expendable procurement															
Window A1: procurement funding for the seeting up and running of pluralistic ToT program (Component 2, Output 2.1.2)	lumpsum	1	180,000	0	180,000	0	0			180,000		180,000			180,000
Window A2: procurement funding for equipment, inputs needed to implement SLM systems and technologies in the non-protected areas of the traget landscapes (Component 2, Output 2.1.2)	lumpsum	1	1,210,000	0	1,210,000	0	0			1,210,000		1,210,000			1,210,000
Window A3: Procurement for equipment and inputs to support ER/SFM systems and technologies in the non-protected areas of the traget landscapes (Component 2, Output 2.1.2)	lumpsum	1	420,000	0	420,000	0	0			420,000	90,000		330,000		420,000
Window B1: Procurement for the creation and running of community seed banks (Component 2, Output 2.1.3)	lumpsum	1	65,000	0	65,000	0	0			65,000			65,000		65,000
Window C1: Procurement for equipment and input to run forest learning group programs. (Component 2, Output 2.2.2)	lumpsum	1	110,000	0	110,000	0	0			110,000	110,000				110,000
Window C2: Procurement for equipment and input on ER/SFM inside PA. (Component 2, Output 2.2.2)	lumpsum	1	1,280,000	0	1,280,000	0	0			1,280,000	896,400		383,600		1,280,000
Window D1: Procurement for the creation and running of community tree nurseries (Component 2, Output 2.2.3)	lumpsum	1	65,000	0	65,000	0	0			65,000			65,000		65,000
Window VC: Procurement for equipment and input to support producer organization in VC development. (Component 3, Output 3.1.2)	lumpsum	1	360,000	0	0	360,000	0			360,000		360,000			360,000
Production of Knowledge Management materials (publications, videos, media news, gingles, etc)	lumpsum	1	115,300	30,000	34,000	0	51,300			115,300			115,300		115,300
5024 Sub-total expendable procurement				**30,000**	**3,364,000**	**360,000**	**51,300**	**0**	**0**	**3,805,300**	**1,096,400**	**1,750,000**	**958,900**	**0**	**3,805,300**
6100 Non-expendable procurement															
Vehicles (3 4x4 cars)	unit	3	30,000	0	0	0	90,000			90,000			90,000		90,000
Vehicles (22 motobikes: 2 x 11 municipalities)	unit	16	4,300	0	0	0	68,800			68,800		68,800			68,800
Computer, equipment and consumables	lumpsum	1	18,000	0	0	0	0		18000	18,000	9,000	9,000			18,000
6100 Sub-total non-expendable procurement				**0**	**0**	**0**	**158,800**	**0**	**18,000**	**176,800**	**9,000**	**167,800**	**0**	**0**	**176,800**
5028 GOE budget															
Office expenses (electricity, water, phone, fuel, etc)	lumpsum	1	18,000	0	0	0	0		18000	18,000	9,000	9,000			18,000
6300 Sub-total GOE budget				**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**18,000**	**18,000**	**9,000**	**9,000**	**0**	**0**	**18,000**
TOTAL				**585,960**	**4,781,380**	**1,034,356**	**311,300**	**272,000**	**349,250**	**7,334,246**	**2,275,256**	**3,117,090**	**1,675,900**	**266,000**	**7,334,246**

SUBTOTAL Comp 1	585,960	
SUBTOTAL Comp 2	4,781,380	
SUBTOTAL Comp 3	1,034,356	
SUBTOTAL Comp 4	311,300	
M&E	272,000	3.89%
Subtotal	6,984,996	
Project Management Cost (PMC)	349,250	5.0%
TOTAL GEF	7,334,246	

ANNEX F: (For NGI only) Termsheet

Instructions. Please submit an finalized termsheet in this section. The NGI Program Call for Proposals provided a template in Annex A of the Call for Proposals that can be used by the Agency. Agencies can use their own termsheets but must add sections on Currency Risk, Co-financing Ratio and Financial Additionality as defined in the template provided in Annex A of the Call for proposals. Termsheets submitted at CEO endorsement stage should include final terms and conditions of the financing.

ANNEX G: (For NGI only) Reflows

Instructions. Please submit a reflows table as provided in Annex B of the NGI Program Call for Proposals and the Trustee excel sheet for reflows (as provided by the Secretariat or the Trustee) in the Document Section of the CEO endorsement. The Agencys is required to quantify any expected financial return/gains/interests earned on non-grant instruments that will be transferred to the GEF Trust Fund as noted in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy. Partner Agencies will be required to comply with the reflows procedures established in their respective Financial Procedures Agreement with the GEF Trustee. Agencies are welcomed to provide assumptions that explain expected financial reflow schedules.

ANNEX H: (For NGI only) Agency Capacity to generate reflows

Instructions. The GEF Agency submitting the CEO endorsement request is required to respond to any questions raised as part of the PIF review process that required clarifications on the Agency Capacity to manage reflows. This Annex seeks to demonstrate Agencies? capacity and eligibility to administer NGI resources as established in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy, GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01, June 9, 2017 (Annex 5).