

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)



PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title:	Strengthening the Network of 'New Protected Areas' ¹ in Madagascar, including New Protected Areas		
Country(ies):	Madagascar	GEF Project ID:	5351
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	1082
Other Executing Partner(s):	The Department for Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Area System (DCBSAP) of the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MEF)	Submission Date:	18 April 2013
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of parent program (if applicable):	Not applicable	Agency Fee (US\$):	371,000

A. INDICATIVE FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Financing (\$)	Indicative Co-financing (\$)
Biodiversity 1 – Improving the sustainability of protected areas systems. Outcome 1.1 Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas - Output 1. New protected areas (9) and coverage (approximately 297,000 hectares) of unprotected ecosystems:	GEF TF	3,905,265	12,200,000
Total project costs		3,905,265	12,200,000

B. INDICATIVE PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: The system of New Protected Areas (NPAs) is effective, it adequately represents marine/costal, freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems (including the previously under-represented mangrove ecosystems), and it supports good site management, the sustainable exploitation of site resources, improved lifestyles for people around sites, and the ability of economic actors to obtain sustainable benefits from sites.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Co-financing (\$)
1. National protected area system strengthening	TA	1.1 Key Malagasy institutions have capacity to inspire, manage and support an effective network of New Protected Areas (NPA). <u>Indicators</u> Capacity of DCBSAP and	1.1.1. NPA Managers, regional technical department staff (DREF ⁴) and DCBSAP technical staff trained in protected area management. 1.1.2. Members of the Madagascar Commission for the Protected Area System (CSAPM) trained in how to manage and monitor a system of protected areas.	GEF TF	666,667	2,000,000

¹ A definition for the term 'New Protected Area' is provided in the main text

		<p>DREFs (as measured by capacity score cards)².</p> <p>METT/RAPPAM³ tools applicable to PA System.</p> <p>National Action Plan for the Conservation of Mangroves fully approved and financed.</p>	<p>1.1.3. CSAPM Sub-Committees for Forestry-Mining, Forestry-Fisheries and Forestry-Land-Use operationalized.</p> <p>1.1.4. Proposed modifications to the process to establishing <i>temporary</i> NPAs and to the process to establishing <i>permanent</i> NPAs – notably a streamlining of the Environmental Impact Assessment process, and a simplifying of the requirements to undertake topographical surveys and to prepare Management Plans.</p> <p>1.1.5. National system to monitor the management effectiveness and biodiversity impacts of the NPA system.</p> <p>1.1.6. National Action Plan for the Conservation of Mangroves (as a complement to the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan that is under development).</p>			
2. Demonstrating and rolling out effective protected area management, including at important mangrove sites and PAs	TA	<p>2.1 Nine NPAs, including three micro- sites, are effectively managed, and key mangrove biodiversity is sustainably protected.</p> <p><u>Indicator</u></p> <p>No. of hectares under effective protected area management (approximately 297,000 hectares).</p> <p>Aggregate METT across all PAs supported by GEF.</p>	<p><i>For details of activities see Section A.1.3 and Annex.</i></p> <p>2.1.1. Bemanevika NPA has permanent protection status and the biodiversity is sustainably protected (36,500 hectares).</p> <p>2.1.2. Lac Alaotra NPA has permanent protection status and the biodiversity is sustainably protected (46,800 hectares).</p> <p>2.1.3. Ranobe PK NPA has permanent protection status and the biodiversity is sustainably protected (148,500 hectares).</p> <p>2.1.4. Makirovana Tsihomanaomby NPA has permanent protection status and the biodiversity is sustainably protected (5,283 hectares).</p> <p>2.1.5. Pointe a Larree NPA has permanent protection status and the biodiversity is sustainably protected (4,417 hectares).</p> <p>2.1.6. The complex of mangroves in the Baie d' Ambaro benefits from NPA protection and is sustainably protected (41,200 hectares).</p> <p>2.1.7. Three critical micro-mangrove sites in Melaky, Boeny and Menabe</p>	GEF TF	2,705,014	7,000,000

⁴ Regional Environment and Forestry Departments

² As developed by UNDP.

³ Management effectiveness tracking tool/Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management.

			Regions are restored and the concerned biodiversity is sustainably protected (approx. 15,000 hectares).			
3. Sustainability and knowledge management	TA	3.1 Project successes are made permanent and replicated. <u>Indicator</u> Approved legislation (bye laws). Total finance to NPAs. Level of uptake and dissemination of KM products/tools.	3.1. Mechanism to ensure local conservation knowledge is captured and stored in a format useful for national dissemination. 3.1.2. Financing strategy for all NPAs is prepared. This will set-up and improve revenue generation and fund-raising mechanisms both at the national level and for specific NPAs (i.e. based on their different revenue-generating potential and local socio-economic contexts) ⁵ thus supporting enhanced long-term financial sustainability of NPAs. 3.1.3. Necessary legal instruments (e.g. Decree) pertaining to modification of permanent NPA process (<i>following on from 1.1.4.</i>). This includes the Implementation Decree for the new protected areas management code (New COAP). 3.1.4. Multi-media outputs that capture and disseminate project successes (websites, documents, videos, conferences, etc). 3.1.5. High level understanding, support and commitment to sustainable management and conservation of mangrove ecosystems.	GEF TF	347,619	2,000,000
Sub-Total					3,719,300	11,000,000
Project management cost				GEF TF	185,965	1,200,000
Total project costs					3,905,265	12,200,000

C. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME IF AVAILABLE, (\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
National Government	Ministry of Environment and Forests/Directorate General for Forestry (and other national members of the CSAPM)	In-kind	2,200,000
GEF Agency	UNEP	Cash	200,000
NGO	WWF	Cash	3,700,000
NGO	Wildlife Conservation Society	Cash	4,000,000

⁵ The revenue-generation potential of each specific PA can vary greatly: some PAs may have high potential due to eco-tourism attractions, local products developments, availability of skilled labor locally, easy access and easy connection to local and national markets etc. Other PAs may be in a more disadvantaged position (e.g. being isolated and inaccessible for tourism, or with limited potential to develop revenue generation mechanisms and alternative livelihoods, etc.). A sustainable financing strategy for NPAs will therefore have to address the above, considering a site-specific as well as national (all NPAs) perspective (whereby i.e. 'luckier' PAs can sustain their operational costs and also contribute to sustaining the costs of other 'disadvantaged' PAs). The core funding for all the management of the entire NPA system should also be secured also through additional fund-raising and national budgeting mechanisms established and promoted at the central level of government and with national donors and partners, such as the 'promoter' approach currently in pace for most of the NPAs.

NGO	Missouri Botanical Garden	Cash	950,000
NGO	Conservation International	Cash	400,000
NGO	Durrell Conservation Trust	Cash	400,000
NGO	Peregrine Fund	Cash	150,000
NGO	Blue Ventures	Cash	200,000
Total Co-financing			12,200,000

D. INDICATIVE TRUST FUND RESOURCES (\$) REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal area	Country Name/Global	Grant amount (\$) (a)	Agency Fee (\$) (b)	Total (\$) (a + b)
UNEP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Madagascar	3,905,265	371,000	4,276,265
Total Grant Resources				3,905,265	371,000	4,276,265

E. PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)

Please check on the appropriate box for PPG as needed for the project according to the GEF Project Grant

	Amount Requested (\$)	Agency Fee for PPG (\$)
• (up to) \$150k for projects up to and including \$6 million	113,000	10,735

PPG AMOUNT REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES) FOR MFA AND/OR MTF

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal area	Country Name/Global	(in \$)		
				PPG (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c = a + b
UNEP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Madagascar	113,000	10,735	123,735
Total PPG Amount				113,000	10,735	123,735

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. PROJECT OVERVIEW

A.1. Project Description

A.1.1 The Global environment problems, root causes and barriers

Madagascar is a mega-biodiversity country with a high concentration of endemic species. Based on current knowledge, the Malagasy ecosystems are home to approximately 12,000 species of plants, 370 species of reptiles, 244 species of amphibians, 154 species of fish and 99 species/sub-species of lemurs⁶. It is estimated that 83% of flora species are endemic⁷. Information on biodiversity specific to mangroves is less comprehensive, although enough is known to state that Madagascar has large and important coastal and marine ecosystems, including large areas of mangrove, coral reef and sea grass. Madagascar's coastal and marine ecosystems provide a habitat for large populations of fauna, including 5 species of turtle, 27 marine mammals and many globally important colonies of seabirds.

The general trend observed with biodiversity is one of degradation, for both flora and fauna. For example, a recent assessment of 2,300 flora species determined that fully 78% were threatened with extinction⁸. Loss of natural habitat is estimated at 0.55% per year⁹. The main threats are human destructive practices such as clearing of natural habitats, over-exploitation of natural resources, mining (both legal and illegal, small and large-scale) and climate change. Behind this, there is a complex mix of causes including

⁶ 4th National Report to UNCBD, Government of Madagascar, 2011.

⁷ The endemic and non-endemic vascular flora of Madagascar updated, Callmander et al. 2011

⁸ Personal communication, Missouri Botanical Garden.

⁹ 4th National Report to UNCBD.

poverty, insecure tenure, low awareness, inadequate legal and regulatory frameworks, demographic trends, lack of conservation incentives, political instability, etc.

The mangroves of Madagascar face particular threats. Mangrove cover declined by 15% over the last fifty years, and 87% of coral reef is threatened. The main threats are human destructive practices such as clearing of natural habitats, over-exploitation of natural resources, mining (both legal and illegal, small and large-scale) and climate change.

Working closely with international partners, the Government and the people of Madagascar have made great efforts to conserve the nation's biodiversity. The policy, legal, institutional and regulatory framework has been developed. A major step was the establishment and funding of a network of National Parks in the 1990's and early 2000's, covering approximately 1.7 million hectares of prime habitat under IUCN categories I, II and IV. Despite these important advances, there were some weaknesses in this network. First, it focused on humid forest eco-systems, and did not adequately cover other ecosystems, notably coastal and marine ecosystems and mangroves. Second, it focused on *conservation*, with insufficient attempts to develop sustainable utilization and participatory, co-management approaches. Thirdly, due in part to the prevalent political instability, the driving force was often the international partners, leaving questions over sustainability and capacity to replicate.

In response to these challenges, in the early 2000's, Malagasy stakeholders developed a vision for expanding and improving the system of protected areas. This vision, unveiled at the World Parks Congress in 2003¹⁰, included the expansion of the area under protection to over 6 million hectares. The vision notably included greater coverage of marine and coastal sites, and inclusion of IUCN categories III, V and VI. To implement this vision, many so-called 'New Protected Areas' (NPAs) have been established. These NPAs cover over 4 million hectares and are critical to the conservation of globally significant biodiversity in Madagascar. The following advances can be mentioned:

- Development – but not finalization – of the legal framework covering the NPAs;
- Creation of the Madagascar Committee for the Protected Area System (CSAPM). The CSAPM has sub-Committees to focus on resolving specific challenges related to mining, fisheries and land-use;
- Development and formalization of the process and the tools to create and manage NPAs. This includes a series of detailed guidance documents, manuals, instructions, etc.;
- Establishing 93 NPAs – although most still only have a 'temporary' status – and for most achieving permanent status remains too difficult;
- Appointment of a 'promoter' for each NPA – either a national or international governmental or non-governmental organization. The promoter is responsible for pushing the NPA creation and supporting its management. In some cases, the promoters have been formally delegated management responsibility.

There remain some serious barriers to the full operationalisation and effective management of the system of NPAs – some barriers are site specific, others affect the entire system. However, even the barriers that affect the entire system play out differently at each site. These barriers are: (i) continuing conflicts between conservation and socio-economic sectors (notably mining, fisheries, agriculture) and no adequate coordination or conflict resolution mechanisms; (ii) incomplete legal framework for the NPAs; (iii) too few successful examples of how to establish and run an NPA; (iv) the process to create *permanent* NPA remains too expensive and too complicated for many of the smaller NPAs; (v) many site managers have not had access to quality training; (vi) inadequate access to financing; (vii) too little coverage of mangroves and other coastal and marine ecosystems; and (viii) at many sites, the land-uses authorized prior to the establishment of the NPA (e.g. for mining, or for transferring management responsibility to local communities) are still valid and contradict biodiversity conservation.

As a result of these barriers, the vast majority of NPAs remain in a *temporary* status and are poorly protected.

In addition, there are some barriers specific to improving the mangrove NPAs, notably: (i) shortage of information on coastal and marine ecosystems; (ii) low appreciation of their potential socio-economic value; (iii) the land use and the protected area legislative framework are not appropriately adapted to cover mangrove ecosystems; and, (iv) the remoteness and low capacity of local managers and communities. The mangroves of Madagascar, although globally important and vital to local development, have not benefitted from many support programmes. There have been programmes to develop fishery resources, yet there have been no comprehensive efforts to develop integrated mangrove management approaches.

The role of mangroves in both mitigating and reducing vulnerability to climate change is greatly under appreciated. Whereas at the global level studies show that mangroves provide resistance to storms and coastal erosion, this is not appreciated by either local communities or economic decision-makers in Madagascar. Moreover, mangroves store enormous amounts of carbon, especially in the earth below their roots, and their contribution to reducing GHG emissions is potentially significant. This could potentially generate funds for local communities. However, these issues are not understood by local communities or economic decision-makers in Madagascar.

¹⁰ Accordingly it is referred to as the 'Durban Vision'.

A.1.2 The baseline scenario and associated projects

The baseline includes actions at the national level to strengthen the system, and it includes conservation and development actions at several NPA sites. In the baseline, at the national level, the DCBSAP is working on the updating of the Protected Area Code. In addition, the CSAPM is active as a coordination and awareness raising mechanism. Its Forest-Mining sub-Commission continues to be very active attempting to settle conflicts – although so far not very successfully. Individual CSAPM members support awareness raising, training, data collection and undertake institutional support activities. However, in the baseline, there is no true comprehensive approach to developing/managing the system of NPAs. In the baseline, the barriers listed in the previous section will mostly remain and the system of NPAs will remain weakly implemented.

At the site level. In the baseline, each of the existing 93 NPAs has a promoter charged with developing local capacity, implementing urgent actions and facilitating the process to obtaining permanent protection status and thus complementing baseline investments from the local and national government. This project focuses on nine diverse sites¹¹. Hence the baseline also includes activities in the 9 sites targeted by this project. These sites are summarized as:

- Bemanevika NPA which currently has temporary protection status and has significantly progressed towards achieving permanent status.
- Lac Alaotra NPA which currently has temporary protection status and has significantly progressed towards achieving permanent status.
- Ranobe PK NPA which currently has temporary protection status and has significantly progressed towards achieving permanent status.
- Makirovana Tsihomaomby NPA which currently has temporary protection status and has started the process towards achieving permanent status.
- Pointe a Larree NPA which currently has temporary protection status and has started the process towards achieving permanent status.
- Baie d'Ambaro which includes a complex of mangroves, some of which lie within a temporary NPA.
- Three small but critical mangrove sites, one each in Melaky (Tsimembo-Manambololmaty NPA), Boeny (Boanamary) and Menabe Regions (Morondava delta). At these sites the mangroves have been degraded and there is, as yet, no protected area.

The Table in Annex provides information on the baseline situation in the 9 sites targeted by this project. It provides information on the biodiversity present, the threats, the ongoing baseline activities, the partners and the proposed GEF supported activities for each site. It also provides incomplete estimates of the baseline financial investments.

However, in the baseline, at the 9 sites, capacity to move forward the site management process is inadequate. In the baseline, the NPAs remain stuck in the temporary status, they remain under-funded, inadequately managed and the threats to biodiversity remain.

A.1.3 The proposed alternative scenario

The Proposed GEF project will develop national capacity to run an effective and efficient NPA system. This capacity will be applicable to all NPA sites across Madagascar, including NPAs to be established in the future. In particular, this capacity will be applicable to the many NPAs that are currently *weakly* managed as they are not benefitting from any large-scale funding from international partners. These weakly managed NPAs include the vast majority of mangrove NPAs. The extension of effective NPA management to these mangrove sites will lead to a significant increase in the *effective representativeness* of the protected area system in Madagascar.

In addition, the Proposed GEF Project will demonstrate effective NPA management at 9 sites. The Project will ensure that the 9 sites are effectively managed in a sustainable manner. The focus will be on sites that currently have weak – or no – NPA management capacity, and will include important mangrove sites. This *demonstration* will develop lessons; these lessons will feed back into the project's national capacity building and knowledge management - a national 'learning by doing' process.

It is noted that GEF funds will not directly support long-term implementation of site based activities - implementation will be covered by co-financing. This approach allows the GEF funds to have an important impact over a large number – nine - sites.

Accordingly, the Project will be implemented through three Components. The first Component has one Outcome: “*Key Malagasy institutions have capacity to inspire, manage and support a network of New Protected Areas (NPA)*”. This will include the development of a needs-based training programme on protected area management, and the running of the programme for NPA managers, technical government officers and DCBSAP technical staff. This Outcome will also include support to the CSAPM – in the form of training, organizational strengthening, and in the form of technical support to the Commission and its sub-Committees, so that the CSAPM can become more effective as a management mechanism for the protected area system. This Outcome will also include technical support to ongoing negotiations to modify the process to establishing *permanent* NPAs – meaning that many more sites

¹¹ Three of which are very small.

should be able to obtain this permanent status. Another key step supported by this Outcome will be the development of a national system to monitor NPA management and to monitor biodiversity at NPAs.

Finally, this Outcome will include support focusing specifically on mangroves. This will lead to a National Action Plan for the Conservation of Mangroves.

The second Component has one Outcome: “*Nine NPAs, including three micro-sites, are effectively managed and key mangrove biodiversity is sustainably protected*”. This Outcome will work with the 9 diverse sites listed in the previous section and in Annex. The specific outputs are:

- Bemanevika NPA has permanent protection status and the biodiversity is sustainably protected.
- Lac Alaotra NPA has permanent protection status and the biodiversity is sustainably protected.
- Ranobe PK NPA has permanent protection status and the biodiversity is sustainably protected.
- Makirovana Tsihomanaomby NPA has permanent protection status and the biodiversity is sustainably protected.
- Pointe a Larree NPA has permanent protection status and the biodiversity is sustainably protected.
- The complex of mangroves in the Baie d’ Ambaro benefits from NPA protection and is sustainably protected.
- Three small critical mangrove sites, one each in Melaky (Tsimembo-Manambololmaty NPA), Boeny (Boanamary) and Menabe Regions (Morondava delta) are restored and sustainably protected.

The approach will be similar at each site. Working with the promoters, the local government technical departments, and the local communities, a scientific and participatory process towards effective NPA will be supported. Two sets of activities will take place in parallel. The first set of activities will focus on conservation priorities – based on existing information or rapid participatory assessments, the project will support urgent priority activities leading to both conservation and socio-economic benefits. This will yield immediate impacts.

In parallel, a second set of project activities will support a thorough approach to NPA strengthening. This will take the NPAs through the following steps: obtaining temporary status; undertaking studies; facilitating negotiations; development of Management Plans; obtaining permanent status; launching Management Plan implementation, and; thorough monitoring of the NPA. Outputs will include the necessary byelaws and Management Plans.

The Annex provides more specific details on the proposed activities at the sites. It is noted that the majority of activities at the site will be financed by partners. Notably, long-term implementation of the site management plans will be the responsibility of the promoters and local government agencies.

A key task is to pilot simplified tools to establishing NPAs, notably a simplified EIA, a simplified system/methodology for topographical surveys, and also piloting conflict resolution to address conflicts between NPA status and previously established land and resource use rights (this will be the practical piloting of tools developed under the first Component). An underlying aim will be to generate socio-economic benefits for local communities and other economic actors, as well as generating biodiversity conservation, at all sites.

The third Component has one Outcome: “*Project successes are made permanent and replicated*”. This Outcome will ensure project successes from Components one and two are sustained and replicated to the many other NPAs in Madagascar. The project will help national agencies to develop the required tools and instruments, including a mechanism to ensure local conservation knowledge is captured and stored in a format useful for national dissemination. The project will also support development of a financing strategy for the NPAs. The project will also support the preparation of necessary legal instruments (e.g. Decrees) pertaining to the modification of the NPA approval process, and to establishing the NPA monitoring system. The project will also support development and monitor the level of user uptake of a range of multi-media outputs that capture and disseminate project successes (websites, documents, videos, conferences, etc). A key Output under this third Component is high level understanding, support and commitment to sustainable to the conservation of mangroves.

A.1.4 The incremental cost reasoning and expected baseline contributions

Scenario without the GEF investment: The baseline consists mostly of work in the NPAs by members of the CSAPM, as described in the previous sections and illustrated in Annex 1. This baseline work has a strong focus on national as well as global benefits – as it includes important conservation activities. However in the baseline, this work is insufficient to protect the globally significant biodiversity. At the national level, baseline efforts to drive, manage and support the system of NPAs are weak and uncoordinated.

Scenario with the GEF investment: GEF funds will build on this baseline. GEF funds will provide a catalyst to develop a coherent and coordinated approach to the system of NPAs – meaning that the total NPA system will benefit from improved management and technical support. In addition, GEF will support nine important sites directly, thereby leading to conservation of key ecosystems. GEF support will also kick-start the development of a coherent approach to sustainable management and conservation of mangroves – within the framework of the NPAs. Hence, all GEF funds will have direct global benefits

A.1.5 Global environmental benefits

The project will directly contribute to conservation and sustainable use at nine important sites, including a range of mangrove sites, all sites internationally recognized as being globally significant. The sites are significant in terms of the ecosystems, the number of species, the levels of endemism and their potential socio-economic values. The global significance of each of the sites is illustrated in the Annex.

In addition, the project will also greatly develop and strengthen national capacity in Madagascar to plan and manage the network of all New Protected Areas. This currently consists of 93 sites; it is expected that this number will continue to increase over the coming years.

A.1.6 Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up

The Project is relatively innovative at the national level as no large-scale projects have focused general strengthening of the NPA system in Madagascar before. Previous internationally supported projects and GEF projects focused on either the pre-Durban set of national parks or on 2-3 highly visible NPAs. The approach in this Proposed project through NPAs has the following set of innovative characteristics for Madagascar:

- An emphasis on developing the capacity of local partners and putting national and local partners in the driving seat;
- An emphasis on sustainable use, as opposed to purely conservation;
- A greater representativeness: the former parks focused very much on humid forest ecosystems, the NPAs targeted by the project cover the less represented mangrove and other terrestrial ecosystems;
- Finally, the project will develop an innovative combination of participatory and scientific methods to plan and manage sites rich in biodiversity conservation.

The project design will include strategies and activities to ensure sustainability. At the site level this includes: (i) training and awareness raising and (ii) supporting local development that is consistent with biodiversity conservation. More importantly, at the national level, this includes: (i) training, awareness raising and development of the legal and regulatory framework; (ii) strengthening the all-round capacity of CSAPM and its members; and; (iii) mobilizing funds from sustainable sources. Component 3, output 3.1.2 will also specifically support the development of financing plans and revenue generation mechanisms to sustain PA management in the longer term, and this will focus both at the local and national level. The community involvement strategy and development of alternative livelihoods and revenue sharing options for local communities will also contribute to enhancing the long-term sustainability of NPAs (ref Annex 1).

The project addresses the system of new NPAs, with specific attention to the challenges facing mangrove NPAs. The project focuses on a small selection of the 93 existing NPAs. In the future, it is expected that additional NPAs will be created in Madagascar, with an increasing number of coastal and marine NPAs. The project strategy is to develop national capacity to establish and manage NPAs, notably through the institutional capacity (mostly CSAPM and DCBSAP) and through the legal/regulatory frameworks. This strategy will facilitate the replication of all project success to all NPAs across Madagascar. Many activities under Outcome 3 will contribute specifically to this replication. Lessons learnt in Madagascar may also be disseminated to other countries with similar socio-economic conditions.

A.2. Stakeholders

The project will be implemented in line with established Government of Madagascar and UNEP procedures. The Department for Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Area System (DCBSAP) of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MEF) will take overall responsibility for execution of the project, and for the project success. DCBSAP will establish the necessary planning and management mechanisms to oversee project inputs, activities and outputs. UNEP will support the DCBSAP as necessary. The PPG process will be used to further define the management, coordination and consultation mechanisms.

Other key stakeholders include:

Stakeholder	Mandate/Role in Project
CSAPM (Madagascar Commission for the Protected Area System)	The Committee membership includes all key national and international organizations involved in biodiversity conservation in Madagascar. It notably includes the promoters and managers of each NPA. In the project, the CSAPM will support coordination and information exchange, and some national CSAPM members will benefit from capacity building. The project may also improve and support the working procedures of the Committee and its sub-Committees.
General Department for Environment (DGE) in MEF	Overall responsibility for environmental protection in Madagascar. DGE is also GEF Operational Focal Point. In the project, DGE will support planning, may benefit from capacity building, and will help disseminate project results.
General Department for Forests in MEF	Overall responsibility for forestry in Madagascar. In the project, it will support planning, may benefit from capacity building, and will help disseminate project results.

Regional Departments for Environment and Forestry (DREF)	Responsibility for implementing environment and forestry programmes in their administrative Region. In the project, they will be involved in planning for activities in their region, and they will benefit from capacity building.
National and local fishery and agriculture departments.	Responsible for development and regulation of fisheries and agriculture, including in mangrove areas. In the project, they will be involved in planning and will benefit from capacity building. They may provide technical support.
WWF, WCS and MBG	International NGOs and CSAPM members. They are official ‘promoters’ and/or delegated ‘managers’ of one or more NPAs. They, accordingly, have a mandate and responsibilities related to management and conservation in the concerned NPA. They are implementing conservation and development activities at the sites. In the project, they may implement activities and provide technical support. They are project partners and co-financers
Blue Ventures, Conservation International, Durrell and Blue Ventures	International NGOs and CSAPM members. They are official ‘promoters’ and/or delegated ‘managers’ of one or more NPAs. They, accordingly, have a mandate and responsibilities related to management and conservation in the concerned NPA. They are implementing conservation and development activities at the sites. In the project, they may implement activities and provide technical support. They may be co-financers
Madagascar National Parks (MNP)	MNP have extensive experience in the establishment and management of protected areas in Madagascar. They may implement activities and provide technical support.
National Environment Office (ONE)	ONE is an autonomous agency responsible for environmental monitoring and for supervising the environmental impact procedures in Madagascar. In the project, ONE may implement activities and provide technical support.
Service des Domaines and Service de Topographie	Responsible for the procedure to prepare topographical surveys when establishing an NPA.. In the project, ONE may implement activities and provide technical support
Madagascar Biodiversity Fund (FAPBM)	The Fund mobilized funds from diverse sources and channels these funds to biodiversity conservation initiatives, especially in protected areas.

Stakeholder participation arrangements during project preparation

An informal task force involving DGE, DCBSAP, UNEP and several CSAPM members has already been established for this project. This task force¹² will oversee project preparation and ensure full participation of stakeholders during project preparation. During the Project preparation, all the stakeholders listed in the above table will be consulted on a bilateral basis in a regular manner. In addition, at least three workshops will be held with all stakeholders – to consult, to generate information and to validate the approach. In addition, intensive bilateral discussion with select stakeholders will be undertaken in order to develop implementation partnerships and to force mutual financing arrangements. Finally, and importantly, at each site, consultation with representatives of local communities will be undertaken. These consultations will utilize the already established mechanisms that the site *promoters* have developed with representatives of local communities.

A.3. Risks

Risk Description and Level	Proposed Measure
Climate change and variability (notably increased cyclones) damages critical costal Mangrove sites. Intense storms may critically damage sites. <u>Low -Medium</u>	A range of geographically dispersed sites in Madagascar is selected, and although some mangrove sites may be exposed to damage by storms, most project target sites are not. The Project will also consider resilience to climate change as part of the preparation of site Management Plans. In particular, the project, by contributing to the protection of mangrove ecosystems, will make a direct contribution to adaptation to climate change. This role and economic value of mangroves in coastal protection will be integrated into the management plans at concerned sites.
Local poverty undermines conservation efforts.	In the Project, great efforts will be made at each site to develop participatory methods and to identify win-win approaches, whereby biodiversity conservation and improved socio-economic conditions are combined. Madagascar is ranked n.151 in the Human Development index scale

¹² Note, this informal task force will evolve into the Project Steering Committee, but in PPG early stages it is advisable to keep it informal and streamlined.

The project seeks participatory methods, however, if local populations are extremely poor, balancing conservation with sustainable use may be difficult to achieve. <u>Low - Medium</u>	and national multidimensional poverty index (%) is 0.357 (source: http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/MDG.html). Therefore the establishment of NPAs will consider the development of nature-based and PA-related economic and revenue-generation activities for local communities within and around NPAs as a highest priority, and these alternative livelihoods as an essential avenue to ensure effective and participatory PA management (ref. also to footnote n. 13 in Annex 1).
Political instability undermines project implementation.	Political situation in Madagascar, although not stable, is currently calm and appears likely to improve in near future.
Current political instability in Madagascar makes it difficult to secure long-term commitment and to develop institutional capacity. <u>Low – medium</u>	The project strategy is designed to circumvent political instabilities, and to work with technical partners [i.e. governmental - The Department for Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Area System (DCBSAP) of the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MEF), local and non-governmental (ref. list of partners for each site in Annex 1)] that are sure to continue to be involved in protected area management over the long term.

A.4. Coordination

MEF and DCBSAP will take a leading role in ensuring coordination with all related government and non-government initiatives. Initial consultations and meetings held during PIF development indicated that there are a vast number of international and national partners involved in biodiversity conservation and natural resource management in Madagascar – the majority are members of the CSAPM. The CSAPM involves almost all concerned Project stakeholders and has a mandate related to coordination in the protected area sector in Madagascar. Hence, it will be the key player in ensuring coordination. Further, the activities of this project, notably under Output 1.1.2. and 1.1.3., will strengthen this coordination capacity. During the PPG phase, a stakeholder consultation process will be conducted both at the national and local level at the 9 target sites. This process will confirm (a) which other initiatives are most relevant for coordination and collaboration with this GEF project, in terms of their geographic and/or thematic overlap or potential synergy (most relevant at this stage include #1, 2,3,4, and 5 below), and (b) adequate coordination mechanisms will be defined and confirmed with key partners, and included at CEO endorsement.

With GEF support, during 2002 – 2011, UNDP implemented the Project “*Madagascar: Third Environment Programme, Support to the Protected Area Network and Support Zones*”. This project supported the undertaking of demonstrations and helped develop small-scale models for mangrove management. The lessons learnt from this project will be utilized and replicated as appropriate.

Coordination will be assured with the following ongoing GEF Projects:

1. *Madagascar’s Network of Managed Resource Protected Areas* (UNDP/GEF), approved in 2010 and currently on hold. This Project focusses mostly on the ‘original’ protected areas established prior to the Durban Vision. However, many objectives and outputs are related to the current proposed project, and strong coordination will be ensured to create synergies;
2. *Third Environmental Program Support Project (EP3)*, (World Bank/GEF), approved in 2011 and currently on hold. This includes activities focussing on two of the larger, highly visible NPAs (NAPCAZ and Makira)
3. *Updating the Madagascar National Biodiversity Action Plan*: ongoing under the UNEP/GEF umbrella programme for NBSAPs
4. *Promoting Climate Resilience in the Rice Sector through Pilot Investments in Alaotra-Mangoro Region*, (UNEP/LDCF, starting in 2013).

The Government of Madagascar is currently launching a series of GEF projects under GEF 5. MEF and DGE, with support from UNEP, will ensure coordination and synergies across all these GEF 5 projects. These projects include:

5. Conservation of Key Threatened, Endemic and Economically Valuable Species in Madagascar;
6. Participatory Sustainable Land Management in the Grassland Plateaus of Western Madagascar;
7. Integrating climate change adaptation into marine resources and biodiversity conservation.

Finally the project will link with and build on the lessons learnt in the following regional and global mangrove-related initiatives:

8. *Mangroves for the Future* (MFF) project - this major project has generated significant knowledge which will feed into the design and approach of the present proposed project;
9. The UNEP/GEF project “*Coastal Resilience to Climate Change: Developing a Generalizable Method for Assessing Vulnerability and Adaptation of Mangroves and Associated Ecosystems*”; and,
10. The work undertaken by IUCN (East and Southern Africa) on Mangroves in the Indian Ocean.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

B.1.National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAs, NAPs, NBSAPs, National Communications, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc:

Specifically, the Project contributes to the implementation of the following laws, plans and strategies related to Protected Areas and/or to local management of natural resources. The following documents and plans make explicit reference to the "New Protected Areas" (NPAs), which are at the core of this project:

- Protected Area Code (2001), with Implementation Decree (2005);
- The 'Durban Vision', announced in September 2003 at the World Parks Congress in Durban, to triple Madagascar's protected areas in five years and to increase the country's protected habitats from 1.7 to 6 million hectares - or from 3 to 10 percent of the nation's area;
- Decree Granting temporary protection status to 93 NPAs covering 5.2 million hectares (2010, due for renewal in 2012)¹³;
- Prime Ministerial Decree on Integrated Coastal Zone Management (2010); and
- Inter-regional Charter and Action Plan for Sustainable Mangrove Management (2012), committed to by the six following administrative Regions: Diana, Sofia, Boeny, Melaky, Menabe and Atsimo Andrefana.

The Project also contributes to the implementation of the following national sustainable development plans and strategies:

- Law on local management of natural resources (GELOSE, 2000) and the related implementation decree (GCF, 2001);
- The National Forestry Policy (1997);
- Madagascar Action Plan 2007 – 2012 (MAP), which, given the current political impasse, is still the valid national development plan. This is focussed around 8 commitments, of which the seventh is "Madagascar will be a world leader in the development and implementation of environmental best-practice.... We will become a "green island" again...";
- National Environmental policies, notably as reflected in the National Environmental Action Plan and in the 3rd Phase of the National Environmental Program;
- The Environmental Charter (Updated in 2012).

Given that the majority of the project's resources focus on 9 sites, the project will also contribute to (i) the implementation of the Regional Rural Development Strategies in the concerned Regions (Sofia, Alaotra-Mangoro, Atsimo-Andrefana, Sava, Analanjanorofo, Diana, Melaky, Boeny, Menabe) and (ii) the existing plans and strategies prepared by local stakeholders to manage and sustainably harvest the sites. The Project also contributes to the forestry and fishery sector strategies/plans pertaining to the affected sites.

The Project also contributes to the implementation of the following other biodiversity plans and strategies:

- The Madagascar National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (1997, and currently being update/revised);
- The 4th National Report to the Convention on Biodiversity (2011) which identifies the importance of managing and upgrading the system of NPAs; and,
- The Madagascar National African Eurasian Water-bird Agreement (AEWA) Plan.

Contribution to Aichi Targets and Appropriate Indicators

This project is designed to contribute to several targets set out in CBD Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011 – 2020 (the 'Aichi Targets'). It will most notably contribute to Target 11, and also to Targets 5, 6 and 14, as follows:

Aichi Target 11 ("by 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, ... are conserved..."). The project will contribute by improving the management and protected status of 9 important sites covering ... hectares, including a large area of coastal ecosystem and mangroves. Aichi Indicator: Trends in protected area condition and/or management effectiveness including more equitable management.

Aichi Target 5 (By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved..."). The project will contribute by reducing habitat loss at targeted mangroves. Aichi Indicator: Trends in proportion of degraded/threatened habitats.

Aichi Target 6 ("By 2020 all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably..."). The Project will contribute by improving the sustainable management of mangrove areas which are key to regenerating fish stocks. Aichi Indicator: Trends in population of target and by-catch aquatic species.

Aichi Target 14 (By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded,). The project will contribute by helping key mangroves to provide important ecosystem services. Aichi Indicator: Trends in natural resource conflicts.

¹³ Ref.: Arrêté interministériel n°52005/2010 portant protection temporaire globale des sites SAPM, December 2010

B.2. GEF Focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities:

This Project will contribute primarily to Objective 1, *Improving the sustainability of protected areas systems*, of the Biodiversity focal area, as follows: Firstly it will 'improve management effectiveness of existing protected areas'. 93 NPAs have been established, and this project will contribute directly to six existing ones, and to developing 3 new ones, and project replication (Outcome 3) should have an indirect impact on all NPAs. Secondly, the project will contribute to 'expanding ecosystem representation within the protected area system'. This is to be achieved notably by focussing on mangrove ecosystems, which are currently under-represented in the Malagasy protected area system. Finally, it will support 'increased financing of the protected area system', by developing a national financing strategy, and working on sustainable financing in at least 9 key sites.

The project will also make an indirect contribution to Biodiversity focal area Objective 2, *Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes/seascapes and sectors*. This will be done at nine sites, working with local communities and economic actors to develop sustainable use mechanisms and to integrate biodiversity conservation with local socio-economic development.

B.3. The GEF Agency's comparative advantage for implementing this project:

This project lies within the following areas recognized by GEF as areas where UNEP has a comparative advantage:

- *Sound science for national, regional and global decision-makers*, notably by strengthening science-to-policy linkages and by strengthening environmental monitoring and assessment;
- *Technical assistance and capacity building at country level*, notably by strengthening technology assessment, by demonstration and through innovation, and also by directly developing capacity;
- *Knowledge management*, including through awareness raising and advocacy.

The project is consistent with the objectives and expected outcomes of the current UNEP Medium Term Strategy (2010-2013) and fits under the Ecosystem Management and Environmental Governance sub-programs. UNEP's advantage also stems from competences developed during the recent implementation of the project: *Developing a Generalizable Method for Assessing Vulnerability and Adaptation of Mangroves and Associated Ecosystems*". This project had activities in Tanzania and Cameroon.

UNEP is opening a Liaison Office in Madagascar to oversee and support its growing portfolio of projects in the country (including the four pipeline GEF 5 projects and the two recently approved Adaptation Fund projects). The Liaison Office will facilitate coordination, project implementation and contacts with partners at the country level. UNEP HQ is also located within the same sub-region, thus allowing a cost-effective support and regular country visits by UNEP HQ staff. Several branches of UNEP and associated organizations will contribute to the design and implementation of the project, mainly the UNEP/DEPI Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Branch and UNEP/WCMC.

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT (S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):

(Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this template. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
RALALAHARISOA Christine Edmée	Director, General Directorate of Environment	Ministry of Environment and Forests	02/07/2013

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for project identification and preparation.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Maryam Niamir-Fuller, Director, GEF Coordination Office, UNEP, Nairobi		04/18/2013	Edoardo Zandri, Task Manager, GEF BD/LD Unit, DEPI, UNEP	+254 20 762 4380	edoardo.zandri@unep.org

Annex 1 – Baseline Situation at the 9 Sites

Site (name, status and area)	Indicator(s) of global biodiversity value (e.g. key species, no. of species, unique ecosystem, etc)	Main threats	Promoter and other important actors (both conservation and development actors)	Main Ongoing Activities by actors	Current Annual Investment from actors ¹⁴ (US\$)	Global Category (WWF Ecoregion, CI hotspot, Ramsar, IBA, KBA, AZE, IUCN Category ¹⁵ , etc)	Main proposed activities (for GEF support) ¹⁶
------------------------------	---	--------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	---	--

¹⁴ This column includes only preliminary data on currently confirmed co-financing from local partners. Other Government's baseline investments and co-financing is not reflected in the table. This information will be expanded and confirmed during the PPG stakeholder consultations process and site visits, so as to ensure alignment with Table C, and will be included at CEO endorsement.

¹⁵ In most cases, the IUCN Category is not yet assigned for New Protected Areas. However it is likely that most NPAs supported by the project may fall under categories: IV, V or VI and only some may potentially fall in category Ib or II. The confirmation of IUCN category for each NPA will be one of the results of the NPA establishment process, and the information will be fed into the WCMC World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA).

¹⁶ **Alternative livelihoods and NPAs:** at most target sites, local communities living within and outside NPAs are in many cases currently relying on the use of natural resources and biodiversity for their subsistence (e.g. collection of firewood, timber and other NTFPs, fishing, hunting, farming and livestock herding, etc.). Such uses are often un-sustainable and posing a threat to the long-term preservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services. When a new Protected Area is established, it often creates an initial perceived sense of loss of access and limitations on resources use rights by the communities. It is also a fact that certain limitations on the collection and use of natural resources are introduced, as a result of PA establishment. It is therefore important to involve local communities closely and since the initial stages of the process of PA design and establishment, to discuss and explain the objectives and local and national benefits of PA establishment, and to illustrate the range of socio-economic development options and tangible benefits for resident communities, that are expected from the establishment of PAs. These livelihood options are 'alternative' to the status-quo (i.e. continuation of unsustainable/illegal use and exhaustion of natural resources and biodiversity at the site), and they might include, i.e.:
 (i) direct employment in the management of the PA (e.g. as PA management and research/survey staff, rangers/guards, community extension awareness/education officers, visitor services team, etc. – for which the GEF project can provide capacity building and TA);
 (ii) set-up of community agreements entailing regulated permits for the continued sustainable and controlled uses of natural resources for subsistence within PAs, such as fuelwood, NTFPs (non-timber forest products), fish, game, periodic limited access for livestock in drought periods, etc.(and the GEF project can provide TA to support the definition and initial set-up of such agreements);
 (iii) local employment in visitor management and ecotourism, resulting from and associated with the new PA (for which the GEF project can provide specific training for community members in: visitor management, nature interpretation and guiding, language skills, small-business management, communication and website set-up, eco-tourism development, etc.);

Site (name, status and area)	Indicator(s) of global biodiversity value (e.g. key species, no. of species, unique ecosystem, etc)	Main threats	Promoter and other important actors (both conservation and development actors)	Main Ongoing Activities by actors	Current Annual Investment from actors ¹⁴ (US\$)	Global Category (WWF Ecoregion, CI hotspot, Ramsar, IBA, KBA, AZE, IUCN Category ¹⁵ , etc)	Main proposed activities (for GEF support) ¹⁶
Lac Alaotra NPA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key ecosystems lie within the created NPA; 46,800 hectares. 	<p>The wetlands and surrounding watershed basin host 30 species of waterbirds, including 5 endemic species and two species of lemurs; The lake contains five endemic fish species.</p> <p>MORE DETAILED INFORMATION TO BE COLLECTED DURING PPG PHASE</p>	Invasive plants, overfishing, illegal fishing, transformation of lake and marshes to rice fields, and sedimentation.	Durrell; Madagascar Wildlife and Conservation (MWC); Ile et vilaine ; ANAE ; JICA ; CASTELLE S; Madagascar ANDRIKO Tafa (Tany	<p>Developing conservation agriculture techniques :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved irrigation systems ; Water supply and sanitation ; Training in agriculture and apiculture ; Developing sustainable fish 	70,000/year (Durrell)	<p>Ramsar site (2003);</p> <p>One AZE site.</p> <p>IUCN Category: not assigned</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> awareness raising; support process to 'permanent' status (Support steps to prepare streamlined Environmental Impact Assessment, to undertake rapid topographical survey, and to develop streamlined Management Plan); establishing protected forest areas

(iv) small scale local enterprises to develop and market (both locally and nationally) new nature-based products with value-added as a result of PA establishment (e.g. organic farming products from around the PA, new and specific nature-related handicrafts building on the flagship species and key features of each PA – for which the GEF project can provide TA and training)

(v) set-up and community-led management of revenue-sharing mechanisms between the community and PA management, to ensure that a share of visitor revenue will flow to local communities, etc. (and the GE project can provide TA and training based on several examples from around the world)

The project will support this approach based on the initial review of best practice and relevant successful experiences in community engagement in PA management and in similar socio-economic contexts from elsewhere in Madagascar, in the African regional and globally.

The above alternative livelihood options will be combined with intensive communication, education and awareness programs on the importance of PAs, biodiversity conservation and the concept of ecosystem services, with local communities. Based on lessons learned from many other PAs around the world, this approach will contribute to an improved level of understanding, ownership and support for the PA by local communities, thus resulting in enhanced PA management effectiveness and improved conservation of biodiversity within the PA. A better understanding of the wide range of economic benefits deriving from the PA for local communities will result in e.g. better community support for law enforcement efforts (e.g. with a reduction of poaching, wildfires etc.), local community effectively sharing 'ownership' of the PA as an economic resources (as opposed to a limited-community-access area only) and thus seeing communities more actively engaged in 'defending' the PA from external pressures, etc.

Site (name, status and area)	Indicator(s) of global biodiversity value (e.g. key species, no. of species, unique ecosystem, etc)	Main threats	Promoter and other important actors (both conservation and development actors)	Main Ongoing Activities by actors	Current Annual Investment from actors ¹⁴ (US\$)	Global Category (WWF Ecoregion, CI hotspot, Ramsar, IBA, KBA, AZE, IUCN Category ¹⁵ , etc)	Main proposed activities (for GEF support) ¹⁶
			sy ampanandrosoana ; BVLac; AVSF; BRL; SDMAD.	farming systems; • Supporting the use of regulation fishnets and traps; • Support to women handicraft groups; • Supporting school gardens and production of construction materials.			upstream; • management of invasive plants and invasive shrimps using biological methods; • training and capacity development to promote investment in compatible socio-economic activities (e.g. sustainable fishing).
Ranobe PK 32 NPA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 148, 552 hectares. • Temporary protection 	The richest protected area in southern Madagascar, with 32 mammal species (including 8 lemurs, of which <i>Lemur catta</i> (VU) and <i>Propithecus verreauxi</i> (VU)), 130 bird and 73 reptile species. Two bird species (<i>Uratelornis chimaera</i> and <i>Monias benschi</i> , both VU) represent monotypic genera of endemic families, and are locally endemic to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charcoal production to feed urban demand from Toliara • Slash-and-burn agriculture (hatsake) for maize production • Selective logging of hardwoods 	WWF Projet de Rehabilitation du Périmètre Irrigué de Manombo (African Development Bank) Agronomes et Vétérinaires sans	Establishment and capacity building of participatory governance structures for protected area. Participatory zoning of protected area Establishment of surveillance mechanisms Rehabilitation of agricultural	WWF: 100,000 USD/yr	Part of Madagascar Spiny Desert Ecoregion (WWF Global 200). Part of Important Bird Area (BirdLife international). Part of Madagascar and Western Indian Ocean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attain definitive protected area status • Develop integrated regional development strategies with mining company and regional authorities. • Strengthen capacity and functionality of community-based governance structures. • Reduce deforestation through agricultural extension activities

Site (name, status and area)	Indicator(s) of global biodiversity value (e.g. key species, no. of species, unique ecosystem, etc)	Main threats	Promoter and other important actors (both conservation and development actors)	Main Ongoing Activities by actors	Current Annual Investment from actors ¹⁴ (US\$)	Global Category (WWF Ecoregion, CI hotspot, Ramsar, IBA, KBA, AZE, IUCN Category ¹⁵ , etc)	Main proposed activities (for GEF support) ¹⁶
	the Mikea subregion. Several reptile and plant species probably occur in no other protected areas, and the carnivore <i>Mungotictis decemlineata lineata</i> may also be restricted to the NAP. The NAP protects one of the largest populations of the Critically Endangered tortoise <i>Pyxis arachnoides</i> .	for timber • Establishment of mining infrastructure and associated indirect impacts	Frontières Maison des Paysans	infrastructure Agricultural improvement activities with farmers Regulation of charcoal sector, training of charcoal producers and reforestation.		hotspot (CI). Key Biodiversity Area (CI). Part of the Alliance for Zero Extinction. IUCN Category: not assigned	• Improve sustainability of the charcoal sector
MakirovanaTsihoma naomy NPA • Key ecosystems lie within the created NPA. • 5,283 hectares.	-priority area for plant conservation (located in a zone with a rare combination of climate, geology and elevation, that is not represented in the current network of protected areas). - presence of local endemic plant species confirmed with some plant species of which are new to science (e.g. <i>Rhodolaena macrocarpa</i>)	• Growing cash crops (vanilla); • Unsustainable wood harvesting, especially precious woods.	Missouri Botanical Garden (MBG).	-support and training for Management committee and polisinala; -Dina application; - Research and Monitoring; -Awareness raising and communication; -Poverty reduction (clove growing, vegetable growing,	\$52,000 USD/year	MORE INFORMATION TO BE COLLECTED DURING PPG PHASE IUCN Category: not assigned	• Support process to 'permanent' status (support steps to prepare streamlined Environmental Impact Assessment, to undertake rapid topographical survey, and to develop streamlined Management Plan); • Help develop alternative livelihoods by

Site (name, status and area)	Indicator(s) of global biodiversity value (e.g. key species, no. of species, unique ecosystem, etc)	Main threats	Promoter and other important actors (both conservation and development actors)	Main Ongoing Activities by actors	Current Annual Investment from actors ¹⁴ (US\$)	Global Category (WWF Ecoregion, CI hotspot, Ramsar, IBA, KBA, AZE, IUCN Category ¹⁵ , etc)	Main proposed activities (for GEF support) ¹⁶
	and Rhopalocarpus randrianavoi). -threatened species: Eulemur coronatus et Eulemur sanfordii, - important water source for the many thousands of hectares of irrigated rice cultivation on the plains surrounding the mountains.			provision for furniture for primary schools).			promoting investment in compatible socio-economic activities.
Pointe a Larree NPA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key ecosystems lie within the created NPA. • 4,417 hectares. 	- A complex mosaic of vegetation types including littoral forest, low-elevation humid forest, swamp and marshes, all of which are inadequately represented in Madagascar's existing network of protected areas. - Several locally endemic and threatened species including for example Santranala decussilvae, Dypsis sanctaemariae, Schizolaena rosea, Eulemur rubriventer...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Collecting construction wood; •Unsustainable farming practices (intensive land burning); •Tourism is a potential threat in Manompana Bay. 	MBG	- support and training for Management committee and polisinala; -Dina application; - Research and Monitoring; -Awareness raising and communication; -Poverty reduction (Clove production Construction of a two-room store house for cloves Construction of a classroom for a	\$46,000 USD/year	MORE INFORMATION TO BE COLLECTED DURING PPG PHASE IUCN Category: not assigned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Support process to 'permanent' status (support steps to prepare streamlined Environmental Impact Assessment, to undertake rapid topographical survey, and to develop streamlined Management Plan); •Help develop alternative livelihoods by promoting investment in compatible socio-economic activities.

Site (name, status and area)	Indicator(s) of global biodiversity value (e.g. key species, no. of species, unique ecosystem, etc)	Main threats	Promoter and other important actors (both conservation and development actors)	Main Ongoing Activities by actors	Current Annual Investment from actors ¹⁴ (US\$)	Global Category (WWF Ecoregion, CI hotspot, Ramsar, IBA, KBA, AZE, IUCN Category ¹⁵ , etc)	Main proposed activities (for GEF support) ¹⁶
<p>Bemanevika NPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key ecosystems lie within the created NPA. • 36,500 hectares. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four volcanic crater lakes lying over 1000m above sea level; • Last home of the Madagascar Pochard (<i>Aythya innotata</i>) - the world's rarest duck; • Commonly observed water birds include: black egret, Cattle Egret, cormorant, Fulvous Duck, Great White Egret, hottentot teal, Little Grebe, Slender-Billed Flufftail, Madagascar Rail, Madagascar Grebe, Malachite Kingfisher, Meller's Duck, Moorhen, Red-Billed Teal, Snipe, Madagascar Pond Heron, Madagascar Harrier, Gray Emutail, squacco heron, Swamp Warbler and White-Faced Duck. • Forest fauna species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agriculture (a high level threat, includes unsustainable use of pesticides and transformation to rice fields); • unsustainable fishing; • invasive fish species; • sedimentation due to poor watershed management practices; • bush fires, and; • over harvesting of plants – 	<p>The Peregrine Fund</p> <p>Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust</p> <p>Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust</p> <p>Asity Madagascar</p>	<p>primary school).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved agriculture and livestock raising – main products are rice, coffee, peanuts and zebu; • Peregrine Fund are supporting the establishment of Bemanevika NPA, and supporting local communities in the sustainable management of renewable natural resources; • Biological and ecological research into endemic/threatened species, such as the Madagascar serpent eagle, Red Owl and Pochard; • Environmental education at Bemanevika NPA; • Habitat restoration 	<p>~ USD 90 000</p>	<p>MORE INFORMATION TO BE COLLECTED DURING PPG PHASE</p> <p>IUCN Category: not assigned</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support process to 'permanent' status (Support steps to prepare streamlined Environmental Impact Assessment, to undertake rapid topographical survey, and to develop streamlined Management Plan); • Help develop alternative livelihoods by promoting investment in compatible socio-economic activities.

Site (name, status and area)	Indicator(s) of global biodiversity value (e.g. key species, no. of species, unique ecosystem, etc)	Main threats	Promoter and other important actors (both conservation and development actors)	Main Ongoing Activities by actors	Current Annual Investment from actors ¹⁴ (US\$)	Global Category (WWF Ecoregion, CI hotspot, Ramsar, IBA, KBA, AZE, IUCN Category ¹⁵ , etc)	Main proposed activities (for GEF support) ¹⁶
	such as Madagascar serpent eagle, Red owl, Calumma hafahafa, Scaphyophryne boribory, Common brown lemur, Sambirano Woolly lemur, Grey-backed sportive lemur.	notably Cyperus which is used for weaving mats and baskets.		through reforestation; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support to local livelihood improvement, such as the development of community apiary. • Support of schools materials (school kits) for the primary schools surrounding the NPA. • With WWF and Durrell - captive breeding of 38 Pochard ducks; • Support to two local associations (2 COBA) in terms of community-based natural resource management. 			
Baie d'Ambaro A complex of diverse management zones.	Abrite l'Ankoay MORE INFORMATION TO BE COLLECTED	- Mangrove exploitation for charcoal	WCS WWF Blue Ventures,	Agriculture; Fisheries; Hotel and tourism activities. Handicrafts	MORE INFORMATION TO	CI Hotspot WWF Ecoregion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support process to 'permanent' status (support steps to prepare streamlined

Site (name, status and area)	Indicator(s) of global biodiversity value (e.g. key species, no. of species, unique ecosystem, etc)	Main threats	Promoter and other important actors (both conservation and development actors)	Main Ongoing Activities by actors	Current Annual Investment from actors ¹⁴ (US\$)	Global Category (WWF Ecoregion, CI hotspot, Ramsar, IBA, KBA, AZE, IUCN Category ¹⁵ , etc)	Main proposed activities (for GEF support) ¹⁶
Some ecosystems are inside an NPA, other ecosystems are inside the 'GELOSE', there is also a 'biologically important shrimp zone'. Other ecosystems have no formalized management regime. Total area of 41,200 hectares, distributed across 4 Districts in Diana region.	DURING PPG PHASE	and construction,	Fanamby, SAGE		BE COLLECTED DURING PPG PHASE	IUCN Category: not assigned	Environmental Impact Assessment, to undertake rapid topographical survey, and to develop streamlined Management Plan); • Help develop alternative livelihoods by promoting investment in compatible socio-economic activities.
Micro mangrove site: Boanamary in Majunga II District, (Boeny Région)	➤ Four mangrove species: • <i>Avicennia marina</i> (afiafy) in the family: Avicenniaceés; • <i>Rhizophora mucronata</i> (Honkolahy) in the family: Rhizophoracées; • <i>Ceriops tagal</i> (Honkovavy) in the family: Rhizophoracées;	Overharvesting of mangroves for wood – over 50% of the mangrove area has disappeared. Surexploitation à travers	Transfer of management responsibilities to local communities (GELOSE); F.E.M. Femmes Entrepreneurs de Madagascar – a local	FEM is involved in producing cocoons. Some irregular mangrove protection activities.	MORE INFORMATION TO BE COLLECTED DURING PPG PHASE	MORE INFORMATION TO BE COLLECTED DURING PPG PHASE IUCN Category: not assigned	• Define baseline; • Local awareness raising; • Re-Planting mangroves; • Socio-economic survey and analysis; • Identify alternative sustainable livelihoods; • Strengthening local management systems;

Site (name, status and area)	Indicator(s) of global biodiversity value (e.g. key species, no. of species, unique ecosystem, etc)	Main threats	Promoter and other important actors (both conservation and development actors)	Main Ongoing Activities by actors	Current Annual Investment from actors ¹⁴ (US\$)	Global Category (WWF Ecoregion, CI hotspot, Ramsar, IBA, KBA, AZE, IUCN Category ¹⁵ , etc)	Main proposed activities (for GEF support) ¹⁶
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Xylocarpus granatum in the family: Méliacées. ➤ The site has an important habitat for crustaceans. This is a zone suitable for mangrove extension: flat zone, with previous logging, with important tidal differences and calm waters. 	des coupes illicites, entraînant une réduction à 50,55% de la superficie totale des mangroves	development CSO.				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing local income generation including in diverse sectors.
<p>Small mangrove site:</p> <p>Tsimembo-Manambolomaty NPA.</p> <p>More than 4,000 hectares for mangroves.</p>	<p>Examples/indicators of important biodiversity are :</p> <p>Honkovavy (Ceriops tagal), Honkolahy (Rhizophora mucronata), Afiaty (Avicennia marina), Tangapoly (Bruguera gymnorhiza)</p>	Illegal mangrove cutting.	The Peregrine Fund	Protection Ankoay (more information to be collected during the PPG phase).	MORE INFORMATION TO BE COLLECTED DURING PPG PHASE	Andranobe Ramsar Site IUCN Category: not assigned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With existing CBO, work on conservation, and restoration of mangroves ; • Develop new CBO – registration, initiative conservation and restoration activities.
Micro mangrove site :	At least eight mangrove	Transformation into	Regional Committee	Awareness raising on mangrove pro-	MORE INFORMATION	WWF Ecoregion.	Restoring degraded mangrove zones (50

Site (name, status and area)	Indicator(s) of global biodiversity value (e.g. key species, no. of species, unique ecosystem, etc)	Main threats	Promoter and other important actors (both conservation and development actors)	Main Ongoing Activities by actors	Current Annual Investment from actors ¹⁴ (US\$)	Global Category (WWF Ecoregion, CI hotspot, Ramsar, IBA, KBA, AZE, IUCN Category ¹⁵ , etc)	Main proposed activities (for GEF support) ¹⁶
Morondava Delta, 6000 ha	<p>species.</p> <p>Habitat for many mammals, birds and reptiles.</p> <p>Reproduction area for fish and sea fauna.</p> <p>(more information to be collected during the PPG phase).</p>	<p>human habitations.</p> <p>Illegal harvesting of wood for construction and fires.</p> <p>Conversion into agriculture.</p>	<p>for coastal zone management (CRZIGC)</p> <p>Local environmental associations.</p> <p>WWF, MNP, Blue-venture, Asity madagascar (in nearby zones)</p>	<p>tection.</p> <p>Promoting development in nearby areas (fish, ecotourism).</p>	<p>MAT TION TO BE COLLE CTED DURIN G PPG PHASE</p>	<p>CI Hotspot</p> <p>IUCN Category: not assigned</p>	<p>ha per year) ;</p> <p>Strengthening local management and co-management structures.</p>

Location Map – NPAs supported by the project



Key	
1.	Lac Alaotra NPA
2.	Ranobe PK 32 NPA
3.	Makirovana Tsihomanaomby NPA
4.	Pointe a Larree NPA
5.	Bemanevika NPA
6.	Baie d'Ambaro
7.	Boanamaray (Boeny Région)
8.	Tsimembo-Manambolomaty NPA
9.	Morondava Delta