



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: A Landscape Approach to conserving and managing threatened Biodiversity in Madagascar with a focus on the Atsimo-Andrefana Spiny and Dry Forest Landscape			
Country(ies):	Madagascar	GEF Project ID:	5486
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5263
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment, Ecology, the Sea and Forests (MEEMF)	Re-submission Date:	March 22, 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration (Months):	72 months
Name of parent program:	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	506,297.94

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD 2: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors	2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation. 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks.	1. Policies and regulatory frameworks (2) for production sectors. 2. National and sub-national land-use plans (3) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation.	GEF TF	5,329,452	43,812,820
Total project costs				5,329,452	43,812,820

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: To mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services into coastal zone management and into the operations and policies of the tourism and physical development sectors in the Republic of Mauritius through a 'land- and seascape wide' integrated management approach based on the Environmental Sensitive Areas' (ESAs) inventory and assessment.

Project Component	Grant Type ¹	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Cofinancing (\$)
1. Effective Landscape-level Conservation Mainstreaming	TA	Landscape level planning and economic analysis support the mainstreaming of biodiversity into management of the Atsimo-Andrefana Landscape, covering three districts and totalling ~2.4 million hectares	1.1 Spatial Planning and land-use management: Biodiversity management integrated and operationalized in the Regional Land-Use Plan (SRAT) and the Regional Development Plan (PRD) of the Atsimo Andrefana Region 1.2 Capacity for Threat Management: Land use allocation practices and applicable regulations and means of enforcement at the regional, district and commune levels are strengthened, in light of new mainstreamed planning instruments	GEF TF	2,152,300	25,000,000

¹ TA includes capacity building, and research and development.
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

Project Component	Grant Type ¹	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Cofinancing (\$)
			<p>1.3 Landscape Governance: Collaborative landscape and sectoral governance framework is developed and provides a platform for monitoring and ensuring compliance with prescribed land-uses</p> <p>1.4 Protected Areas integrated into Landscape Management: Critical measures for completing pending PA proclamation processes and boundary demarcation are supported</p>			
2. Community-based conservation and sustainable use operationalised	TA	Community-based production and resource use activities incorporate the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into management practice million hectares	<p>2.1 CCAs Establishment: Selected habitats with high conservation value in target communes are set-aside through formal proclamation as 'Community Conservation Areas' (CCAs) and their management is operationalised</p> <p>2.2 Codifying Local-level Resource Use Governance: Local governments (commune, <i>fokontany</i>) and participating local communities collaborate to sanction into by-laws (Dinas) the proclamation and sustainable management of CCAs</p> <p>2.3 Local Capacity for BD Management: Strengthened and functional CBOs in targeted local communities establishing CCAs provide a vehicle for building community capacities to manage biodiversity sustainably</p> <p>2.4 Local Economy and Benefits: Livelihood activities carried out by targeted local communities are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity and its use within sustainability thresholds, but equally the generation of socio-economic benefits</p>	GEF TF	2,927,700	16,550,000
Subtotal					5,080,000	41,550,000
Project Management Cost (PMC)				GEF TF	249,452	2,262,820
Total Project Cost					5,329,452	43,812,820

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

Source of Cofinancing	Name of Cofinancer	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing amount (\$)
National Government	Ministère de l'Agriculture	Cash	38,000,000
CSO	HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation, Madagascar and Welt Hunger Hilfe – WHH	Cash	3,431,673
Bilateral Aid Agency (ies)	GIZ	Cash	1,100,000
Private Sector	Ader	Cash	931,147
Foundation	Tany Meva	Cash	350,000
Total cofinancing			43,812,820

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES (\$) REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/Global	Grant Amount(\$) (a)	Agency Fee (\$) (b) ²	Total (\$) c=a+b
UNDP	GEF Trust Fund	Biodiversity	Madagascar	5,329,452.00	506,297.94	5,835,749.94
Total Grant Resources				5,329,452.00	506,297.94	5,835,749.94

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table.

PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	1,257,453	3,651,068	4,908,521
National/Local Consultants	417,500	10,953,205	12,315,705

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF

For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

A summary of what changed since the PIF is provided below.

Original project design in PIF	Adjustment/improvement made at CEO Endorsement
Allocation of GEF resources per component Comp 1) \$ 2,080,000 Comp 2) \$3,000,000	Slight changes, moving some \$72K from component 2 to 1. Project Management Costs and total amounts remained unchanged.
Co-financing resources:	The total leveraged co-financing has increased by almost 70% from what

Original project design in PIF	Adjustment/improvement made at CEO Endorsement
<p>Indicative total: \$ 26.1 million</p>	<p>had been foreseen at PIF stage (68% to be precise), totaling of \$43.8 million in mobilized co-financing at CEO Endorsement stage.</p> <p>This significant increase was the result of the effective engagement of development partners during the PPG stage.</p>
<p><u>Project Sites:</u> Only indicatively defined.</p>	<p>Sites within the project zone were defined, their choice validated and the methodology is explicitly explained in the PRODOC (Refer to Section 1.6 Site Selection).</p> <p>Local stakeholders were duly consulted (but several sites remain to be visited and assessed). Their views and interest in the project helped shape the final choice. (Refer also to PRODOC Annex 6 for thorough explanations and descriptions.)</p>
<p><u>Project Strategy:</u> Outputs described with some indications on activities.</p>	<p>Through site visits, stakeholder consultation and national validation, the project strategy is now fully developed and activities described.</p> <p>Feasibility assessments were completed and with due environmental and social safeguards applied to the proposed activities. Refer to UNDP PRODOC Part 2 and to the results application of UNDP’s Social and Environmental Screening Template (SEST) in PRODOC Annex 6.</p> <p>The Project Strategy remains in line with the original strategy.</p> <p>Only, slight changes were introduced to the formulations of Outputs 1.1 and 1.2. Yet, the idea remains more or less the same.</p> <p>Output 1.4 changed in the content due to advances achieved by the government of Madagascar in the finalization of permanent protection status accorded to the PAs targeted by the project. This took place between the PIF approval and the end of the PPG Phase. Consequently, instead of providing support to finalize the processes required to obtain the permanent protection decree, the project will enhance and support the effective management of these Pas as per the output description in the PRODOC.</p>
<p><u>Risk Analysis:</u> Cursory analysis based on assumptions and with limited stakeholder consultation.</p>	<p>Thorough risk analysis was carried out and the corresponding management response has undergone stakeholder scrutiny.</p> <p>Also, potential risks and impacts related to the following topics have been considered through the application of the Social and Environmental Screening Checklist and Template (SESP). Some risks, pertaining to the environmental sustainability standards, were flagged through the exercise, and were incorporated into project design and the Risk Analysis Table. (Refer to PRODOC Section 2.3 and Annex 8 for safeguards).</p> <p>During STAP review it was requested that climate change be included as a potential risk, and that the corresponding management strategy be incorporated within the risk analysis and the project document. In response to this request, this risk, in addition, to the impacts that natural hazards may have on the project, were included in the risk analysis and the project design. Climate change adaptation and DRR measures were considered in approach, and their mainstreaming, within</p>

Original project design in PIF	Adjustment/improvement made at CEO Endorsement
	the project strategy will be promoted by the project teams (Refer to Section 2: Project Strategy, of the PRODOC).
<u>Other aspects</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicators are fully developed • Management arrangement agreed upon • Project consultants' TORs developed

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions

Refer to PRODOC *7.1 Project Consistency with National Strategies* for a summary. Below are more thorough explanations from various PRODOC sections.

This project is country-driven and consistent with, and supportive of, national development strategies and plans that relate to green growth and sustainable development, with focus on MDGs and the Post-2015 development goals.

It is supportive of the 1990 National Environment Charter (PNAE), which was currently revised and adopted in 2015; the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (developed for the period 2002 to 2012)² and currently being updated and revised to incorporate the Aichi Targets); and the principles of the Environment Programme III (2005), which are still valid. A new environment programme under the name of Sustainable Development Environment Programme, is currently being developed by the government, which will provide policy guidance for the next 5 years in succession of the EP. Together, they outline the basis and strategic axes for environmental governance and sustainable development in Madagascar.

Specifically as the decentralised NRM policies, the project is in line with the general developmental principles enshrined in the National Development Plan (NDP) and various sectoral policies related to land use management, agriculture, oil & gas, mining, energy provision, and infrastructural development. Much of the project's effort will though focus on ensuring that biodiversity considerations are more actively taken into account in those sectoral frameworks.

A new National Development Plan (NDP) was adopted for the period 2015-2019. The NDP highlights the value of Madagascar's natural capital and provides new direction for the country's economic development based on an inclusive and sustainable approach". Axe number 5 of the National Plan states the need to "value natural capital and reinforce resilience to natural hazards", additionally it makes reference to "the integration of natural capital within economic and social development planning, and the national accounting system". The Action Plan to implement the NDP refers to natural resources as a legacy for future generations, and it includes, as an expected result, the responsible management of natural resources articulated within economic development. The NDP has a land based approach, highlighting the role of land use planning tools.

The government of Madagascar has developed a National Land Use Planning Policy (NLUPP)³ which states the importance of integrating inter-sector planning processes by coordinating planning processes at the landscape level, to enhance the country's social and economic development. This vision is conveyed in the National Plan for Sector and Transversal Orientation⁴ stating national guidelines for land use planning for the next 10 year (2015 2025), based on the inputs provided by the National and Regional Land Use Plans⁵. Together this national plans provide guidance to the country's development programmes and policies.

The Region of Atsimo Andrefana has been identified by the NDP as one of the country's poles for economic growth due to the "mining investment opportunities and the impacts they will have on the region and commune development"⁶. The NDP also states the need to make investments compatible with conservation and "participatory preservation, systematic restauration and rational use" of the regions biological resources. The latter mentioned as the one of the country's most

² For more information refer to the *Cinquième rapport national de la Convention sur la Diversité Biologique – Madagascar* (2014)

³ Politique Nationale de l'Aménagement de Territoire (PNAT)

⁴ Schéma National des Orientations Sectorielles et Transversales (SNOST)

⁵ Plan National d'Aménagement du Territoire

⁶ Ministère de l'Économie et de la Planification : Plan national de développement - 2015-2019.

GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

important economic resources. The NDP makes reference to the latter by stating that “ mining activities [...] are among one of the three principal causes of deforestation and forest degradation in Madagascar, and are in conflict with the Protected Area Network of Madagascar, and at the core of biodiversity and natural habitat functions threats, pollution of water and land resources, and the unexpected negative effects of development [...] It is crucial that mining activities mitigate the risks and threats and contribute effectively to development [...] Growth of this sector, up to date, has not been inclusive, sustainable, nor have benefits been shared.”

Other sector policies such as the National Agriculture, Fishing and Livestock policies highlight the need for sustainable development in line with their aims to ensure food and nutrition security, sector growth, extension of arable lands, and improved productivity.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities

The links to the GEF focal area strategy were thoroughly described in the PIF and remain valid – hence, **not applicable (NA)** / will not be repeated here. They are included in PRODOC Section 3.1 *Programmatic Links*.

A summary of eligibility criteria and priorities is provided below. Refer to PRODOC Section 7.2 *GEF conformity and Country eligibility*.

This project will help Madagascar achieve its set objective vis-à-vis relevant conventions, in this case, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), plus the various CBD related conventions.

More specifically, this project is fully consistent and will contribute to Madagascar’s achievement of the Aichi Targets as follows: Target 5, to the extent that the project will contribute to stabilising land-use in the fringes of core protected areas thereby reducing threats to PAs biodiversity; Target 11, to the extent that (i) the project will contribute to making the protected areas system more effective in conserving biodiversity within the surrounding landscapes; and (ii) it includes other area-based conservation measures that are not just than formal PAs, in particular through the incorporation of CCAs into the system; Target 12, as it contributes to reducing the loss of known threatened species, possibly preventing their extinction across the landscape; Targets 14 and 15, as it relates to the enhancement of ecosystems’ functions, their structure and resilience, including in the face of climate change, through a landscape mainstreaming approach.

A.3. The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage

NA (No changes since PIF approval.)

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address.

The UNDP PRODOC provides a country-specific analysis on underlying drivers behind the current rate of ecosystem degradation and deforestation that prevails in the country and in the project region in particular. (The project justification is underpinned by technical reports, contextual analysis and application of the Tracking Tool).

The problem that the project seeks to address is thoroughly described in the PRODOC, in particular in Part 1 – *Situation Analysis* and Part 2 – *Project Strategy*.

A summary of the overall strategy is outlined in narrative form below.

Project Strategy:

This project is designed to build national conservation management capacities for the conservation and sustainable use in Madagascar, with a focus on the dry and spiny forest landscape of the Atsimo Andrefana Region, located in southwestern part of the island and which harbour unique spiny thickets and dry forests, and within them a number of globally important species. Although spiny and dry forests are considered as one of the most distinctive ecosystems of

Madagascar, their landscape still remains among the least protected in the country. Natural resources and biodiversity in the Region are subject to increasing and emerging pressures, which are mostly of anthropogenic origin.

Historically, human activity has already resulted in the massive loss of the unique biodiversity that characterises Madagascar and led to substantial ecosystem degradation. Across the country, the average forest cover makes up only 10% of what it used to be 1,500 years ago, which is when human presence started to have a more marked footprint on the island.⁷ Of note, the pace of forest loss and degradation has accelerated over the last decades and it has today reached a critical level. In the Atsimo Andrefana Region, land conversion for the purpose of subsistence agriculture has until now posed the most significant threat to biodiversity and ecosystem services. This is however changing as new economic trends are taking shape.

New threats to ecosystems and biodiversity are currently emerging due to large-scale extractive and agriculture investments, such as oil and mining and commercial agriculture projects. The Atsimo Andrefana Region holds e.g. the highest number of environmental permits granted to mining and oil & gas companies in the country. The Marombe district harbours one of the largest commercial agricultural projects in the country, currently being revived with new investments in irrigation and mechanisation. With the current levels of underdevelopment and social deprivation that characterises Madagascar, these new investments are expected to generate jobs and revenues, and to boost the uptake of new technologies and techniques. At the same time, without adequate support to counter the actual and potential disruptive impacts of these new investments on the environment, they could cause a rapid and possibly irreversible degradation of Atsimo Andrefana's natural assets. Yet, for the positive socio-economic gains to realise, an adequate negotiation of trade-offs needs to take place, along with the introduction of mainstreaming measures that will help decision-makers and the population in general avoid and manage the negative impact. Moreover, these economic and environmental emerging trends are not exclusive to the target landscape, but they have also been increasingly experienced in other parts of the country. Hence, positive changes that the project may bring about could also apply to other regions.

Currently, the Government indicates that it does not have an effective framework for the protection and management of Atsimo Andrefana's landscapes. Also, in spite of expected changes in the economic profile of the Region, it will still take a while before local communities are able to fully participate in these changes and reap benefits. Subsistence agriculture and extraction of local natural products are likely to remain the basis of their livelihoods, which is also likely to have an impact on the integrity of ecosystems, unless land-use can be more appropriately governed. There are very few incentives in place for local communities to changing harmful production practices and adopt more sustainable ones.

The project is designed to strengthen conservation management capabilities across the multi-use Atsimo Andrefana Spiny and Dry Forest Landscape, straddling an area of some 2.4 million hectares. There is an urgent unmet need to mainstream biodiversity management into development and to influence the trajectory of development, to contain pressures in the most ecologically sensitive areas, including protected areas (PAs), their adjacent zones and important ecological corridors.

The project will address this need through a two-pronged approach: First, it will strengthen resource use governance at the landscape level by developing and implementing a Landscape Level Land-Use Plan, in support of the Regional Plan, that explicitly incorporates biodiversity conservation needs and prescribes land uses with a view to mitigating threats—the BD LUP. It will collaborate with stakeholders from the national and regional levels so as to involve development sectors, as well as the private sector and negotiate the implementation of environmental and biodiversity conservation measures, with the aim of mitigating the impacts of large-scale investments on fragile ecosystems. Second, the project will work with local communities to strengthen conservation on communal lands-addressing existing threats to biodiversity linked to artisanal livelihoods and subsistence activities. It will also address the exclusion of communities from decision-making processes relating to large-scale economic projects by raising their awareness on their right to public consultation. The project will work with communities to establish multi-use 'Community Conservation Areas' (CCAs), put in place the necessary institutional framework for management, and install measures to ensure the sustainable utilisation of wild resources, while reinforcing local participation in decision-making processes.

⁷ Goodman, 2008; Humbert, 1927.

For an analysis of **the baseline project**, refer to PRODOC, Section 1.4 *Baseline Analysis*, which includes the following sub-sections:

- 1.4.1 *The Status Quo of Landscape Level Management in the Atsimo-Andrefano Region*
- 1.4.2 *The Project's Financial Baseline*

Refers also to other relevant sections and chapters in the PRODOC's background and strategy parts, in particular: Section 1.2 *Development and Environmental Management Context*, and 1.3 *Barriers Analysis and Long Term Solution*, in addition to PRODOC Annex 5: *Context and analysis behind the project justification*.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning

The development and financial baseline for each of the components, and the adaptation alternative facilitated by the project are thoroughly described in the PRODOC in Section 2.1 *Project Goals, Outcomes, Outputs and Activities*, which also presents how the expected outcomes will be achieved.

The Incremental cost reasoning is presented in matrix form in PRODOC *Annex 4*, reproduced below.

Baseline Alternative and Benefits of the GEF Project

<u>Current Baseline</u>	<u>Alternative</u>	<u>Global Biodiversity benefits</u>
<p>In the business-as-usual (BAU) scenario, deforestation and forest degradation trends experienced at the Atsimo Andrefana Spiny and Dry Forest Landscape will continue and likely accelerate.</p> <p>Forest patches will become further fragmented. Species that are forest-dependent will be increasingly threatened and may even become locally extinct.</p> <p>The existing threats to biodiversity from subsistence activities will be compounded by threats associated with large scale development: road opening, irrigation schemes, oil & gas developments and mining activities.</p> <p>Large scale projects will rapidly establish themselves in the region, bringing significant investments that are bound to transform landscapes and lead to biodiversity loss.</p> <p>There will be little if any investment in conservation, and any environment safeguards that may apply will be weak from a biodiversity perspective. At the landscape level, the “development accelerator effect” will add to the pressures, as increased economic activities will attract migrants. There will be more demand for firewood,</p>	<p>With the project, Madagascar will implement concrete measures for conserving, sustainably using and safeguarding biodiversity in the Atsimo Andrefana Landscape covering three contiguous districts (Morombe, Tuléar II and Betioki).</p> <p>In terms of response to the current, and emerging threats to biodiversity, the project promotes a paradigm shift from site based work to a landscape approach.</p> <p>The project will develop a collaborative governance framework for sectoral biodiversity mainstreaming involving public, private, CSO and CBO actors. Biodiversity considerations will be integrated into the development of economically relevant sectors across the landscape, in particular agriculture, forestry, extractive industries, energy production and transport, but also in the livelihoods and land use patterns of local communities.</p> <p>A two-pronged approach will apply.</p> <p><u>First</u>, it will strengthen resource use governance at the landscape level by developing and implementing the BD LUP. It will work with national and sub-national level stakeholders to engage economic sectors, and negotiate the application of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use measures, and bring about necessary policy change.</p> <p><u>Second</u>, the project will work with local communities to strengthen conservation on communal lands by establishing and managing multi use CCAs. It will put in place measures</p>	<p>The highly threatened dry deciduous forest and spiny thickets totalling 2.4 million ha will enjoy increased conservation security and, at the wider landscape level, biological resources will be used more sustainably and essential ecosystem services maintained.</p> <p>Adverse land-use change will be stabilised in the fringes of core PAs (existing and new terrestrial PAs sum 240,000ha), thereby reducing the level of threats to biodiversity in PAs that emanates from their periphery.</p> <p>Forest fragments and extensive areas of high biodiversity value outside PAs (minimal estimated surface is 100,000 ha) will be brought under conservation management and will function as connectivity corridors.</p> <p>Threatened species found within the landscape will enjoy improved chances of survival among them emblematic species of lemur (<i>Propithecus verreauxi</i>, <i>Lemur catta</i> and <i>Cheirogaleus medius</i>), red-listed birds (<i>Monias benschi</i> and <i>Uratelornis chimaera</i> among others), as well as reptiles and amphibians (e.g. <i>Furcifer antimena</i> and <i>Ptychadena mascareniensis</i>).</p> <p>The current and emerging negative impacts on biodiversity from production sectors will be more effectively avoided, and managed at the landscape level, in particular within the agriculture, forestry,</p>

<u>Current Baseline</u>	<u>Alternative</u>	<u>Global Biodiversity benefits</u>
charcoal, land and water resources. This will in turn exacerbate deforestation and forest degradation.	to ensure the sustainable utilisation of wild resources and conservation-friendly farming through a focused sustainable livelihoods and capacity building programme.	extractive industries, energy production and transport sectors.

A.6. Risks

A more thorough risk analysis than that of the PIF has been carried out during the PPG. It is presented in PRODOC Chapter 2.3 *Risks and Safeguards*, and reproduced herein. Refer also PRODOC Table 5: *Risk Assessment Matrix*.

IDENTIFIED RISKS, CATEGORY AND RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
<u>Political</u> Political instability may ensue, in spite of the on-going democratisation process. <u>LEVEL:</u> HIGH	UNDP has played a key role in brokering the transition process out of the political crisis and elections are due soon. UN Security monitors country and project risk on a rolling basis and adapts strategies accordingly. Currently, the approach is to continue to invest in the success of the elections and then engage with the elected government after the ballot and through renewed dialogue.
<u>Organisational</u> Difficulties in reconciling institutional mandates and conflicts in administrative jurisdiction <u>Level</u> High	Through Output 1.3, the project will create a platform for collaborative landscape and sectoral governance. All the relevant administrative levels of government will be engaged in the process and represented in the platform. UNDP has previous and useful experience with developing such platforms, e.g. from the UNDP-GEF EP3 project but also from its governance programme (Decentralisation Project) and Joint-UN programme with UNICEF and others (<i>Gouvernance par le mobil</i> Project). Conflict resolution techniques and facilitation will apply to make all processes smoother. In addition, the process of landscape level planning (BD LUP) and at the level of <i>terroirs</i> , plus the coordination with DCPSAP and MNP, will together ensure coordination and harmonisation between these plans with PA planning. All partners will have a voice and will be given a chance to present their stakes. Where possible, formal agreements/MOUs will be used to better define roles and responsibilities.
<u>Operational</u> The landscape mainstreaming approach is proven overly ambitious for the prevailing managing capacities in Madagascar. <u>Level</u> Medium	With adequate scoping, the landscape approach is also feasible in Madagascar. Capacity building is threaded through every activity foreseen under Component 1. Specifically, Outputs 1.1 and 1.2 are tailored to address regional and district level capacity gaps to make use of tools and systems generated by the project, including the BD LUP. In addition, Madagascar can draw inspiration from tested models for the application of the landscape mainstreaming approach in neighbouring countries. The Grasslands' project in South Africa and other examples have proven that 'biodiversity spatial planning' is a powerful tool for mainstreaming and that it is not difficult to be mastered and applied. With the right balance between planning and enforcement, and by explicitly targeting key decision-making processes, the approach has good chances of success. The threats' and baseline analyses in this project have explicitly focused on the relevant sectors and the decisions-making processes and the interventions have been planned accordingly.
<u>Strategic</u>	In spite of the difficulties in the governance terrain faced by Madagascar

IDENTIFIED RISKS, CATEGORY AND RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
<p>Some investment-heavy private sector stakeholders will not collaborate with the project as certain recommendations in the BD-LUP may go against their short-term interests.</p> <p><u>Level</u> Medium</p>	<p>in the last few years, there is a framework in place for EIA that has many strengths. Any corporation involved large-scale developments within the Atsimo-Andrefana Landscape will need to abide by the rules set by this framework for obtaining due permits to their projects. This is the minimum baseline. The project obviously introduces a strengthening of the application of this framework through spatial planning and enforcement. The leverage for applying them comes from the regional and local level. The both the regional government and directly affected communes have in various occasions manifested an interest in fully gauging the impacts of these large scale projects at the landscape level and are therefore fully supportive of the project. This will oblige private sector stakeholder to seek compromise and collaborate with the project. Also, many of these corporations respond to a board of investors and need to safeguard their reputation, as part of their long-term interests. In this light, the project will engage the private sector within extractive industries, transport and agri-business. With support from specialised technical assistance, the project will offer them opportunities to develop and implement actions within their CSR programmes that are in line with the BD-LUP. This is bound to create a win-win situation for both project and corporate stakeholders, thereby reducing the risk of non-collaboration.</p>
<p><u>Environmental</u> Limited acceptance of sustainable use models by local communities lead to continued encroachment into PAs, resource pillage and further degradation and fragmentation of habitats.</p> <p><u>Level</u> Medium</p>	<p>The TdG approaches from Tany Meva and Sage with respect to the involvement of local communities and in the realisation of their aspirations have been demonstrated, including in terms of producing results in the sustainable management of natural resources. Compliance and enforcement measures will be community-based. The project will define and monitor key ecological indicators as a means of monitoring this risk. An adaptive management approach will also apply, so will lessons from EP3.</p>
<p><u>Organisational</u> Consultations at sub-national level with respect to investment decisions that favour high-impact physical development projects in the Atsimo-Andrefana Landscape remain limited.</p> <p><u>Level</u> Low</p>	<p>The involvement of key policy-making players at both the national and regional levels will ensure that opportunities and benefits from biodiversity mainstreaming will be duly understood and used accordingly. Until now, the buy-in has been high. Furthermore, the BD LUP will be designed to be availed openly with full disclosure. The project will apply a pro-active approach to the engagement of high-impact physical sectors and conduct an informed dialogue with them, in particular with extractive industries. The collaborative governance framework for sectoral mainstreaming proposed by the project will provide the best changes to promote consultations and disseminate key information that affects biodiversity across the landscape.</p>
<p><u>Climatic and natural</u> Climate change and natural hazards may have a devastating impact on PA and the livelihoods of the communities living in the surrounding who are stakeholders and beneficiarires of the project.</p> <p><u>Level</u> Medium</p>	<p>Natural hazards potentially impact the region of Atsimo Andrefana, on yearly basis (cyclones, flooding, prolonged dry season are some common risks). Additionally, studies show that climate change will have serious consequences on the region, increasing the frequency and intensity of cyclones and torrentiel rains, affecting biodiversity and PA's; and the livelihoods of local communities. (Refer to Threat Analysis Section 1.1, sub-section on 'Climate change' of the PRODOC).</p> <p>In response to this risk, the project will work with CSO partners in the region, who are currently working in the field, and with the local and regional authorities, who are building the resilience of local communities through climate change adaptation strategies; and those working on food</p>

IDENTIFIED RISKS, CATEGORY AND RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
	<p>security and disaster risk management and reduction programs, by building partnerships and synergies.</p> <p>The project in itself will have a climate change adaptation approach, mainstreaming climate change within the design and implementation of project activities on the ground. It is hence expected that the resilience of PA's and of people will be built through project activities.</p>

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

NA (no changes since PIF).

Else, refer to PRODOC Section 7.3 *Main synergies with Related Projects and Programs* and to PRODOC Table 7 for the *Matrix of Collaboration* – reproduced below.

PRODOC Table 8: Matrix of Collaboration

Programmes, and Initiatives	Proposed collaboration
On-going and recently closed UNDP-GEF BD projects and SGP	<p>During the PPG, the project worked with the SGP to scope the relevance of past and prospective SGP projects in the Atsimo Andrefana Landscape. As for FSPs, two projects are worth mentioning: PIMS 2762 “Madagascar EPIII Third Environment Programme” (or EP3) and PIMS 4172 “Madagascar Network of Managed Resource PAs” (or MRPA).</p> <p><u>EP3:</u> The UNDP-GEF EP3 project ended in 2012 and revolved around the development of ‘sustainable natural resource management’ practices with communities within Protected Areas Support Zones. The WP-GEF EP3 project complemented it, by focusing on operationalising the core PAs. Mikea Forest was one of the Southern sites that benefitted from both EP3 projects. This project will build from the positive legacy of EP3.</p> <p><u>MRPA:</u> There is significant scope for learning, collaboration and cross fertilisation with respect to TdG, but equally in the dialogue with extractive industries and product certification. There are no site overlaps.</p>
Recently submitted UNEP-GEF national BD projects	<p>Two FSPs were recently submitted to the GEF by UNEP but the PIFs await clearance: (1) “<i>Strengthening the Network of ‘New Protected Areas’ in Madagascar</i>” (or NAP Strengthening) and (2) “<i>Conservation of Key Threatened, Endemic and Economically Valuable Species in Madagascar</i>” (Threatened Species). The NAP Strengthening project will work in core sites, one of which (Ranobe PK 32 NPA) is within the Atsimo Andrefana Landscape. A third MSP PIF on SLM was recently cleared and may be relevant with respect for ecosystem services. The FSP have been approved by the Council and collaboration will be sought with UNEP.</p> <p>There are no risks of overlap, only opportunities for synergies. The current project focuses on terrestrial ecosystems within the landscape and adopts a mainstreaming approach. The UNEP NAP Strengthening project adopts a PA approach and Ranobe is a MPA (incidentally also the site of the Tar Sands mining project). As for the Threatened Species Project, there is significant potential for collaboration with respect to the BD LUP and the community-based biodiversity & livelihoods spatial assessments and planning.</p>
Conservation initiatives in core PAs	<p>Besides the above cited NAP Strengthening project, partner organisations are implementing a suite of activities in core PA sites within the Atsimo Andrefana Landscape. Currently, knowledge of their concrete activities is limited, but sufficient to indicate that there are no potential overlaps. During the PPG phase, it will be important to chart the work of these partners, engage with them and find concrete collaboration</p>

Programmes, and Initiatives	Proposed collaboration
	<p>areas.</p> <p>During PPG phase consultation took place with GIZ, USAID, WCS, BV as well as with other partners working in the target areas, in order to integrate them within the preparation phase of the project. Consequently, synergies were found with on-going projects and those that are in the planning phase. GIZ is currently planning the multi-year program. Agreements were accorded with the UNDP to share approaches and project work plans in order to operationalise collaboration. USAID will launch the bidding process for their multi-year program this year. Other partners will share work plans and will work in coordination with the project through the DREEMF, which centralizes project management by environmental constituents in the Region.</p>
Baseline programmes of MINAGRI, donor partners, Tany Meva and Sage	<p>These partners will play a pivotal role in supporting and complementing GEF funding for advancing with issues of food security, livelihoods and energy under both Components 1 and 2. These are central development issues that need to be taken into consideration, in order for the GEF project to secure global biodiversity benefits. Periodic information exchange sessions with partners working in the rural development will be developed throughout project implementation to define and harmonise priorities and interventions.</p>
Initiatives on policy reform and spatial planning	<p>A few partners are currently working on issues of policy and legislation reform, though moving slowly due to the political transition. The project will work closely together with Helvetas Swiss Inter-cooperation, WHH, the SNAT Consortium, MEPATE, MEEMF and other to explore synergies and collaboration topics related to policy reform and spatial planning.</p>

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE

B.1 Stakeholder engagement in project implementation

A thorough stakeholder engagement approach is enshrined in the PRODOC in the description of all activities (Section 2 *Project Strategy*). Refer also to PRODOC Section 1.5 *Stakeholder Analysis*.

B.2 Socio-economic benefits at the national and local levels, including gender dimensions considerations

And how these will support the achievement of global environment / adaptation benefits

A thorough analysis of benefits and gender is included in the PRODOC.

Refer to PRODOC Section 2.2 *Gender Considerations and Other Project Benefits, including Innovativeness, Sustainability and Replicability*, reproduced below.

The gender dimension is fully integrated into the PRODOC, in particular in the description of activities. For a specific discussion of the gender topic, refer to Section 2.2.1 *Gender Considerations*. Excerpts from the chapter and other passages from the PRODOC are reproduced below.

In addition, UNDP carried out due diligence prior to PRODOC clearance and screened the project for potential social and environmental negative effects. Refer to PRODOC Annex 8 and section 2.3.2 for a presentation of the UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Template applied in May 2015.

Gender Mainstreaming Considerations

The project is guided by the UNDP Gender Equality Strategy, 2014-2017. The UNDP's vision states that gender equality is grounded in international human rights, norms and standards.

The overarching goal is to contribute to building the resilience of poverty stricken women and men, in order to achieve sustainable development. By conducting gender disaggregated research and capacity assessments, the project will develop knowledge on how gender relations are reflected in natural resource management; be able to develop gender sensitive project activities; develop government capacity to address gender issues; encourage governments to take action to integrate gender perspectives within natural resource management legislation, policies and programmes in the project target region of Atsimo Andrefana. The latter will also enable to institutionalize the use of these tools within the government structures that the project will work with and reinforce at the regional project site level.

The project's strategy is to mainstream gender considerations as a means to achieving gender equality. Challenges in promoting gender equality and women's empowerment may be faced in any stage of the project cycle. The project will aim to integrate gender sensitive considerations and activities to counterbalance these inequalities.

The gender mainstreaming approach is dual: 1. supporting the empowerment of women and girls through gender-specific targeted interventions, and; 2. addressing gender concerns in the developing, planning, implementing and evaluating of all project activities.

The project will ensure that in all stages of the project cycle, starting from the design phase, gender concerns are integrated.

Clear guidance for gender mainstreaming in the project cycle will be included in the UNDP quality assurance tool. In addition, the UNDP environmental and social screening procedure which is a mandatory project level screening requirement that aims to minimize or offset the potentially adverse environmental and social impacts of UNDP development work, contains a screening checklist that includes specific questions related to the project's gender equality impact and engagement with women⁸.

Global Environmental Benefits

The highly threatened dry deciduous forest and spiny thickets totalling 2.4 million ha will enjoy increased conservation security and, at the wider landscape level, biological resources will be used more sustainably and essential ecosystem services maintained. Adverse land-use change will be stabilised in the fringes of core PAs (existing and new terrestrial PAs sum 240,000 ha), thereby reducing the level of threats to biodiversity in PAs that emanates from their periphery.

Forest fragments and extensive areas of high biodiversity value outside PAs (minimal estimated surface is 100,000 ha) will be brought under conservation management and will function as connectivity corridors.

Threatened species found within the landscape will enjoy improved chances of survival among them emblematic species of lemur (*Propithecus verreauxi*, *Lemur catta* and *Cheirogaleus medius*), red-listed birds (*Monias benschi* and *Uratelornis chimaera* among others), as well as reptiles and amphibians (e.g. *Furcifer antimena* and *Ptychadena madagascariensis*).

The current and emerging negative impacts on biodiversity from production sectors will be more effectively avoided, and managed at the landscape level, in particular within the agriculture, forestry, extractive industries, energy production and transport sectors.

Protected areas combined with Community Conservation Areas will be reinforced and secured, and enhanced within the landscape land use management and planning processes. Traditionally one of the most widely used and, arguably, most effective tools for achieving conservation goals are protected areas which play a significant role in supporting local, national, and international biodiversity policies. They also serve as places for scientific research, wilderness protection, maintenance of environmental services, education, tourism and recreation, protection of specific natural and cultural features, and sustainable use of biological resources.

Development Benefits

With the project, Madagascar will implement concrete measures for conserving, sustainably using and safeguarding biodiversity in the Atsimo Andrefana Landscape covering three contiguous districts (Morombe, Tulear II and Betioky).

In terms of response to the current, and emerging threats to biodiversity, the project promotes a paradigm shift from site based work to a landscape approach. The project will develop a collaborative governance framework for sectoral

⁸ Refere to annex 7 SESP.

biodiversity mainstreaming involving public, private, CSO and CBO actors. Biodiversity considerations will be integrated into the development of economically relevant sectors across the landscape, in particular agriculture, forestry, extractive industries, and energy production, but also in the livelihoods and land use patterns of local communities.

A two-pronged approach will apply: First, it will strengthen resource use governance at the landscape level by developing and implementing the BD LUP. It will work with national and sub-national level stakeholders to engage economic sectors, and negotiate the application of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use measures, and bring about necessary policy change. Second, the project will work with local communities to strengthen conservation on communal lands by establishing and managing multi use CCAs. It will put in place measures to ensure the sustainable utilisation of wild resources and conservation-friendly farming through a focused sustainable livelihoods and capacity building programme.

The project will enhance the knowledge and understanding of the role of ecological processes and the services that Biodiversity provides in benefit of local development. The project will engage with sector ministries (e.g. Agriculture, energy, infrastructure, land use planning, etc.) and the private sector, in discussions and negotiations, where biodiversity and ecosystem conservation will be presented as an essential part of development planning, introducing a long term and sustainable development vision. In this respect, the project will promote the negotiation of trade-offs between conservation and development partners, with the aim to enhance environmental considerations within development planning; and will provide guidance and information to the government on the Mitigation Hierarchy which can be applied when negotiating with large scale investment projects.

The project will promote a multi-sector landscape governance structure enhancing the negotiating capacity of local stakeholders, such as community members living in and around PA, hence building their knowledge and capacity to defend their rights to a safe environment and strengthening their ability to monitor potential violations on PAs. Communities will be able to participate actively in decision making regarding land use planning, and safeguard their environment and their livelihood base.

Innovativeness, Sustainability and Replicability

Innovation is embedded in the novelty of the project's landscape approach and the move away from site based work to addressing diffuse and indirect threats to biodiversity from both the economically emerging sectors in Madagascar and from communities' subsistence activities. In the current setting, there is a need to do both.

Another innovation aspect pertains to the PA approach to community conservation and its link to the internationally recognised ICCAs. Demonstrating constructive ways of involving local stakeholders in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in and around protected areas remains one of the most important challenges and priorities for nature conservation. Although Madagascar has a long history of Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM), and its PA system has benefited with a significant increase in the protected area surface, thanks to innovative CBNRM models, many communities which are targeted by the project, in the Atsimo Andrefana Region, which have participated in integrated conservation and development initiatives, continue to show weaknesses in capacities to sustainably manage community conservation sites. Findings from previous projects (i.e. EP III Final Evaluation), show that CBNRM models in and around PAs remains a challenge. The project will work by learning on past experience, identifying gaps and strengths, and creating an enabling environment both for the social and economic benefit of local communities and for biodiversity conservation. The project will introduce best practices and guidance provided by ICCA experiences worldwide, and enhance the current CBNRM practices in Madagascar.

The project will introduce tools and technologies (BD LUP) and build government capacities to integrate PAs within land use management and development planning. This has been tried previously in Madagascar, but due to the lack of suitable access to information, full understanding of the role and importance of PAs for local development, and non-inclusive consultation processes, land use management has proven not to be comprehensive of biodiversity conservation.

The project will innovate by providing tools that will counterbalance previous experience and build the capacity civil society to play a more significant role, by raising their awareness on their right to participate and be consulted prior to decision making regarding private and public sector investments. The use of georeferenced spatial planning, will enhance current community based land use planning (PAG terroir approach) bringing innovation in terms of how they intertwine the spatial, socio-economic and ecological dimensions, while fostering participation, both remotely and on the ground.

By working both at the government (regional, municipal) land use planning, and the community level land use planning levels (local community level: *fokontany*, *fokonola*), the project will aim to tackle threats to biodiversity conservation in a comprehensive manner. By enabling informed decision making and promoting an inclusive negotiation based land use

and development planning and decision making, the project aims to set the stage for the long term sustainable development of the region.

Sustainability and replicability of the project. The sustainability elements of the project derive from two aspects. First, the concerted landscape governance approach, involving public, private and CSO actors in biodiversity mainstreaming. Second, the socio-economic benefits that the project is expected to generate through livelihoods activities.

The project will work with the Ministry of Environment (MEEMF), specifically with the regional department (DREEMF), where guidance, technical assistance and tools will be provided and built. The aim of the project is to convey experience and knowledge on how to dynamically work among different sector ministries involved in land use planning; and how to engage with the private sector, in benefit both of biodiversity conservation and development planning. By working within a government structure, such as the DREEMF, the project expects that products and know-how passed on during project implementation will be perennial.

On the latter, *Fondation TANY MEVA's* revolving Fund is a key instrument in securing financial sustainably and encouraging communities to establish community funds.

The second component of the project is dedicated to the support and building of CCAs. This approach combines sustainable development, in the form of introducing economic activities that are respectful of conservation needs, within community livelihood enhancement activities. The CCAs that have been identified as target sites of the project, are areas where local communities have voluntarily requested resource transfer contracts and require support for CBNRM.

The project has a participatory approach to development. All stakeholders are involved in the design, development and will be integrated in the implementation of its activities. This is key to generating ownership, cooperation and active engagement, all elements which are crucial to the sustainability of the project.

Gender marking will apply to this project. Refer to PRODOC Section 3.1 *Programmatic Links* for further details.

B.3. Cost-effectiveness reflected in project design

Cost-effectiveness is enshrined in the project strategy and its choices since Work Programme entry. The cost effectiveness analysis has been further developed during the PPG and it is incorporated in the PRODOC.

For a summary, refer to PRODOC Section 2.4 *Cost-Effectiveness*, which is reproduced herein.

The project will seek to achieve a long term solution to biodiversity protection in the Region of Atsimo Andrefana, by providing support to the Regional government, the DREEMF, and the local communities who live in lands adjacent to PAs.

The project's resources will be dedicated to developing a comprehensive land use management plan that is respectful of biodiversity. The latter is reflected in the landscape level approach to PA conservation of the project. This approach will be implemented by providing support to the Regional government to develop a land use plan, that takes into consideration the value of the ecosystems and unique biodiversity contained in PAs, both being key elements for sustainable economic and social development.

The project will also dedicate over half of its resources to promoting new CCAs and sustainable social and economic activities by communities that manage them.

The project is considered cost-effective for the following primary reasons:

- (i) By using project resources, to act on a larger scale, such as on land use planning processes, that are conducted at all levels (from community to the Regional and National), the project's investment and outreach will considerably multiply, rendering the project considerably cost-effective.
- (ii) By providing direct support to PAs for the implementation of PA management plans that include including finding ways of strengthening financial independence.

- (iii) By enhancing economic activities of local communities that will enable communities to be self-sufficient (e.g. through micro-finance activities that will enhance local economies).

The project will complement and build upon the extensive baseline activities already underway in the sector (e.g. land use policies and planning processes currently underway; community based natural resources management legislation; build on community conservation areas; etc.). Wherever possible, the project will use the competencies and technical skills within the mandated Government and public institutions to implement project activities. Where applicable, project resources will also be deployed to strengthen and expand existing initiatives and programs to avoid duplication of effort.

Increased co-financing commitments will continue to be targeted by the project during the project implementation (e.g. co-financing of the private sector, co-financing of the NGOs involved in PA management, etc.). The project will seek to engage actively with the mining, oil and large scale agriculture sectors to promote partnerships and seek potential funding for the regional PA system.

Project funding will build the capacity of the Regional and National Government, to integrate comprehensive biodiversity information, analyses, impact projections and sustainable management considerations within regional Land Use Plans. This will serve as a pilot project that will create the in country capacity, allowing to replicate such approaches in other regions of the country.

Additionally, the project will enable the government to advance legislation concerning community conservation areas and the management of key biodiversity areas by communities, by promoting such sites in the region. This will lead to multiplying CCAs and the protection of KBA's. In this light, the project will enable to cost-effectively multiply this type of conservation model throughout the country and expand the protected area surface of the country.

Much of the projects resources and support will be dedicated to building local capacity within the region; providing biodiversity land use planning tools; promoting dialogue and interactions among productive sectors, the government and civil society. This investment in institutions and local work dynamics, is considered key to the sustainability of the project's results beyond the duration of the project. The regional government will gain autonomy throughout the project and key work processes will be incorporated within the institutional structures of the Region and the DREEMF. In the long term this will save costs for future investments in PA protection in the Region, and guarantee the achievement of long term results of the project.

C. BUDGETED M & E PLAN

The project's M&E Plan is thoroughly described in the PRODOC Section 7 *Monitoring Framework and Evaluation*. For more detail, refer to *Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget*. The table below provides a summary.

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ Excluding project team staff time	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	Project Manager, Project Team, Government and associated CSOs UNDP CO, UNDP GEF	Indicative cost: \$20,000	Within first two months of project start up with the full team on board
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	Project Manager and CTA will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members/consultants UNDP-GEF RTA advises	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ Excluding project team staff time	Time frame
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on output and implementation	Oversight by Project Manager and CTA Implementation teams	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation. Indicative cost is \$40,000	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	Project manager and CTA UNDP CO UNDP RTA UNDP GEF	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	Project manager and team	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Review	Project manager and CTA UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost: \$ 40,200	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Terminal Evaluation	Project manager and CTA UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost : \$40,200	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Audit	UNDP CO Project manager PCU	Indicative cost per year: \$2,000 (\$10,000 total)	Yearly
Visits to field sites	UNDP CO UNDP RCU (as appropriate) Government representatives	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly for UNDP CO, as required by UNDP RCU
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 115,400 (+/- 2.5% of total GEF budget)	


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)

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Christine Ralalaharisoa Edmé	Director General for the Environment	Ministry of Environment and Forests	25/07/2013

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 CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP- GEF Executive Coordinator.		March 22, 2016	Fabiana Issler Regional Technical Advisor, Ecosystems & Biodiversity, Africa, UNDP-GEF	+251- 929352140	fabiana.issler@undp.org

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).

Refer to specific sections and pages in the PRODOC for the Project Results Framework:

Section 3:	<u><i>Project Results Framework</i></u>	pages 67- 73
	3.1 <u><i>Programmatic Links</i></u>	
	3.2 <u><i>Logframe</i></u>	

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).

Comments at PIF Stage

Comments	Responses	Document reference
<i>STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF), dtd. February 21, 2014</i>		
Overall assessment: 2 Minor revision required	UNDP acknowledges the comments and provides a response to comments herein.	See specific comments from STAP and response below.
<p>The STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>1- STAP welcomes the submission of this concept for an important project intended to mainstream biodiversity conservation and management into existing and emerging development sectors and to contain pressures in a realistic fashion in the most ecologically sensitive areas, including protected areas (PAs) and their adjacent zones, by respectively strengthening resource use governance at the landscape level and conservation on communal lands.</p> <p>2- The project concept is clearly well thought through as evidenced by the logic and coherence of its components.</p> <p>3- The title and objective are clear and consistent with the described problem.</p> <p>4- Regarding the presented Outcome</p>	<p>The STAP specific comments have been addressed as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No response required. 2. No response required. 3. No response required. 4. This comment was well noted and it was taken into consideration during PPG stage. We also note that the general goal of mainstreaming is improved management of landscapes for biodiversity. Yet, the project strategy is quite sound and possibly the best bet for one such approach in Atsimo Andrefana. More specifically on the question: At this current stage, it is not possible to assess baseline and targets for reductions in land use conversions, not even at the local level (e.g. sites), where the project is bound to operate. This is because the work during the PPG has focused on implementing a methodology for site selection and defining a framework for the BD LUP. It also focused on defining key activities under Component 2, which if successful will likely lead to improved management of community based landscapes through the PAG-T, CCA and KBA approaches, which are so thoroughly described in the PRODOC. By the project's year 1, it should be possible to foresee and estimate a reduction in land use for agriculture, once we have more specific data on 	<p>(comment 4) See PRODOC Strategic Results Framework section 3.1.</p> <p>(comment 5) See PRODOC Project Strategy section 2. Under component 1, Output 1.1, land use planning, section 'Activity and output by component', activity 1.1.1, contains a detailed explanation. The Project LogFrame included as an annex (see annex 6) Refer to PRODOC section 1.2 Legal and Institutional Context; section 1.5 Stakeholder Analyses, and; Annex 5 'Technical Reports from PPG Phase', which contains the Report by the SIG expert on the BD LUP.</p>

Comments	Responses	Document reference
<p>indicators, some of them could be reworded (e.g. conversion of natural habitats for agriculture is significantly reduced in CCAs) to make them more focused to rate of conversion.</p> <p>5- Some clearer alignment of the Outputs with the defined barriers could also be pursued during the PPG phase. For example, while access to available information on biodiversity is defined as a barrier, addressing this barrier is not clearly reflected in the proposed Outputs.</p> <p>6- The existing and developing threats and pressures and root causes are well presented, and the context of the project is thoroughly described.</p> <p>7- The description of the baseline conditions is comprehensive, and the fit/nesting of the proposed project with baseline activities is well presented.</p> <p>8- The barrier definition is sound, and looking ahead, although the specific barriers ought to become more reflected in the proposed activities as per the observation above.</p> <p>9- The incremental cost reasoning is well presented but more details will be expected following the PPG phase.</p> <p>10- The GEBs are well documented. The innovative aspects of the proposed project are noted and accepted.</p> <p>11- Concerning the sustainability of the project's results, however, more information could be provided even at this</p>	<p>conversion rates at site level.</p> <p>5. This comment was duly taken into account during the PPG phase. Output 1.1 directly addresses this barrier by proposing the development of a Biodiversity Planning Tool (BD LUP) that has the function of producing, capitalizing, gathering and making use of existing information to produce analyses and projections on potential impacts of industries providing government decision makers in charge of land use planning with the necessary information to safeguard biodiversity.</p> <p>As formulated in the <i>barrier analysis</i> the issue faced by the Government of Madagascar at the national and the regional levels, are primarily the (1) lack of <i>access to existing information</i> on biodiversity that would enable to understand the impacts that large scale productive investments may have on biodiversity and fragile ecosystems; (2) <i>lack of tools</i> to use this information to analyse the potential impacts of new industrial investments, and; (3) gaps in information, mainly related to <i>lack of information itself</i>, due to scarcity of studies being conducted on ecosystems and the impacts of industries in the region.</p> <p>Taking this comment into account, within the revised Framework, Output 1.1 now directly addresses these barriers.</p> <p>Further addressing this issue, action was taken during the PPG stage to ensure synergies among partners and government stakeholders, managing and producing information on biodiversity. Extensive consultations took place with key personnel from the different units of the Ministry of Environment of Madagascar (MEEMF, ONE, DIS) in charge of managing data bases and gathering information, in addition to engaging high level civil servants, such as the General Secretary of the MEEMF and the General Director of the ONE, to ensure that cooperation among units in information managing and sharing would take place and reconcile inter-</p>	<p>(Comment 8) Refer to the PRODOC section 1.2 'Development and Environmental Management Context', and Annex 5, where a detailed background analysis is included.</p>

Comments	Responses	Document reference
<p>preliminary stage.</p> <p>12- Regarding the project's scaling up, the potential is clearly there but external support will undoubtedly be required.</p> <p>13- It is beneficial to see the attention devoted to the issue of gender and the recognition of the role of women in local communities and the project's implementation.</p> <p>14- The definition of stakeholders is comprehensive along with engagement of local communities & their roles in the project are also clearly defined.</p> <p>15- Regarding risks, what is presented is a comprehensive appraisal of the magnitude of the defined risks. Climate change related risks, however, are not mentioned. STAP urges that climate risks be addressed explicitly during the PPG stage.</p>	<p>ministerial discrepancies with regard to information systems management.</p> <p>Discussions took place regarding how the project will: gather information, combine data bases and capitalize on existing data bases (currently produced and stored by environment constituents, such as NGO partners; and those managed by the ONE, as the government entity in charge of EIA, under the MEEMF), in order to centralize information at the level of the Ministry of Environment. The Legal and Institutional Analyses section and the Stakeholder Analyses within the PRODOC provide an analyses of the role and responsibilities of the different entities mentioned above.</p> <p>6. No response required</p> <p>7. No response required</p> <p>8. In addition to what is mentioned in comment 5, it is to be noted that during the PPG stage, a detailed Project Strategy was developed, and included in the PRODOC, and a detailed activities logical framework was developed, which define the different outputs and activities in detail. This clarifies the manner in which the barriers will be addressed.</p> <p>9. Incremental reasoning is developed. Refer in particular to the Financial Baseline Analysis.</p> <p>10. No response required.</p> <p>11. As indicated, during the PPG phase further information regarding the sustainability strategy was integrated in the text of the PRODOC. It is highlighted that the project has a participatory approach integrating stakeholders from design to implementation, generating sustainability through ownership, and compliance. Additionally, it is explained how the project will build on the working dynamics of public institutions and national civil society organizations that have long term</p>	<p>(Comment 11) See PRODOC section 2.2.4 subtitled 'Innovativeness, Sustainability and Replicability'</p> <p>(Comment 15) Refer to PRODOC section 2.3.1 'Risk Analysis'; section 1.2.2 'Threats to Biodiversity and Drivers of Ecosystem Change', and Annex 5-E 'Threats to and impacts to biodiversity specific to the target landscape'</p>

Comments	Responses	Document reference
	<p>anchorage in the target region.</p> <p>12. Refer to Annex 2, for the ‘Overview table of human resource inputs’. The project will have two international staff supporting it. This is the best bet for introducing into key government entities essential knowledge management skills that are in short supply in Madagascar.</p> <p>13. No response required.</p> <p>14. No response required.</p> <p>15. As recommended, climate change was integrated as a potential risk to the project. The project has also integrated explicitly climate change impacts specific to the target region within Section 1.2.2 ‘Threats to Biodiversity and Drivers of Ecosystem Change’. Refer also to Annex 5-E ‘Threats to and impacts to biodiversity specific to the target landscape’</p>	
<i>Comments from Germany - Feb-Mar 2014</i>		
<p>Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:</p> <p>Suggestions for improvement to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal: Germany welcomes the PIF and would like to make the following suggestions for improvement:</p> <p>1- Regarding land use planning at local level (community conservation areas), the approach developed by AVSF at Fokontany level should be taken into account. AVSF is implementing the approach together with the regional farmer organization (maison des paysans) within a project on food security and agriculture.</p> <p>2- Considering the existence of several forest</p>	<p>1- Due note of this suggestion was taken during the PPG phase. The GIZ is currently the main bilateral partner working to provide support to the region in land use planning. This process began this year and is currently underway. During PPG phase GIZ was consulted to understand what synergies may be developed with Project, and generate a partnership to enable cooperation between UNDP and GIZ. The PPG team was successful in promoting a strong working relationships, and mobilizing co-financing by the GIZ. GIZ and UNDP stated the full intention of developing complementary and synergetic work plans. The AVSF approach has been taken into account in this respect, given the need to align approaches in order to provide coherent support to the Region, UNDP will build on the lessons and best practises of AVSF and other program approaches.</p> <p>2- Component 2 which deals with the creation of CCA’s</p>	<p>(Comment 1) Refer to PRODOC Annex 1 for GIZ co-financing letter.</p> <p>(Comment 2) Refer to section 2 ‘Project Strategy’, Component 2, Output 2.1: creation of CCA, activity 2.1.2.</p> <p>(Comment 4) Refer to section 2 ‘Project Strategy’, component 2, Output 2.1, Activity 2.1.6.</p>

Comments	Responses	Document reference
<p>areas where the management has already been taken over by local user-groups, Germany recommends that SAGE also uses the planned budget to support existing arrangements in terms of biodiversity protection, and does not solely focus on the establishment of new areas.</p> <p>3- VPDAT (Vice-primature en charge du développement et de l'aménagement du territoire) is promoting land use planning at municipal level and has validated a guide for the elaboration of these plans. The project should be in line with this evolution and use the guide for supporting decentralized land use planning as one key element of the landscape approach.</p> <p>4- Local land authorities/offices (Guichets fonciers) should play an important role in the implementation of the biodiversity plan and facilitate the elaboration of municipal land use plans. If possible, we recommend foreseeing the support and establishment of guichets foncieres in selected municipalities, which would facilitate the development of such local land use plans.</p>	<p>will be implemented by two local CSOs, Tany Meva, and SAGE. During consultations with both institutions, it was suggested that they take such approaches into consideration during work planning stage. The project aims not only to create new CCA's, but also to assist in finalizing the steps involved in full development of community transfer contracts, that are currently underway. These contracts legally secure the lands for community management in buffer areas and within new PA of categories V and VI of the IUCN. This has been made explicit in the Project Strategy section, and may be found in the detailed logframe provided in Section 3.</p> <p>3- The project, at the implementation phase will conduct a preliminary assessment of tools and approaches to ensure alignment with existing programs. As the aim of the project is to reinforce land use management at the landscape level, it will build synergies with partner involved in land use planning, as mentioned in comment, 2, and not necessarily conduct the process itself. The project will aim to strengthen the knowledge on biodiversity to be annexed to the regional land use plan and ensure that agencies with which it will partner will take into account studies and information pertaining to the safeguard of biodiversity within land use and development plans.</p> <p>4- Initially, the plan was to include one such activity, but funding is quite tight under both components and the ambition level high. The activity on land supporting land registration was excluded, but noting that other partners (including Tany Mevca and Sage) and government itself are assisting local communities with this theme.</p>	
<i>Comments from JICA - Feb-Mar 2014</i>		
<p>The methodology used in below JICA project can be applicable and useful for this Project though each project location is not identical.</p>	<p>1- Due note was taken during PPG phase. The approach of the aforementioned project will be duly taken into account by the project team.</p>	<p>-</p>

Comments	Responses	Document reference
<p>It is recommendable to contact to JICA country office in Madagascar for more details.</p> <p>1- Project Title: Project of Integrated Approach Development in order to Promote Environment Restoration and Rural Development in Morarano Chrome</p> <p>Project Duration: February 2012 to February 2017</p>		
<i>Comments from USA – Feb- Mar 2014</i>		
<p>The United States registers no formal objection to these projects but remains concerned about the situation in Madagascar. The United States welcomes positive developments, including the inauguration of a democratically elected president, and we look forward to the new president's formation of a government that has the confidence of the Malagasy people and credibility with the international community.</p>	<p>No response needed</p>	<p>-</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

A. DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF PPG ACTIVITIES AND FINANCING STATUS

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$150,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Available</i>
Project scope and strategy defined, and GEF full proposal documentation prepared and approved	150,000.00	88,896.69	
Total	150,000.00	88,896.69	

If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue und activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (IF NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT IS USED)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fu will be set up)

NA