



**Sustainable Financing and Inclusive Management to Perpetuate Madagascar's Locally
Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs) - GEF Project ID: 11802**

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN

September 4, 2025

GEF Agency: WWF US

Lead Executing Agency: Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Acronyms.....	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Regulations and Requirements	5
3. Project Stakeholders	6
4. Summary of any previous stakeholder engagement activities	8
5. Stakeholder Engagement Plan	11
6. Resources and Responsibilities	14
7. Grievances Mechanism	15
8. Monitoring and Reporting	17
Appendix 1: Stakeholder Analysis.....	19
Appendix 2: Systematic Documentation of Stakeholder Consultations	22

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CBO	Community-Based Organization
CLB	<i>Communauté Locale de Base</i>
DREDD	<i>Direction Régionale de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable</i>
GBFF	Global Biodiversity Framework Fund
ESS	Environmental and Social Safeguards
FAPBM	<i>Fondation pour les Aires Protégées et la Biodiversité de Madagascar</i>
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
GCF	<i>Gestion Contractualisée des Forêts</i>
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GELOSE	<i>Gestion Locale Sécurisée</i>
GRM	Grievance Redress Mechanism
IH.SM	<i>Institut Halieutique et des Sciences Marines</i>
KMD	<i>Komity Mpanatanteraka Dina</i>
LMMA	Locally Managed Marine Areas
MEDD	<i>Ministère de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable</i>
MPEB	<i>Ministère de la Pêche et de l'Économie Bleue</i>
OECM	Other Effective area-based Conservation Measures
PAP	<i>Plan d'Aménagement des Pêcheries</i>
PCO	Project Complaints Officer
PMU	Project Management Unit
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SEAH	Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment
SEP	Stakeholder Engagement Plan
TGRH	<i>Transfert de Gestion des Ressources Halieutiques</i>
TGRN	<i>Transfert de Gestion des Ressources Naturelles</i>
VOI	<i>Vondron'Olona Ifotony</i>
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

1. Introduction

Marine and coastal ecosystems in Madagascar are increasingly under pressure from overfishing, habitat degradation, illegal exploitation, and the effects of climate change, including coastal erosion and rising sea levels. These ecosystems play a critical role in sustaining biodiversity, supporting local livelihoods, and contributing to climate resilience, as more than 1.5 million people depend directly on coastal resources for food security and income. In response, Madagascar has seen a significant expansion of Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs), with more than 280 sites established across its coastline. However, many LMMAs continue to face operational challenges, including limited legal recognition, insufficient access to long-term financing, and weak institutional coordination. These constraints limit their ability to contribute effectively to national conservation objectives.

The objective of the project is to facilitate sustainable financing solutions and effective and inclusive management practices to strengthen the conservation and sustainable use of coastal and marine biodiversity in LMMAs across three seascapes in western Madagascar: Diana, Manambolo-Tsiribihina, and Mahafaly. These areas include ecosystems of high ecological value and are home to numerous community-based initiatives.

The project is structured around five components:

- Component 1 will strengthen the enabling environment for LMMA governance through legal and regulatory improvements, support to marine spatial planning, and the formal recognition of LMMAs as other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs).
- Component 2 will develop and pilot sustainable and blended finance mechanisms for LMMAs, while strengthening the fiduciary and operational capacities of national conservation trust funds (FAPBM and Tany Meva) to channel resources to community-level actors.
- Component 3 will reinforce inclusive governance and ecological resilience in selected LMMA sites through support to local management bodies, the development of operational management plans, and the promotion of nature-based livelihoods in collaboration with local stakeholders.
- Component 4 will focus on knowledge management and communication, including the development and dissemination of tools, peer-to-peer exchanges, and coordination with national and regional initiatives, such as the GBFF project in Mozambique.
- Component 5 will ensure effective project monitoring and evaluation, integrating gender-responsive indicators and supporting adaptive management throughout implementation.

The project builds on previous investments, including the GEF-6 Marine Protected Areas project, and aligns with Madagascar's national biodiversity strategies and commitments under the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework—particularly Target 3 on area-based conservation. It contributes to the formal recognition of community-led conservation efforts and the consolidation of a national LMMA network.

This Stakeholder Engagement Plan outlines the approach, tools, and institutional arrangements that will guide stakeholder participation throughout the project lifecycle, with a focus on inclusion, transparency, and responsiveness to local priorities.

2. Regulations and Requirements

Government of Madagascar Policies and Regulations

Stakeholder engagement in Madagascar is supported by a robust legal framework that guarantees the public's right to participate in environmental decision-making and in the governance of natural resources.

Regarding environmental and social risk management, the Environmental Charter (Charte de l'Environnement Malagasy, Law No. 2015-003) requires that all investment projects likely to affect the environment undergo an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), with public participation integrated throughout the process. This is operationalized through Decree No. 99-954, as amended by Decree No. 2004-167 (MECIE), which mandates bilingual disclosure (Malagasy and French), structured public consultations, and formal documentation of stakeholder inputs. Arrêté No. 6830/2001 further details procedures for participation, including public hearings and the use of registers to capture feedback during environmental assessments.

In the context of natural resource governance, Law No. 96025 and Decree No. 2000027 establish the legal basis for transferring resource management rights to local communities through the GELOSE and TGRN mechanisms. These transfers require prior consultation, local validation, and the participatory development of management plans. Ministerial Order No. 29211/2017, based on Law No. 2015-053 (Fisheries and Aquaculture Code), which governs fisheries resource transfers, applies similar provisions in the coastal and marine domain. Finally, Law No. 2001004 on Dina (community by-laws) provides a legal basis for locally developed rules that play an important role in natural resource management. Dinas must be adopted in open assemblies by a qualified majority and are subject to judicial validation.

WWF Standard on Stakeholder Engagement

The WWF GEF Agency requires all GEF projects comply with GEF and WWF standards on Stakeholder Engagement, specifically the WWF [Standard on Stakeholder Engagement](#) and the associated [Procedures for Implementation of the Standard on Stakeholder Engagement](#). Stakeholder engagement is an overarching term that encompasses a range of activities and interactions with stakeholders throughout the project cycle and is an essential aspect of good project management.

The WWF Standard on Stakeholder Engagement requires the Executing Agency to engage stakeholders throughout the life of the project; communicate significant changes to project stakeholders and consult on potential risks and impacts; establish a grievance redress mechanism and register and respond to grievances throughout project execution, and; disseminate information in a way that is relevant, transparent, objective, meaningful, easily accessible. The Standard on Stakeholder Engagement promotes an inclusive process to support the development of strong, constructive and responsive relationships that help to identify and manage risks, and which encourage positive outcomes for stakeholders and project activities.

3. Project Stakeholders

This section identifies the key stakeholder groups the project will inform, consult, and engage with. It includes persons or groups who: (i) are directly or indirectly affected by the project or have an interest in it, and (ii) have the potential to influence project outcomes and operations.

1. National Government Entities

National government entities involved in this project include the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD) and the Ministry of Fisheries and Blue Economy (MPEB). MEDD leads national policy on environmental governance and biodiversity conservation, including the implementation of the GELOSE and TGRN frameworks and the recognition of OECMs. MPEB is responsible for fisheries governance and small-scale fisheries management and leads implementation of the TGRH framework. Both ministries have a direct interest in the project's objective to strengthen community management of marine and coastal resources and to harmonize legal frameworks for LMMAs. As co-executing and strategic partners, they will support policy and legal reforms, enable coordination across sectors, contribute technical guidance, and facilitate the integration of LMMAs into national strategies for marine spatial planning and biodiversity conservation.

2. Sub-national Government Administration

These include the regional and district environmental offices (DREDD/CEDD), which are responsible for overseeing TGRN implementation and supporting enforcement in collaboration with communities. The project will also engage regional and local representatives of the MPEB, who are involved in the oversight of TGRH structures and community-based fisheries governance. These also include commune-level authorities such as mayors and fokontany chiefs who are key actors in the enforcement of Dina, the mediation of local conflicts, and the coordination between formal governance systems and community-based structures. In some areas, these actors have expressed that they are not sufficiently involved in LMMA governance and have requested stronger coordination with community systems. These actors influence the legitimacy, functionality, and legal anchoring of LMMAs at local level. The project will work with them to reinforce coordination mechanisms and ensure coherent governance across administrative and community levels.

3. Non-Governmental Organizations

NGOs are central to LMMA support in Madagascar. These include WWF-Madagascar, active in mangroves co-management and livelihoods; Blue Ventures, active in fisheries co-management and livelihoods; Conservation International, supporting marine biodiversity; and WCS, which supports marine protected area co-management and works with coastal communities to strengthen governance and species protection. NGOs serve as technical intermediaries, assisting communities in LMMA establishment, planning, monitoring, and sustainable livelihoods. The Secretariat of the MIHARI network, a national platform of LMMA practitioners and support organizations, also plays a key coordination and advocacy role. Within the project, some NGOs will support local implementation (as executing partners) through technical assistance, capacity building, and facilitation, while contributing to knowledge exchange and national policy dialogue.

4. Conservation Trust Funds

Conservation trust funds play a strategic role in supporting long-term financing for community-based natural resource management in Madagascar. Two national foundations—Tany Meva and FAPBM—are engaged in the project. Tany Meva is a public-interest environmental foundation that provides direct grants to community-based organizations for terrestrial and coastal conservation activities. FAPBM (Fondation pour les Aires Protégées et la Biodiversité de Madagascar) is Madagascar's national biodiversity trust fund, traditionally focused on financing protected areas and will serve as the fiduciary agent of this project. Both institutions will contribute to the project by strengthening their internal systems, developing funding pathways to reach LMMA actors, and supporting the long-term sustainability of community-based marine management.

5. Community-Based Organizations

CBOs are essential actors in the governance and daily management of marine and coastal resources. These include VOIs (Vondron'Olona Ifotony) and CLBs (Comités Locaux de Base), which oversee natural resource management in TGRN areas such as mangroves and upland forests; fisheries cooperatives and TGRH committees, which coordinate local management of marine zones; and Dina enforcement bodies such as the Komity Mpanatanteraka Dina (KMD). Community patrollers (e.g. Polisin-drano) monitor compliance but often face resourcing and safety challenges. The project will work directly through CBOs to implement management plans, strengthen enforcement systems, promote sustainable livelihoods, and support inclusive governance, particularly for women and youth. CBOs will also facilitate dialogue among user groups and ensure equitable benefit sharing.

6. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities

No groups in Madagascar are formally recognized as Indigenous Peoples under GEF or WWF definitions. However, local communities, particularly those managing resources through Dina, TGRN, and TGRH, are considered part of the IP&LC stakeholder groups. This includes women, men, youth, and seasonal fishers relying on VOIs/CLBs, TGRH committees, and Dina-based systems. These communities apply traditional knowledge, uphold local rules, and sustain biodiversity and livelihoods across the seascapes. The project may affect their resource access, governance responsibilities, and income opportunities. Their influence stems from their practical knowledge, governance role, and social legitimacy. Within these communities, some groups remain structurally excluded from decision-making and benefits. These include women with limited roles in leadership despite active involvement; youth, often absent from governance despite high engagement in fishing; migrant fishers, usually outside formal structures despite their presence and economic role; and non-members of VOIs/CLBs, who may lack access to information or participation rights. These vulnerable groups will be prioritized in the project's inclusion and benefit-sharing strategies. The project will engage IP&LCs through participatory planning, ecosystem restoration, community surveillance, and development of sustainable livelihoods. It will promote inclusive representation to ensure fair participation and equitable outcomes.

7. Private sector

Private sector actors may include fish buyers, processors, tourism operators, and other value chain actors influencing marine resource use and coastal economies. Though not directly involved in implementation, they have a strategic role in supporting sustainable livelihood options, value chain development, and long-term LMMA financing. The project will engage selected private actors through dialogue, pilot initiatives, and knowledge-sharing to promote responsible practices and mobilize complementary investments. In

addition, private financial institutions such as microfinance organizations and commercial banks (e.g. ACEP, BNI) will be engaged to improve access to credit, financial inclusion, and the development of tailored financial products for community-based enterprises and value chains.

8. Academia

Academic and research institutions in Madagascar support biodiversity conservation, fisheries management, and governance through research, data collection, and training. While no formal partnerships are in place yet, institutions such as IH.SM and universities may contribute to marine spatial planning, socio-ecological monitoring, and LMMA evaluation. The project will explore partnerships to develop knowledge products, support participatory research, and inform adaptive management and policy dialogue.

9. Multilateral and Bilateral Partners

Key multilateral and bilateral partners such as the World Bank, KfW, AFD, and the EU play an important role in financing and supporting marine conservation, fisheries management, and coastal resilience in Madagascar. Although not directly involved in project implementation, they may operate in overlapping geographic areas or support complementary policy and institutional reforms. Their engagement will be important to ensure strategic alignment, foster synergies with existing investments (e.g., SWIOFish2, Blue Action Fund), and explore future co-financing or scaling opportunities linked to LMMAs and sustainable financing mechanisms.

4. Summary of any previous stakeholder engagement activities

The project design was informed by a structured stakeholder engagement process that included (i) a national workshop, (ii) community consultations in LMMA sites, and (iii) bilateral technical consultations with key institutions. These consultations were conducted during the PIF/CN and ProDoc/PPG phases and contributed directly to the formulation of the project's objective, site selection criteria, safeguard instruments, gender analysis and action plan, and the design of each component. A consultation log is provided in Appendix 2.

1. National Stakeholder Workshop – Antananarivo, 12 June 2025

A national stakeholder consultation workshop was held on 12 June 2025 in Antananarivo, with 19 participants (9 women, 10 men) from MEDD, WWF, Blue Ventures, Conservation International, WCS, MIHARI, and Tany Meva. The workshop aimed to present the project concept, gather technical feedback, identify legal and financial gaps, and explore stakeholder roles in implementation. The Ministry of Fisheries and Blue Economy was not represented due to its participation in the UN Ocean Conference.

The plenary session highlighted the importance of recognizing LMMAs as OECMs under Target 3 of the Global Biodiversity Framework, the need to build on GEF-6 achievements, and the urgency of securing LMMA governance structures. MIHARI and CI emphasized gaps in tenure and regulatory clarity, while the GEF focal point stressed that ecosystem integrity and species protection must guide site prioritization. WWF and MEDD underlined the need to focus on the application of existing laws (GELOSE, GCF, Dina) rather than creating new texts.

Group discussions focused on two themes:

- **Legal frameworks:** Participants called for alignment between TGRN and TGRH regimes, greater legal durability of management transfers, and clarity on the recognition of OECMs through national mechanisms. These insights directly informed Component 1, which includes legal analysis, harmonization, and support to the recognition of LMMAs as OECMs.
- **Sustainable financing:** The group identified gaps in direct community financing and highlighted the need for cost benchmarks, LMMA management standards, and support to intermediary organizations. FAPBM and Tany Meva's limited experience in marine finance was noted. These inputs were integrated into Component 2, which includes capacity-building for conservation trust funds, structuring of eligible expenditure, and diversified financing pathways.

Participants also stressed the importance of linking marine conservation with local development priorities, such as livelihoods, social services, and market access, elements reflected in Component 3 of the project.

2. Community Consultations – Field Missions, June 2025

From 2 to 10 June 2025, consultations were held in the three targeted seascapes—Diana (Antsatrana, Ankazomborona, Angodorofo), Manambolo-Tsiribihina (Kimony, Kivalo), and Mahafaly (Befasy, Itampolo, Lanirano). These field missions aimed to validate the relevance of selected LMMAs, assess local needs, inform the ESS screening process (gender, risks, mitigation), and refine stakeholder mapping and institutional arrangements. Across all sites, community consultations included bilateral meetings with local authorities and 4 focus groups per LMMA: men, women, VOI members, and fishers linked to TGRH. Key feedback is summarized below.

Legal status and governance gaps. Most visited LMMAs have active TGRN and/or TGRH contracts, except in Mahafaly where governance remains informal. Across sites, discussions confirmed a strong interest in LMMA structures, but participants highlighted the need for clearer mandates, support for contract renewal (e.g. Ankazomborona's TGRN ends in 2026), and improved transparency and inclusiveness of local governance bodies (e.g. underrepresentation of women in CLB and VOI structures). These insights shaped Component 1, which includes legal diagnostics and support to the development of improved co-management frameworks for community-based marine governance.

Livelihoods and access to markets. In all sites, communities depend primarily on fisheries, complemented by small-scale agriculture, livestock, charcoal, and crafts. Women are highly active in post-harvest activities (drying, trading) yet face limited access to equipment and credit. In Mahafaly, former farmers are shifting to fishing due to droughts, increasing pressure on marine resources. These findings informed Component 3, which promotes livelihood diversification through value chain support (seaweed farming, aquaculture, honey, ecotourism) and community-based financing mechanisms.

Gender-specific vulnerabilities. Women consistently reported limited voice in mixed assemblies, despite being key actors in fisheries, household provisioning, and resource management. In Diana and Menabe, they requested literacy training, equipment for processing and trade, and safer working conditions (e.g. access to drinking water and energy). Gender disparities in decision-making, land tenure, and LMMA representation were recurrent across sites. These concerns are directly addressed in the project's gender action plan.

Compliance and enforcement challenges. All groups reported difficulties enforcing Dina rules due to lack of patrol equipment, reluctance to denounce peers, and limited involvement of fisheries authorities. Patrollers reported lacking equipment and formal recognition, particularly in mangrove areas. In some areas, Dina were more effective than formal contracts (e.g. TGRH sanctions seen as too lenient). These challenges informed the design of Component 1 (improved co-management frameworks) and Component 3 (capacity-building for monitoring and enforcement by community rangers).

Perceptions of the LMMA approach. Most community members were unfamiliar with the term “LMMA” but identified with its underlying principles. Across sites, the concept was well accepted once explained, particularly due to visible ecological recovery (e.g. mangrove restoration, increased fish stocks) and strengthened local identity. The integration of sensitization and inclusive governance training into project activities responds directly to these observations.

Environmental and social risks. Communities noted vulnerabilities linked to migration, youth marginalization, lack of equipment, and climate variability. In some sites, tensions between neighboring LMMAs or ethnic groups (e.g. Vavalinta in Lanirano) were flagged. Tensions were also noted between VOI members and migrant fishers or non-members, especially around rule enforcement and benefit-sharing. These risks are integrated into the project’s safeguard instruments and mitigation measures (SEP, ESMF).

These community-level consultations ensured that the project design reflects the lived realities, priorities, and aspirations of local stakeholders—particularly women, youth, and small-scale fishers—and confirmed the appropriateness of the proposed support to LMMAs as key vehicles for biodiversity conservation and sustainable development.

3. Technical and Institutional Consultations – June 2025

In parallel to the workshop and field missions, targeted consultations were held with key institutional stakeholders between 10 and 11 June 2025 in Antananarivo. These bilateral meetings aimed to deepen technical inputs on legal frameworks, LMMA financing, and alignment with other ongoing initiatives.

Tany Meva shared its new strategic plan and approach to funding community-based conservation through field partners. The meeting clarified its funding criteria, experience with local implementation, and readiness to support LMMA-related initiatives under the GBFF, in coordination with other actors.

MIHARI Network emphasized the urgent need for a dedicated regulatory framework to secure community rights over marine areas and support the formal recognition of LMMAs. The team highlighted its operational model, ongoing field activities, and role in LMMA performance monitoring. These insights informed the project’s focus on governance strengthening and legal harmonization under Component 1.

FAPBM confirmed the creation of a pilot LMMA fund in partnership with WWF, as a first step toward longer-term financing solutions. Discussions underlined the need to improve community financial management, identify strategic LMMA sites, and clarify legal eligibility. These priorities were directly reflected in Component 2, which includes capacity-building for conservation trust funds and piloting of community sub-grants.

MEDD and WWF-GEF6 teams contributed lessons from the GEF-6 project, including the revision of the GELOSE law, the development of the OECM interministerial decree, and the expansion of the KBA network. Challenges encountered under GEF-6 (e.g., institutional coordination, financial flow

mechanisms) were used to refine the GBFF project design. In particular, the need to integrate legal advances, avoid duplication, and ensure alignment with spatial planning and income-generation strategies was emphasized.

These consultations strengthened the technical foundation of the project, ensured strong national and local ownership of the project and laid the foundation for a multi-stakeholder implementation approach, aligned with the priorities of both communities and institutions.

5. Stakeholder Engagement Plan

The purpose of this Stakeholder Engagement Plan is to ensure appropriate and consistent involvement of project stakeholders in every stage of the project implementation, supporting effective communication and working relationships. The Project Management Unit (PMU) will ensure that the views and inputs of stakeholders are taken into consideration throughout project implementation.

The project proposes a stakeholder engagement strategy structured across three distinct levels:

- **Information:** Information dissemination represents the first level of the stakeholder engagement process. It is based on a one-way flow of clear, timely, and accessible information from the project to stakeholders, with the aim of providing them with the elements needed to understand the project, its implications, and the mechanisms available for participation.
- **Consultation:** Consultation represents the second level of the stakeholder engagement process. It involves a two-way exchange between the project and stakeholders—beyond simple information dissemination—where perceptions, suggestions, concerns, and proposals are actively collected to help improve the technical quality, social relevance, and sustainability of project interventions. In all cases, consultations will be preceded by the dissemination of clear, accessible, and context-appropriate information.
- **Participation in project governance:** The third level of stakeholder engagement seeks to ensure the active, structured, and continuous involvement of the most relevant stakeholders—particularly those with high influence or high exposure—in the strategic management and decision-making of the project. In this sense, a National Steering Committee, chaired by MEDD, will provide strategic orientation and validate project frameworks to ensure consistency with public policy and safeguard standards.

Each type of stakeholder will be engaged through methods adapted to its level of interest, influence, and role in the project. This differentiated approach ensures transparency, effective inclusion, and the alignment of participation mechanisms with each stakeholder's profile—giving particular attention to those most directly affected, who must have a meaningful voice in project decisions.

Stakeholder Type	Stakeholder Name	Frequency of Engagement	Engagement During Project Implementation
	MEDD	At least quarterly, throughout project	Information by formal communication (emails, reports); consultation through quarterly
	MPEB		

Stakeholder Type	Stakeholder Name	Frequency of Engagement	Engagement During Project Implementation
Government of Madagascar			meetings; participation in project governance through the Steering Committee chaired by MEDD.
	DREDD/CEDD	At least quarterly in pilot sites, throughout project	Information through brochures, summary leaflets and WhatsApp groups; consultation through quarterly meetings; support to grievance resolution when required.
	Local MPEB representatives		
	Mayors and Fokontany Chiefs		
NGOs	WWF- Madagascar	At least biannually, throughout project	Information through brochures, summary leaflets and WhatsApp groups; consultation through thematic workshops and coordination meetings; potential participation in project governance through the Steering Committee chaired by MEDD.
	Blue Ventures		
	Conservation International		
	WCS		
	MIHARI Network		
	National conservation NGOs		
Conservation Trust Funds	FAPBM	At least monthly, throughout the project	Information through formal communication (emails, reports); consultation via monthly coordination meetings; participation in project governance through the National Steering Committee chaired by MEDD.
	Tany Meva	Formal consultation at least quarterly, throughout project + regular engagement to support day-to-day implementation of component 2	Information by formal communication (emails, reports); consultation through quarterly meetings; participation in project governance through the Steering Committee chaired by MEDD.
CBOs	VOIs / CLBs	Formal consultations at least quarterly in pilot sites, throughout project + regular field engagement to support day-to-day implementation of component 3	Information through brochures, oral briefings and summary leaflets; consultation through quarterly meetings; support to grievance resolution when required.
	TGRH Committees, Fisheries Cooperatives		
	KMD		
Communities and Indigenous People	Men in coastal communities	Formal consultations at least biannually in pilot sites, throughout project + regular field engagement to support	Information through posters, illustrated leaflets, and community meetings; consultation through surveys, focus group discussions (disaggregated by gender and
	Women in coastal communities		
	Youth in coastal communities		
	Migrant fishers		

Stakeholder Type	Stakeholder Name	Frequency of Engagement	Engagement During Project Implementation
	Non-members of VOI/CLB	day-to-day implementation of component 3	profile), and legitimate community representatives; access to grievance mechanism ensured.
Private Sector	Fish buyers and processors	At least annually in pilot sites, throughout project	Information through brochures, summary leaflets and WhatsApp groups; consultation through targeted dialogue and thematic workshops.
	Tourism operators		
Academia	Institut Halieutique et des Sciences Marines	At least annually, throughout project	Information via email and technical documentation; consultation through thematic workshops, scientific coordination meetings.
	National Universities and Research Centers		
Bilateral and Multilateral Partners	World Bank, KfW, AFD, and the EU	At least annually, throughout project	Information through brochures, summary leaflets; consultation through targeted dialogue and thematic workshops.

Inclusion Measures for Vulnerable Groups

The project acknowledges that certain social groups face structural barriers that may limit their effective participation in processes of information sharing, consultation, and decision-making. These include women, youth, migrant fishers, non-members of VOI/CLB, and persons with disabilities.

To ensure the active and equitable inclusion of these groups across all stakeholder engagement strategies, the project will adopt the following targeted measures:

- **Training of project staff:** Territorial and technical personnel will receive training in human rights-based approaches and gender sensitivity, to ensure respectful, empathetic, and culturally appropriate interaction with vulnerable individuals and groups.
- **Adaptation of communication channels:** The project will prioritize the use of simplified messages shared through posters, illustrated leaflets, and community meetings.
- **Identification of legitimate representatives:** In each pilot site, the project will identify trusted representatives of vulnerable groups, validated by their communities, who will act as intermediaries between project teams and their respective constituencies.
- **Adapted consultation formats:** Focus group discussions will be organized in safe and accessible spaces, at times compatible with domestic responsibilities. All content will be delivered in plain language, free of technical jargon, to promote understanding. Protection measures will be implemented to avoid any risk of backlash for participants, ensuring confidentiality of individuals raising concerns and using trusted facilitators.
- **Accessible grievance mechanisms:** The Grievance Mechanism will be adapted to ensure accessibility for groups with low literacy levels. The resolution of submitted grievances will be handled promptly, clearly, and transparently.

- **Targeted monitoring:** Throughout project implementation, periodic consultations will be conducted to assess their level of participation, satisfaction, and any remaining barriers. The findings will inform dynamic adjustments to engagement strategies.

6. Resources and Responsibilities

Stakeholder engagement activities will be coordinated by the Project Management Unit (PMU). The PMU will include a Gender and Safeguards Specialist, who will serve as the focal point for the implementation of the SEP. This specialist will ensure the planning, coordination, documentation, and follow-up of all stakeholder engagement processes. The position forms part of the project's overall safeguards framework, and its cost is already covered under the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) budget.

At the local level, stakeholder engagement will be conducted primarily by executing partners (mainly NGOs) embedded in the project's pilot sites. These teams, who are responsible for implementing technical activities in the field, will also act as community liaison staff. They will organize community consultations, disseminate project-related information through appropriate channels, maintain relationships with local authorities, and document community feedback. Their engagement-related work is fully integrated into the operational budgets of the component 3 and will be monitored and reported by executing partners to the PMU on a regular basis.

Workshops and consultation events—such as Steering Committee meetings, ministerial dialogues, LMMA governance workshops, and community assemblies—are also budgeted under the relevant technical components of the project (e.g. legal reform under Component 1, financing under Component 2, site-level implementation under Component 3, knowledge sharing under Component 4, monitoring activities under Component 5).

The only specific resources allocated to the implementation of the SEP cover:

- The design and production of stakeholder communication materials (e.g. brochures, illustrated leaflets, posters, and other context-appropriate formats);
- The training of field and technical staff in inclusive stakeholder engagement and gender sensitive and human rights-based facilitation techniques.

The indicative budget for these dedicated activities is estimated at USD 40,000 for the entire project duration. These resources will ensure that all stakeholders—especially the most vulnerable—are informed, consulted, and able to engage meaningfully with the project throughout implementation.

The WWF-US, as GEF Agency, is responsible for oversight. The MEDD, as Lead Executing Agency, is responsible for executing the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and overall compliance with the WWF Standard on Stakeholder Engagement.

7. Grievances Mechanism

The grievance redress mechanism (GRM) is designed to enable the receipt of complaints of affected women and men and public concerns regarding the environmental and social performance of the project. In short, the aim of the mechanism is to provide people fearing, or suffering, adverse impacts with the opportunity to be heard and assisted. It is designed to address the concerns of the community(ies) with a particular project, identify the root causes of the conflicts, and find options for the resolution of grievances. Therefore, it is an essential tool to foster good cooperation with project stakeholders and ensure adequate delivery of previously agreed-upon results.

This mechanism is designed to:

- Address potential breaches of WWF's policies and procedures;
- Be independent, transparent, and effective;
- Be accessible to project-affected people;
- Keep complainants abreast of progress of cases brought forward; and
- Maintain records on all cases and issues brought forward for review.

The PMU will be responsible for informing project-affected parties about the grievance mechanisms.

Contact information of the staff member responsible for the grievance mechanism in the PMU will be made publicly available.

Project-Level Grievance Mechanism

The grievance mechanism for this Category B project is designed to ensure that all stakeholders, including vulnerable groups, can express concerns related to the project and have them addressed in a transparent, timely, and culturally appropriate manner. This mechanism aligns with WWF's safeguard standards and is accessible to all stakeholders. The specificity of this project-level grievance mechanism will be determined through stakeholder consultations at the onset of the project implementation phase (within the first 6 months of project implementation), and will include the following steps:

Step 1- Reception of The Grievance: Grievances may be submitted through multiple channels to ensure accessibility, including: (i) Written submissions (email, letters) addressed to the Gender and Safeguards Specialist of the PMU; (ii) Verbal submissions during community meetings or consultations; (iii) A dedicated grievance hotline, to be activated no later than six months after project launch and maintained until six months after project closure; (iv) Local grievance boxes placed in strategic locations (discreet but accessible) in the pilot sites. Project staff and community representatives will serve as the initial points of contact for grievances.

Step 2 – Registration of the Grievance: Once received, the grievance will be relayed by the initial points of contact for grievances to the Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialist of the PMU, who will log it into a centralized grievance register. Sensitive grievances, particularly those involving SEAH or human rights violations, will be handled confidentially and securely. Acknowledgement will be provided to the complainant within seven (7) working days, verbally and in writing.

Step 3- Assessment and Categorization: Grievances will be assessed by the Gender and Safeguards Specialist of the PMU based on their nature (e.g., environmental, social, gender-based, or Indigenous Peoples-related) to determine whether it falls under the project's scope and is categorized for appropriate

resolution, considering three level of risk: (i) Low – straightforward and resolvable through simple action or clarification; (ii) Medium – requiring additional fact-finding or coordination; (ii) High – involving serious allegations such as discrimination, violence, legal breaches, or requiring urgent mitigation. Grievances related to sensitive issues, such as gender-based violence or SEAH (sexual exploitation, abuse, and harassment), will be handled with confidentiality and referred to specialized mechanisms or partners, to be determined within the first six months of project implementation.

Step 4- Resolution Process: The Gender and Safeguards Specialist prepares a draft response in coordination with technical staff, if required. Most grievances will be resolved at the community or project site level through dialogue between the complainant, local project team, and other relevant stakeholders. High-risk cases will be reviewed and validated by the Project Coordinator and could also engage a neutral third-party mediator to facilitate resolution in the most complex situation. All grievances should be addressed within 30 working days of receipt, unless the matter requires additional investigation. Resolutions will be communicated in a culturally appropriate manner (local language, oral or written). The complainant's confirmation of receipt and satisfaction will be requested. If the complainant is not satisfied, the case may be submitted to the WWF GEF Agency for further review.

Step 5- Closure and Documentation: Once resolved and any corrective measures completed, the grievance will be closed and archived with supporting documentation. All information will be recorded in the centralized grievance register.

Step 6 – Continuous Monitoring and Reporting: The following indicators will be monitored: (i) Total number of grievances received; (ii) Percentage resolved within the 30-day timeline; (iii) Number of cases escalated to the WWF GEF Agency. Grievances will be periodically analyzed to detect trends or systemic issues. An annual grievance report will be shared with stakeholders, anonymizing personal data where necessary.

WWF GEF Agency Grievance Mechanism

Project-affected communities and other interested stakeholders may raise a grievance at any time to the WWF GEF Agency. Contact information of the WWF GEF Agency will be made publicly available.

A grievance can be filed with the Project Complaints Officer (PCO), a WWF staff member fully independent from the WWF GEF Agency, who is responsible for the WWF Accountability and Grievance Mechanism and who can be reached at:

Email: SafeguardsComplaint@wwfus.org

Mailing address:

Project Complaints Officer Safeguards Complaints,
World Wildlife Fund
1250 24th Street NW
Washington, DC 20037

Complaints may be submitted in the Affected Party's native language and should include the following information:

- Complainant's name and contact information;

- If not filed directly by the complainant, proof that those representing the affected people have authority to do so;
- The specific project or program of concern;
- The harm that is or may be resulting from the project;
- The relevant Environmental and Social Safeguards policy or provision (if known);
- Any other relevant information or documents;
- Any actions taken so far to resolve the problem, including contacting WWF;
- Proposed solutions; and
- Whether confidentiality is requested (stating reasons).

The PCO will respond within 10 business days of receipt, and claims will be filed and included in project monitoring.

Stakeholders may also submit a complaint online or over the phone through an independent third-party platform at <https://secure.ethicspoint.eu/domain/media/mg/gui/113222/index.html>.

GEF Secretariat Conflict Resolution Mechanism

In addition to the project-level grievance mechanism and the WWF-GEF Agency mechanism, project-affected people and other stakeholders may also submit complaints to the GEF Secretariat's Conflict Resolution Commissioner. The Conflict Resolution Commissioner plays a facilitation role, independent of project implementation structures, and reports directly to the GEF CEO. Complaints may relate to potential non-compliance with GEF policies, perceived harm, mismanagement, or other unresolved issues affecting stakeholders in GEF-financed projects.

Complaints can be submitted in writing and in any language. At a minimum, they should include a general description of the concern, the nature of the harm (actual or potential), and the GEF-funded project or program in question. The Commissioner will confirm receipt, seek clarifications if needed, and refer complaints to the relevant GEF Agency mechanism when appropriate. Requests for confidentiality and anonymity will be respected.

Contact information:

Mr. Peter Lallas
GEF Conflict Resolution Commissioner

Email: plallas@thegef.org

Mailing address:

Global Environment Facility
The World Bank Group, MSN N8-800
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433-002

8. Monitoring and Reporting

Progress against the Stakeholder Engagement Plan will be monitored and reported on throughout implementation.

The following comprises the monitoring and reporting activities to be undertaken with respect to stakeholder engagement **by the PMU**:

- The SEP will be periodically reviewed and updated as necessary at an annual Reflection Workshop. The review will ensure that the list of project stakeholders and methods of engagement remain appropriate.
- Activities related to stakeholder engagement will be documented and reported by the PMU every 6 months in a Project Progress Report (as part of regular reporting). The project Results Framework and Annual Work Plan and Budget will track beneficiaries of the project and activities related to the Stakeholder Engagement Plan.
- Stakeholder Engagement activities and progress will be monitored through the following indicators:
 - GEF Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment
 - Indicator SEP 1: Number of government agencies, civil society organizations, private sector and other stakeholder groups that have been involved in the project implementation phase on an annual basis
 - Indicator SEP 2: Number of persons (sex disaggregated) that have been involved in project implementation phase (on an annual basis)
 - Indicator SEP 3: Number of engagements (e.g. meeting, workshops, consultations) with stakeholders during the project implementation phase (on an annual basis)

Stakeholder Engagement will be evaluated by **independent consultants** recruited for the project midterm and terminal evaluations.

The **WWF GEF Agency** will undertake annual supervision missions to ensure compliance, and report on progress against the Stakeholder Engagement Plan annually to the GEF through Project Implementation Reports.

Appendix 1: Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholder Type	Stakeholder Name	Interest/Involvement in the Project	Project Effect on Stakeholder / Stakeholder Influence on the Project
Government of Madagascar	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD)	Lead executing agency for the project; leads environmental governance, OECMs, and legal frameworks (GELOSE, TGRN)	Will guide legal reforms and national alignment; high policy influence
	Ministry of Fisheries and Blue Economy (MPEB)	Responsible for fisheries governance and TGRH implementation	Key to integrating fisheries co-management; high influence on marine planning
	DREDD/CEDD	Oversee TGRN contracts and support local enforcement	Will support site-level coordination; limited by capacity but critical locally (moderate influence)
	Local MPEB representatives	Coordinate TGRH oversight and local implementation	Important for operationalizing marine governance; moderate influence
	Mayors and Fokontany Chiefs	Validate Dina, mediate conflicts, and link communities with formal systems	Their legitimacy and coordination role is essential to anchoring LMMA governance
NGOs	WWF- Madagascar	Supports fisheries and mangrove co-management and community livelihoods	Supports local implementation and scaling of practices
	Blue Ventures	Supports fisheries co-management and community livelihoods	Supports local implementation and scaling of practices
	Conservation International	Engages in marine biodiversity protection	Contributes technical support and site-based collaboration
	WCS	Supports marine protected area co-management, Blue Belt initiatives, and community-based marine governance in key coastal regions	May contribute site-level experience and tools for co-management and species protection; potential synergies with ongoing marine programs
	MIHARI Network	National platform supporting LMMAs and coordination	Advocates for inclusive governance and federates local experience
	National conservation NGOs	Support community-based marine management through awareness raising, facilitation, capacity building, and ecological monitoring.	May support implementation at site level; contribute to sustainability and legitimacy of LMMA governance through ongoing local engagement.
Conservation Trust Funds	Tany Meva	Public-interest foundation supporting local CBOs and community projects	Will be strengthened to channel LMMA financing and support long-term sustainability

Stakeholder Type	Stakeholder Name	Interest/Involvement in the Project	Project Effect on Stakeholder / Stakeholder Influence on the Project
	FAPBM	Fiduciary Agent of the project, national biodiversity trust fund managing endowments and financing protected areas	Launching a pilot fund for LMMAs; key for long-term financing mechanisms
CBOs	VOIs / CLBs	Lead planning, enforcement, and restoration in TGRN zones	Directly implementation of site-level activities; high operational relevance
	TGRH Committees and Fisheries Cooperatives	Govern local fisheries and support registration, monitoring, planning	Key to LMMA functionality in marine zones; strong local influence
	Komity Mpanatanteraka Dina (KMD)	Enforce customary rules and resolve conflicts	Important for legitimacy and compliance; influence varies by site
Communities and Indigenous People	Men in coastal communities	Direct users of marine resources and mangrove systems; target group for co-management and livelihoods	Core to project success; Affected by access rules and restoration efforts; influence through informal systems
	Women in coastal communities	Actively involved in mangrove-based livelihoods (e.g. harvesting, processing, selling) and holders of knowledge on health of coastal resources, but structurally underrepresented in governance bodies.	Core to project success; project will enhance inclusion and leadership support; improving gender equity in decision-making
	Youth in coastal communities	Engaged in livelihoods but excluded from formal roles	Targeted for inclusion and leadership support (both male and female)
	Migrant fishers	Use local resources seasonally; often excluded from governance	Project will aim to integrate their voice into LMMA governance
	Non-members of VOI/CLB	Often excluded from decisions and access to project benefits	Project will support more inclusive governance mechanisms
Private Sector	Fish buyers and processors	Shape local fisheries value chains	Can support sustainable value chains and certification
	Tourism operators	Interest in sustainable use of marine areas	Potential partners for livelihood diversification
Academia	Institut Halieutique et des Sciences Marines (IH.SM)	Marine research, training, and data generation	Can support monitoring and inform adaptive management
	National Universities and Research Centers	Research on biodiversity, socio-ecological systems, and LMMA impacts	Support learning, policy dialogue, and knowledge sharing

Appendix 2: Systematic Documentation of Stakeholder Consultations

Date	Description of Consultation	Venue	Objective of the Consultation	Summary of Meeting Outcomes	Participants
3 June 2025	Meeting with Fokontany President of Antsatrana	Antsatrana, Diana	Understand local leadership perspective on LMMA governance and security issues	Identified weak formalization of LMMA, reliance on community control and Dina, concerns over conflicts with migrants	Fokontany President of Antsatrana
3 June 2025	Focus group with women community members	Antsatrana, Diana	Capture women's role in fisheries, natural resource use, and governance	Active in chevette harvesting and fish drying; excluded from decision-making; expressed desire for literacy and income-generating activities	8 women (chevette collectors, processors, vendors)
3 June 2025	Focus group with TGRN members (CLB)	Antsatrana, Diana	Assess structure and functioning of the TGRN and community patrolling	TGRN contract ends in 2026; issues with patroller motivation, security concerns, request for equipment and recognition	8 members (6 men, 2 women) of the CLB
3 June 2025	Focus group with TGRH members	Antsatrana, Diana	Understand fisheries management practices and enforcement issues under TGRH	TGRH members operate without patrol support; low enforcement capacity; need for refresher training and tools	5 male fishers active under TGRH agreement
3 June 2025	Focus group with men in mixed livelihoods	Antsatrana, Diana	Explore perceptions of marine resource degradation and LMMA governance	Identified declining fish stocks, lack of formal recognition of VOI, limited engagement of young men in governance structures	8 men from fishing, charcoal, and agriculture sectors
3 June 2025	Meeting with Chef de cantonnement forestier intérimaire	Ambilobe, Diana	Discuss institutional support to TGRN oversight and Dina enforcement	Acknowledged weak institutional monitoring; TGRN renewal capacity limited without project support	Vincent Ramanitrastrasana, Chef de cantonnement par intérim
4 June 2025	Meeting with Deputy Mayor of Ambilobe	Ambilobe, Diana	Assess commune involvement in LMMA governance and Dina validation	Commune largely uninvolved in LMMA management; requested improved coordination with VOI and patrollers	Deputy Mayor of Ambilobe
4 June 2025	Meeting with Chef du Fokontany of Ankazomborona	Ankazomborona, Diana	Understand local governance structures (TGRN, TGRH), resource	TGRN in place ~20 years, TGRH since 2022. Strong forest protection, local ownership.	Chef du Fokontany of Ankazomborona

Date	Description of Consultation	Venue	Objective of the Consultation	Summary of Meeting Outcomes	Participants
			use, conflicts, and priority needs	Good coordination between Fokontany; needs: patrol boat, training.	
4 June 2025	Focus group with CLB members	Ankazomborona, Diana	Understand CLB structure, governance, benefits, and local development priorities	CLB active since 2011; 835 members; manages funds from tourism, usage rights; uses money for social needs; requests: tourism development, CLB office, hospital, women's GEC space	8 CLB members (6 women, 2 men incl. CLB president)
4 June 2025	Discussion with tourism site agent	Ankazomborona, Diana	Understand local tourism dynamics and visitor trends	Tourism site open since late 2023; 200+ visitors to date; visitors do not stay overnight; language barrier noted; 20 local guides available	Tourism site agent
4 June 2025	Focus group with TGRH members	Ankazomborona, Diana	Understand TGRH structure, fishing practices, and governance challenges	TGRH created in 2021; covers 3 fokontany; informal mareyeur system widespread; surveillance limited; declining catches; group supports idea of credit-based gear access	7 members (4 men, 3 women incl. president and VP)
4 June 2025	Focus group with men in fisheries and mixed livelihoods	Ankazomborona, Diana	Explore fishing practices, governance participation, and rule compliance	Low gear ownership; reliance on mareyeurs; limited compliance with rules due to unmet equipment needs; some are in co-ops and savings groups; seasonal migrants present; conflict resolution via local structures	8 male fishers (5 CLB, 4 co-op members, 3 in savings groups)
4 June 2025	Focus group with women community members	Ankazomborona, Diana	Understand women's roles in fisheries, commerce, and governance	Active in chevette fishing (Dec–Mar) and commerce; 4 in CLB, contribute to mangrove restoration; prefer separate discussions; concerns on health and social impacts of seasonal migration	7 women (fishers, vendors, artisan)

Date	Description of Consultation	Venue	Objective of the Consultation	Summary of Meeting Outcomes	Participants
4 June 2025	Debrief meeting with WWF Ambilobe	Ambilobe, Diana	Review WWF interventions and explore synergies with GBFF project	WWF supports 20 fokontany via TGRN/TGRH, value chains, and social safeguards; needs: long-term funding, inclusion, 14 TGRN unfunded including 3 visited	Antonio (Conservation Lead), Odilon (Development/Partnerships Lead)
5 June 2025	Meeting with district fisheries authorities	Angodorofo, Diana	Discuss fisheries card system, enforcement issues, and TGRH implementation	Post-Swiofish 2 support focused on fisher registration and illegal gear; TGRH enforcement weak due to fear of retaliation and corruption; sanctions under TGRH seen as ineffective	District Heads of Fisheries Statistics and Inland Fisheries
5 June 2025	Focus group with CLB members	Angodorofo, Diana	Assess CLB functioning, mangrove restoration, and local livelihoods	CLB contributes to mangrove recovery and flood protection; daily crab fishing, charcoal making, and occasional aquaculture; requests: better patrol gear, durable boats, kitchen equipment	8 CLB members (2 women, 6 men incl. president and treasurer)
5 June 2025	Discussion with female crab trader	Angodorofo, Diana	Understand crab marketing chains and female involvement in value chains	Operates small grocery and crab trade; supplies Ambanja, Ambilobe, Diego markets; uses bush taxis or travels with large shipments; collaborates with multiple vendors	Female crab trader from Marmokoto
5 June 2025	Focus group with farmers	Angodorofo, Diana	Understand farming systems, constraints, and alternative livelihoods	Rice production insufficient; climate change impacts noted; irrigation and aquaculture hindered by lack of water; raphia handicrafts face market barriers; apiculture abandoned due to lack of follow-up	9 farmers (5 women, 4 men; 4 CLB members)
5 June 2025	Joint meeting with Chef du Fokontany and CLB President	Angodorofo, Diana	Understand local leadership roles, governance structure, and past support from WWF	Longstanding TGRN (since 2004); police collaboration praised; mangrove protection improving; past support from WWF	Chef du Fokontany (since 2012), CLB President (since 2019)

Date	Description of Consultation	Venue	Objective of the Consultation	Summary of Meeting Outcomes	Participants
				appreciated; request for renewed disaster response support	
5 June 2025	Focus group with women community members	Angodorofo, Diana	Understand women's roles in agriculture, fishing, commerce, and governance	Women involved in farming, small trade, light fishing; limited knowledge of CLB and TGRN; prefer small group settings for expression; face barriers to capital and labor; request support for agriculture and business	8 women (farmers, vendors, crab traders)
5 June 2025	Focus group with male community members	Angodorofo, Diana	Explore transitions away from fishing, conservation roles, and community-based governance	Most stopped fishing due to accidents or effort; active in farming, apiculture, charcoal, and CLB; TGRN improves mangrove protection; conflicts managed via CLB/KMD; needs: water access for aquaculture, support for apiculture and pisciculture, processing facilities, improved fishing gear	8 men (farmers, charcoal makers, former fishers; 4 CLB members)
6 June 2025	Meeting with Chef du Fokontany	Befasy, Mahafaly	Understand LMMA structure, governance, and needs in Befasy	LMMA Riaka Mahavelo established by local election; community-based management with Dina enforcement; key activities: octopus reserves, seaweed farming, fisheries coop; needs: funding for alternative livelihoods and better farmer engagement	Chef du Fokontany of Befasy
6 June 2025	Focus group with male fishers	Befasy, Mahafaly	Understand LMMA fishing practices, techniques, and governance impacts	Fishers use spearfishing and nets near Befasy; improved catches since LMMA setup; fewer destructive practices; key species: tuna, squid, octopus; decisions made by community	Male fishers (members of LMMA Riaka Mahavelo)

Date	Description of Consultation	Venue	Objective of the Consultation	Summary of Meeting Outcomes	Participants
				assembly; support received from WWF and partners	
6 June 2025	Focus group with farmers turned fishers (VOI members)	Befasy, Mahafaly	Understand shift from agriculture to fishing and VOI involvement	Former farmers now rely on fishing due to drought; VOI membership tied to LMMA rights/responsibilities; little distinction from non-members; no contact with other VOIs; women handle local product sales	Mixed group of VOI members (men and women)
6 June 2025	Focus group with women community members	Befasy, Mahafaly	Understand women's roles in fisheries, governance, and LMMA impacts	Women manage household and fish trade; support capture monitoring and AGRs; LMMA improved catches and reduced illegal fishing; call for gender equality training and support for women's businesses	12 women (fishers, vendors, weavers, farmers)
6 June 2025	Focus group with men active in LMMA governance	Befasy, Mahafaly	Understand LMMA impacts, participation, and conflict resolution mechanisms	LMMA created in 2007 with Dina; improved catches, reduced illegal fishing; restrictions accepted by most; participation gaps noted; need for funding for alternative livelihoods, Dina enforcement, and patrol equipment	Male VOI members involved in LMMA management
6 June 2025	Meeting with the Mayor of Anakao Commune	Anakao	Understand the commune's involvement in LMMA management, community perceptions, and socio-environmental dynamics	Support of LMMAs and recognition of benefits; LMMA management seen as legitimate and effective. Recommendations: LMMA expansion, support for IGAs	Mayor of Anakao Commune
7 June 2025	Interview with the President of Itampolo Fokontany	Itampolo	Understand the involvement of the fokontany in LMMA governance and identify	Fokontany not involved in LMMA establishment. No knowledge about members, activities, or financing of the VOI. Suggests better	President of the Itampolo Fokontany

Date	Description of Consultation	Venue	Objective of the Consultation	Summary of Meeting Outcomes	Participants
			potential gaps in coordination	collaboration between LMMA and local authorities.	
7 June 2025	Focus groups with fishers (LMMA members and non-members)	Itampolo	Understand fishing practices, resource management, and LMMA perceptions	Fishers operate within fokontany limits; use spearguns, nets, foot fishing; catch varies by season; LMMA improved income and cohesion; WWF support appreciated	Mixed group of male and female fishers
7 June 2025	Meeting with Mayor of Itampolo	Itampolo	Understand commune's role in LMMA management and community development needs	Mayor not involved in LMMA; supports traditional conflict resolution; sees LMMA as legitimate; requests stronger commune collaboration, information on LMMAs and development support (AGRs)	Mayor of Itampolo
7 June 2025	Focus group with men active in LMMA management	Itampolo	Understand LMMA impacts, participation, and perceptions of restrictions and risks	LMMA since 2007; promotes cohesion and resource-based livelihoods; benefits include increased income, diversification (e.g. ice sales), coral culture; restrictions accepted; non-fishers less engaged	Men active in LMMA management
7 June 2025	Focus group with women	Itampolo	Understand gender roles, LMMA impacts, participation, restrictions, and support needs	Women lead household tasks and income activities (ice, fish trade); LMMA increased production (from 3kg to 7–8kg); restrictions seen as fair; women involved in some decisions; request support for economic autonomy and better participation in LMMA	Women from the community
7 June 2025	Meeting with chef du Fokontany	Lanirano	Understand VOI structure, governance, and collaboration with local authorities	LMMA seen as nepotistic and exclusionary; conflict with Vavalinta group; no collaboration with current fokontany chief; WWF funding;	Fokontany president of Lanirano

Date	Description of Consultation	Venue	Objective of the Consultation	Summary of Meeting Outcomes	Participants
				nature protection through Dina; request greater involvement of fokontany	
7 June 2025	Meeting with the Mayor	Lanirano	Understand commune's role and knowledge of LMMA governance and collaboration	Commune not involved in LMMA; mayor uninformed about contracts or activities; meetings reportedly held without commune; WWF funding mentioned; request for stronger commune-LMMA collaboration	Mayor of Lanirano
7 June 2025	Focus group with fishers (LMMA members and non-members)	Lanirano	Gather perceptions on LMMA functioning, resource use, and impacts on livelihoods	Members of LMMA Hery Mitambatra; fishers target fish, octopus, crab, squid; men catch 10kg, women 2kg per trip; use family pirogues; improved catches and income since LMMA; decisions by committee and assembly; illegal practices reduced	Fishers (men and women), LMMA members and non-members
7 June 2025	Focus group with farmers turned fishers – VOI members (mixed group)	Lanirano	Understand livelihood diversification, VOI participation, and constraints	Members rely on both farming and fishing; low agricultural yield due to drought; fishing provides better income; women handle sales; LMMA membership grants access rights and decision-making; WWF provides support	Farmers turned fishers (men and women)
7 June 2025	Discussion with men active in LMMA management	Lanirano	Understand LMMA governance, participation, and challenges	LMMA created in 2007; enables community management of marine resources; key benefit: increased catches (women ~3kg, men ~10kg); generates income and supports fisher-farmers; restrictions accepted and seen as necessary; conflicts resolved	Men actively involved in LMMA Hery Mitambatra

Date	Description of Consultation	Venue	Objective of the Consultation	Summary of Meeting Outcomes	Participants
				via traditional/community mechanisms; call to involve more non-members	
7 June 2025	Focus group with women community members	Lanirano	Understand gender roles, participation in LMMA, and perceptions on natural resource mgmt.	Women manage households, trade fish; men lead community decisions; limited female presence in meetings; support LMMA goals; seek financial support for fish processing	Women community members of Lanirano
8 June 2025	Meeting with Chef du Fokontany	Kimony, Menabe	Understand VOI functioning and local enforcement dynamics	VOI counts ~60 active members; awareness raised across 4 villages; mangrove cover recovering; local patrols reduce illegal wood cutting; sanctions focus on replanting rather than fines	Chef du Fokontany of Kimony
8 June 2025	Focus group with VOI members	Kimony, Menabe	Explore VOI structure, roles, and challenges in governance and enforcement	VOI unclear on TGRN details; fishing is main activity; police nala lack boats, resources, and compensation; wood-cutting rules unclear; reforestation involves whole community; low VOI engagement; presence of GECs for women	9 VOI members (3 women, 6 men incl. VP, treasurer, 5 police nala)
8 June 2025	Additional exchange with Chef du Fokontany (and WWF)	Kimony, Menabe	Clarify VOI responsibilities, enforcement challenges, and past project experiences	Police nala verify protected species and gear but lack means; external crab fishing during closures an issue; past USAID project (GPPM/MAIKAJY) no longer active; reforestation funded by DREDD/WWF but slow; inter-village pressure linked to irrigation challenges	Chef du Fokontany of Kimony, Tojo (WWF)
8 June 2025	Focus group with women community members	Kimony, Menabe	Understand women's roles in fisheries, commerce, and natural resource use	All engage in fish trade; limited fishing by women due to fear of crabs and patrols; VOI is gender-	11 women (fish vendors, basket weavers, poultry keepers)

Date	Description of Consultation	Venue	Objective of the Consultation	Summary of Meeting Outcomes	Participants
				balanced; issues include water access, lack of electricity, low literacy; need support for product valorization and language skills	
9 June 2025	Focus group with VOI members	Kivalo, Menabe	Understand fisheries, VOI functioning, and youth/livelihood dynamics	Fishing is main activity; concerns over Chinese vessels and mangrove degradation; VOI active since 2005; patrols limited; strong need for gear and youth support; product sold fresh or dried; reforestation shared with neighboring fokontany	13 VOI members (10 men, 3 women), later joined by Chef du Fokontany
9 June 2025	Meeting with Chef du Fokontany	Kivalo, Menabe	Discuss governance challenges, social dynamics, and environmental change	Long-serving president (since 1998); appreciates VOI support; rising sea levels, destructive gear, and off-shore trawlers noted; social issues include domestic violence and youth conflict with Mangily	Chef du Fokontany of Kivalo
9 June 2025	Focus group with ecotourism group (women)	Kivalo, Menabe	Understand women's roles in local ecotourism and challenges faced	Group includes cooks and hostesses; trained in 2017/2019; 360 visitors in 2024 but no overnight stays; infrastructure and training gaps noted; request for water access and more autonomy	9 women (3 hostesses, 6 cooks incl. group leader)
9 June 2025	Focus group with women community members	Kivalo, Menabe	Understand women's roles in fishing, agriculture, crafts, and local governance	Women farm, fish, and sell baskets and fish; lack equipment, funds, and market access; participate in mangrove reforestation; no major conflicts; express interest in ecotourism and need training	12 women (fishers, farmers, vendors, basket weavers)

Date	Description of Consultation	Venue	Objective of the Consultation	Summary of Meeting Outcomes	Participants
10 June 2025	Meeting with interim fisheries administration	Morondava, Menabe	Understand regional fisheries administration's role and data availability	Not familiar with LMMAs; confirms WWF presence in the region; regional fisheries statistics available up to 2023	Acting Head of Administration and Finance, Regional Fisheries Office
10 June 2025	Meeting with Mayor of Bemanonga	Morondava, Menabe	Discuss local governance, fisheries dependence, and development needs	Commune relies on fishing; needs support for reforestation, gear, education, irrigation, and potable water; rice production down due to Dabara dam issues; concerned about Chinese trawlers	Marie, Mayor of Bemanonga (2nd term)
10 June 2025	Meeting with Tany Meva	Antananarivo	Present the project and collect data on Tany Meva's work and institutional framework	Insights on Tany Meva's strategic plan, operational methods, funding criteria, initiatives, and interest in GBFF project	Hariliva RASOANARIVO (Executive Director)
11 June 2025	Meeting with Mihari Network	Antananarivo	Present the project and collect data on Mihari Network's work and institutional framework	Insights on strategic plan, LMMA support challenges, partner initiatives, and interest in GBFF project	Guy Célestin RAKOTOVAO (Executive Secretary), Jean-Michel HERINAIVO (Partnership and Fundraising Manager)
11 June 2025	Meeting with FAPBM	Antananarivo	Present the project and gather data on FAPBM's activities and interest in LMMAs	Insights on pilot LMMA fund, collaboration opportunities, and requirements for long-term funding	Rija RANAIVOARISON (Executive Director)
11 June 2025	Meeting with MEDD	Antananarivo	Finalize consultation workshop and explore GEF-6 synergies	Insights on GELOSE law renewal, OECM decree, legal analysis, and GBFF-GEF-6 synergies	Fara Mihanta ANDRIAMBELO (Technical Support Staff, DGGE/MEDD)
11 June 2025	Meeting with WWF-Madagascar/GEF-6	Antananarivo	Present the project and collect data on GEF-6 results and synergies	Insights on GEF-6 challenges, key results (KBAs, OECMs, MPAs), and project synergies	Remi RATSIMBAZAFY (Senior Marine Biodiversity Officer)
8 July 2025	Meeting with WWF-Madagascar team on	Online	Collect information on innovative financial mechanisms being	Overview of the Marine Biodiversity Resilience Fund with 3 facilities (endowment,	Domoina RAKOTOMALALA Henitsoa RAZAFINDRAKOTO

Date	Description of Consultation	Venue	Objective of the Consultation	Summary of Meeting Outcomes	Participants
	Innovative financing mechanisms		developed by WWF Madagascar and explore synergies with the GBFF project	guarantee, technical assistance); pilot with FAPBM starting Aug 2025; key challenges: community fund access, legal framework, need for LMMA capacity-building and financial inclusion	Santatra RAZAFINDRATSIMBA
9 July 2025	Meeting with Ministry of Fisheries and Blue Economy	Online	Present project design and collect feedback on legal, technical and planning aspects related to fisheries and LMMA governance	Legal framework for LMMAs still lacking; TGRH seen as workable basis; strong regional disparities (PAP/TGRH status); need for updated PAPs; emphasis on aquaculture, marine spatial planning and surveillance; weak capacity of regional committees; call for financial/logistical support for CSS and inclusion of migrants in TGRH rules	Director of Fisheries and Aquaculture, Head of Small-scale Fisheries, Director of Blue Economy, Eric Liva RAJAONARY (Environment), Domoina RAKOTOMALALA (WWF)
10 July 2025	Meeting with Blue Ventures	Online	Understand BV's financing approach, work with LMMAs, and explore synergies with GBFF	BV supports legal and functional LMMAs via direct community funding and capacity-building; key mechanism: Frontline Community Fund (grants, training, due diligence); interest in aligning with GBFF to secure rights, ensure financial inclusion, and support community autonomy	Naly Rakotoarivony (Head of Partnership Network of Blue Ventures)
11 July 2025	Meeting with WCS	Online	Discuss WCS' approach to AMP/LMMA management, identify potential synergies with GBFF, and share lessons from co-management	WCS shared experience with AMP and LMMA co-management, local governance tools, and Blue Belt initiatives; discussed funding models (grants, community reserves), integration of CITES species protection, and potential pilot	Ravaka Ranaivoson, Lanto Andriamampianina (WCS); Domoina Rakotomalala (WWF)

Date	Description of Consultation	Venue	Objective of the Consultation	Summary of Meeting Outcomes	Participants
				sites; strong interest in synergies with GBFF	
16 July 2025	Meeting with CI Madagascar	Online	Understand CI's approach to marine conservation and LMMA-AMP integration, and explore synergies with GBFF	CI presented its co-management model in the SitBe corridor (16 LMMAs), experiences with community platforms, alternative livelihoods, and challenges related to legal status and sustainable financing; alignment with GEF-6 AMP and interest in GBFF synergies	Luciano Andriamaro (Science and Knowledge Department Director, CI); Domoina Rakotomalala (WWF)