



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9553		
Country/Region:	Mauritius		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming IAS Prevention, Control and Management		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5503 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$130,000	Project Grant:	\$3,888,265
Co-financing:	\$17,003,000	Total Project Cost:	\$20,891,265
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Cyrille Barnerias	Agency Contact Person:	Phemo Kgomotso

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	August 02nd 2016 Yes it is aligned with BD 1.1 by improving Effective Management of the National Ecological Infrastructure and BD 2.4 by strengthening the capacity to prevent, control and manage IAS. The project is intended to address 13 Aichi targets well detailed in annex1. Please provide the SMART indicators in the PIF.	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>September 6, 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SMART indicators will be provided at the end of the PPG phase. - As the overall objective of the project, as well as all components are related to the IAS issue, please put all GEF financing under the IAS program in table A (BD2-Program4). <p>September 12th, 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Comment addressed 	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>August 02nd 2016</p> <p>Yes it is consistent with the NEP (p41), NBSAP (p11) and NIASS</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>August 02nd 2016</p> <p>Main drivers are identified: IAS, CC, LD&C</p> <p>Is internalization of IAS considerations into daily operations the only way to insure the sustainability of the project? Please provide more details on how you plan to insure the sustainability of the project. For example, how the Apex Agency will be financed after the end of the project.</p> <p>Please ensure also to show how the project intends to address Market transformation and innovation. Regarding innovation, how the</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>project plans to include a participatory monitoring network could be all the more innovative if using Apps or others means of communication.</p> <p>September 6, 2016 Comments addressed</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>August 03rd 2016</p> <p>Yes, as it intends to go further compared to the current situation by making sure that IAS will be included in all relevant policies and legislative texts, focusing on some species and areas of greater importance and insuring a complete KM set and communication tools.</p> <p>- Please add a reference to the GEF project 3526 "Expanding Coverage and Strengthening Management Effectiveness of the Protected Area Network on the Island of Mauritius" in the baseline and also use the MTE to build on lessons learned (cost of IAS removal, capacity development, procedures lengths ...)</p> <p>- Among the risks, isn't there some regarding the possibility to modify laws and policies and also to create a</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>PA as proposed for Mourouk Valley (ie administrative and political lengths)? Please indicate how the present project will address issues noted in the GEF-UNDP 3526 project MTE (for example on page vi: "The poor implementation of cumbersome procurement procedures by the Ministry of Agro-industry and Food Security has resulted in significant delays to the Project. Insufficient oversight led by the Ministry has allowed these problems to continue unchecked.").</p> <p>- Please also indicate how the project plans to avoid issues listed para 19 (page 11 and 12) of the GEF-UNDP 3526 project MTE.</p> <p>September 6, 2016 Comments addressed.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>August 2nd 2016 Yes, with a few comments:</p> <p>- Please provide a general planning for the different components and Outputs but especially for the policy and legislative aspects that may have consequences on downstream elements of the project.</p> <p>- Do you plan also to document the methods and results of IAS removals</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>and also to have a minimal protocol to evaluate the impacts of these actions? If yes, please indicate it in the PIF. If not, it could be good.</p> <p>- Could you please provide further details on how you plan to support local community participation and local management of Pas (2.2.2 p3)?</p> <p>- Is the protection status of Flat and Gabriel Islands enough to allow biosecurity measures to be taken? Wouldn't it be interesting to take advantage of this project to change the status of these islands if needed?</p> <p>September 6, 2016 - Comments addressed - The planning will be elaborated during the PPG phase</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>July 11th 2016 Yes. Regarding Gender and social aspects an assessment will be conducted during the PPG and a plan established. (p13-14)</p>	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	Yes	
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>August 2nd 2016 No, The project is not recommended for clearance. Please address the issues identified in the previous comments.</p> <p>September 6, 2016 No, there is just a need for a small change in table A.</p> <p>September 12, 2016 Yes, the project is recommended for clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	August 02, 2016	August 23, 2016
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 07, 2016	September 12, 2016
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 12, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.