



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

GEF ID:	<b>9836</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Mauritius</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management and Biodiversity Conservation in the Republic of Mauritius</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>6005 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Land Degradation</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>LD-3 Program 4;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$50,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,699,204</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$6,600,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$8,299,204</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jean-Marc Sinnassamy</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Penny Stock</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	Not fully. The alignment with the LD3 Objective and the Program 4 should be revised and reinforced. The project, as written, seems to significantly focus on forest and forest protection, and not the other production landscapes, such as agriculture and pastoral lands. This should be revised and balanced as 1) 43% of the land area in Mauritius is	

<sup>1</sup> 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>agriculture (and 25% forests) and 2) the proposed landscape approach should address the needs and enable a balance amongst competing land uses while fulfilling ecosystem services and livelihoods.</p> <p>As described, the project is too forest oriented, to restore and protect some forests, with SLM on the margins, and less so a LD project using the landscape approach. Please, clarify.</p> <p>Are thematic maps available? They would help to identify the land uses, the landscapes of focus of the project, and the protected areas. They may assist with clarifying the points above.</p> <p>Part I: the project is announced as a MFA project, please correct: it is LD project.</p> <p>March 17, 2018 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>Not fully.</p> <p>- A reference is made to the GEF/UNDP MSP (PIMS 3092) which supported capacity building and a draft NAP. However the project does not make reference to the UNEP/GEF enabling activities (#5136) which supported the alignment of the NAP with the 10yr strategy and the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>reporting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A reference should also be made to the IUCN/GEF LDN Target setting project (#9365), as Mauritius is one of the countries who volunteered for LDN.</li> <li>- Please, correct the information p.8: the support to set up the LDN targets is not provided by the GM only, but through a GEF/IUCN project (we are not aware, but interested to know more about the support provided by UNDP on this topic).</li> <li>- Please, be informed that a new project for enabling activities will be developed in 2017 with UNEP to align the NAP with the upcoming long term UNCDD strategy (2030) and the SDGs, especially the target 15.3 on LDN.</li> </ul> <p>March 17, 2018 Addressed.</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The drivers have been adequately explained.</li> <li>- Sustainability is not sufficiently addressed. This needs to be considered in various components of the project related to policy and institutional framework, addressing the causes of degradation in the river</li> </ul>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>reserve, training, maintenance of the land information system.</p> <p>March 17, 2018 Addressed.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>However, please indicate the added value of the GEF project in relation to the other projects listed in the baseline scenario, as well as those listed in the Coordination section. Are there linkages in terms of activities and geographic proximity within the landscape of focus for this project.</p> <p>March 17, 2018 Addressed.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>- GEB: Table F, Corporate Result 2 on carbon: we should read only one figure. Please, correct</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Given the focus on the landscape approach, what are the land uses and who are the land users that will be consulted in the strengthening of the policy and institutional framework and involved in the assessment of suitable incentives.</li> <li>- Explain the sustainability aspects of the different proposed tools (WOCAT and others).</li> </ul> <p>Output 1.1.1: - Because of the other</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>activities financed under the EA and the LDN target setting project (see item 2), it is difficult to support the output 1.1.1 and the work related to the NAP. Please, refer to the existing EA, contact IUCN, the GM, and UNEP, and update the information.</p> <p>- However, we understand that the resources are limited through the EA: additional activities to support LDN target setting are welcome. Be more specific, confirm there is no duplication of efforts, and define complementary activities.</p> <p>Output 1.1.2: the formulation is not a not an output (it is more an outcome). We do not understand the activities that are financed under this output (cf. explanations p10). Be more specific. Provide metrics to reflect the costs (number of training, number of beneficiaries, for instance). But "promotion of SLM", "stronger system for coordination", "Intersectoral collaboration", "strengthen current provisions" are not acceptable formulation for activities. Please, revise.</p> <p>Output 1.1.3: Yes. the assessment and adoption of monetary incentives is much welcome.</p> <p>Output 1.1.4: Please, confirm that the tools and methods will be compatible with the LDN system.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Component 2: the implementation of SLM on the ground is obviously much welcome. Please, confirm that the ultimate objective of all these activities under the component 2 is to sustainably manage production systems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We have the impression that "protection" and especially "forest protection" activities are preponderant. It should not be the case for a SLM project. Please, rebalance the wording and the activities (mainly output 2.1.2., but also 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.1.6, 2.1.7), and confirm.</li> <li>- SLM is present in the outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.6. The others are protection and forest oriented. cf previous point. Please rebalance.</li> <li>- Output 2.1.5: Why a focus on Climate Smart Agriculture and exclusion of other SLM technologies?</li> <li>- Output 2.1.6: Please, provide further details on the training that will be provided, the target group, the kind of training (in town or on site), the way the Civil Society will be involved, how the results will be sustainable? and how the institutions will be involved for sustainability (agriculture)?</li> <li>- Is the sector agriculture a root cause</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>of land degradation? What kind of activities are proposed to correct land degradation from the agriculture sector around the River reserves?</p> <p>March 17, 2018 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>Not fully.</p> <p>- Please complete the section with information on the farmers, their organizations, the land uses, the land users, and how they will be impacted by the project.</p> <p>- Gender issues are mentioned. However, during the PPG, please consider gender issues as a possible source of inequality between men and women and, if appropriate, reflect these issues in the result framework and the project document (access to land, access to property, access to business, etc).</p> <p>March 17, 2018 Point taken.</p>	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	<p>7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		
		<p>The project grant + PPG + fees = \$1,915,378</p> <p>Remaining STAR allocations: \$1,915,378</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Cleared.</p> <p>However, approval of PIFs at the end of the replenishment period depends on the overall availability of the trust fund and cannot be guaranteed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>As said above, approval of PIFs at the end of the replenishment period depends on the overall availability of the trust fund and cannot be guaranteed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>Thanks for the submission of this project. The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please, address comments above.</p> <p>March 17, 2018 All points have been addressed and the PIF is ready for clearance. However, the fee amount in the Part 1 is wrong. Please, correct.</p> <p>March 20, 2018 A revised PIF was submitted. All points are now addressed. The PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	



<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	June 07, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 17, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	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)		

## CEO endorsement Review

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

<sup>3</sup> 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.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)		