



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Mainstreaming biodiversity into the management of the coastal zone in the Republic of Mauritius			
Country(ies):	Mauritius	GEF Project ID:	5514
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4843
Other Executing Partner(s):	Mauritius Oceanography Institute (MOI) in collaboration with Rodrigues Regional Assembly and national entities in charge of environment, fisheries, tourism, agriculture and physical development	Re-submission Date:	January 11, 2016
EF Focal Area (s):	Multi-focal Areas	Project Duration (Months):	60
Name of parent program:	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	443,129.50

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
BD 2: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors	2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation. 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks.	1. Policies and regulatory frameworks (number = 1) for production sectors. 2. National and sub-national land-use plans (number = 2) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation. 3. Certified production landscapes and seascapes (hectares tbd).	GEF TF	1,815,132	9,031,838
BD 1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems	1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.	1. New protected areas (number tbd) and coverage (hectares tbd) of unprotected ecosystems.	GEF TF	2,103,133	6,720,839
LD 3: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape	3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities	3.1 Integrated land management plans developed and implemented	GEF TF	746,256	1,386,500
Total Project Costs				4,664,521	17,139,177

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

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

Project Component	Grant Type ¹	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Co-financing (\$)
1) Landscape-level planning and sectoral mainstreaming	TA	Threats to biodiversity and ecosystem function are addressed by ensuring that 27,000 ha marine and coastal Environmentally Sensitive Areas are an integral part of planning and implementation mechanisms relating to coastal development and the tourism sector – <i>thus measured</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of coastal and marine ESAs under improved management or conservation status from 4,696 ha to 27,000 ha Policy effectiveness of ESA categorization in key planning and decision making processes pertaining to coastal and marine areas 	<p>1.1 Information necessary for marine and coastal biodiversity mainstreaming is made available and capacity for knowledge management is developed by making the ESA study and other relevant information available</p> <p>1.2 ESAs are mainstreamed into physical development and ICZM planning processes, through the provision of guidance and support to ongoing activities and by demonstrating appropriate approaches through implementation of ICZM plans for Rodrigues and one District on Mauritius</p> <p>1.3 Standards and a certification system developed for the tourism sector that facilitates the mainstreaming of the management of marine and coastal biodiversity into their operations</p>	GEF TF	1,704,000	8,024,375
2) Integration of MPA management into the wider landscapes	TA	Threats to marine and coastal biodiversity are mitigated and fishery resources protected in at least 20,000 ha of seascapes, through the improved management of MPAs and no-take zones – <i>thus measured</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> METT Scores for the 5 METT sites impacted by the project increase from an average of 48% to at least 60% 	<p>2.1 Management effectiveness of the MPA network is improved through management planning where required, and through the introduction of operations and business planning, and improved surveillance and enforcement</p> <p>2.2 An investment framework for MPAs is developed and contributes to improved financial sustainability of the MPA sub-system</p>	GEF TF	1,992,000	5,713,375
3) Erosion control in sensitive areas	TA	Erosion control and ecosystem services restoration: erosion and soil loss are reduced in 200ha of erosion-prone water sheds; and ecosystem services are restored in 100 ha of coastal wetlands – <i>thus measured</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area under SLM from 0ha to approx. 300ha 	<p>3.1 Sustainable land management (SLM) techniques are applied to control erosion and water course sedimentation in the SEMPA watershed, with a focus on Rivière-Coco</p> <p>3.2 Essential ecosystem services are restored in coastal wetlands (e.g. water filtration, storage and flood control services, habitat and recreation)</p>	GEF TF	746,256	1,386,500
Subtotal					4,442,256	15,124,250
Project Management Cost (PMC)				GEF TF	222,265	2,014,927
Total Project Cost					4,664,521	17,139,177

¹ TA includes capacity building, and research and development.

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

Please include letters confirming co-financing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing Amount (\$)
National Government	Mauritius Oceanography Institute (MOI)	In-kind	1,832,208
National Government	Ministry of Ocean Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries, Shipping and Outer Islands (MOEMRFSOI)	In-kind	1,626,000
National Government	National Coast Guard (NCG)	In-kind	430,000
National Government	Ministry of Environment, Sustainable Development, Disaster and Beach Management (MOESDDBM)	In-kind	1,326,000
National Government	Ministry of Agro Industry and Food Security (MOAFS)	In-kind	1,288,000
National Government	Ministry of Tourism and External Communications (MOTEC)	In-kind	1,884,000
National Government	Ministry of Gender Equality, Child Development & Family Welfare (MGECDFW)	In-kind	6,000
Local Government	Rodrigues Regional Assembly (RRA)	In-kind	1,000,000
CSO	Reef Conservation Mauritius	In-kind	152,969
CSO	Mauritius Marine Conservation Society	In-kind	120,000
CSO	EcoSud	In-kind	444,000
CSO	Mauritian Wildlife Foundation	In-kind	3,900,000
CSO	University of Mauritius	In-kind	2,490,000
CSO	Shoals Rodrigues	In-kind	150,000
Private Sector	AHRIM – Hotels and Restaurants Association	In-kind	15,000
Private Sector	Rogers & Company Ltd	In-kind	405,000
GEF Agency	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Cash	70,000
Total Co-financing			17,139,177

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

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/Global	Grant Amount(\$) (a)	Agency Fee (\$) (b) ²	Total (\$) c=a+b
UNDP	GEF Trust Fund	Biodiversity	Mauritius	3,918,265	372235.20	4,290,500.20
UNDP	GEF Trust Fund	Land Degradation	Mauritius	746256	70,894.30	817,150.30
Total Grant Resources				4,664,521	443,129.50	5,107,650.50

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	870,000	1,713,918	2,583,918
National/Local Consultants	552,000	5,998,712	6,550,712

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

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

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

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

Table 1: Changes from the PIF

Original project design in PIF	Adjustment/improvement made at CEO Endorsement
<u>Landscape/seascape approach:</u> The PIF proposed that the project should develop plans for 6 landscapes/seascapes which were broadly defined as areas important for ESAs.	<p>During the PPG research, it became evident that this approach might not be so appropriate for the comparatively small islands involved, where there is close connectivity across all ecosystems. It also became apparent that a wide range of coastal planning initiatives are underway or have been initiated, and that there is not so much a need to create new plans, as to harmonise existing plans and develop the capacity to implement them.</p> <p>It is considered that a better approach is to use the coastal areas of each District on Mauritius as the local planning unit, and for Rodrigues to use the entire island. Village-based planning, although effective in some situations, would not generally be appropriate as fishers' use of the lagoon is not limited to the area adjacent to their village - a broader seascape approach is needed. District level planning would provide a sound legal and administrative basis for planning, whilst ensuring that the integrated approach laid down in the ICZM framework is addressed, and that threats and drivers associated with catchments that are impacting on marine and coastal biodiversity are fully taken into consideration.</p> <p>Refer to PRODOC <i>2.1.1 Project Goal and Objective</i></p>
<u>Allocation of GEF resources per component:</u> Comp. 1) \$2,000,000 Comp. 2) \$1,796,000 Comp. 3) \$646,256 Project Management: \$222,265	<p>Detailed budgeting carried out in connection with the PRODOC development resulted in adjustments in the allocation of GEF resources per component as in the tables further up. Project Management cost represents 4.997 % of total project cost and remained unchanged.</p>
<u>Co-financing resources:</u> Indicative total: \$20,400,000	<p>The total leveraged co-financing has decreased by approx. 10% from what had been foreseen at PIF stage, totaling of \$17,139,177 in mobilized co-financing at CEO Endorsement stage.</p>
<u>Project Sites:</u> Only indicatively defined.	<p>Sites for implementation of specific activities (e.g. ICZM plans, SLM techniques) were defined and their choice validated. Local stakeholders were consulted. Their views and interest in the project helped shape the final choice.</p>
<u>Project Strategy:</u> Outputs described with some indications on activities.	<p>Through site visits, stakeholder consultation and national validation, the project strategy is now fully developed and activities described.</p>
<u>Risk Analysis:</u> cursory analysis based on assumptions and with limited stakeholder consultation.	<p>Thorough risk analysis was carried out and the corresponding management response has undergone stakeholder scrutiny.</p> <p>Also, potential risks and impacts related to the following topics have been considered through the application of the SESP (PRODOC Annex 6).</p>
<u>Other aspects</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators are fully developed; Management arrangement agreed upon; and TORs for key project staff are fully developed.

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

The project is fully consistent with and supportive of national development strategies and plans, including the National Environmental Policy 2007, which defines the overarching environmental objectives and strategies for the country, the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2006 (currently being revised), the Fisheries Act No 27 (2007), the National Tourism Policy (2005/6), the draft National Action Programme for the UNCCD and associated draft Investment Framework Strategy (IFS) for Sustainable Land Management (SLM), and other policies as outlined Section 1.2.5. It will support a number of activities proposed under the Government Programme for 2015-2019, including ensuring that the newly evolving ocean economy is sustainable, providing technical input for the revision and development of new legislation (e.g. new Fisheries and Marine Resources Bill) and providing capacity building and training for small-scale fishers.

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

GEF Focal Area Strategy/Objectives:

NA (No changes since PIF approval)

GEF conformity:

The project has been designed to meet overall GEF requirements in terms of design and implementation. It will contribute to Strategic Objective 2 of the GEF5 Focal Area Strategy (BD2), 'Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors'. The mainstreaming approach has been chosen because it allows the project impact to go beyond site-based action and focus on sectoral impacts and the wider landscape. It will lift the management of ESAs to the land/seascape level. It also creates scope for ensuring that biodiversity and ecosystem services can be integrated into sectoral policies and practices, e.g. through permitting systems or incentives for the tourism industry to respect and protect marine and coastal ecosystem services.

The project will contribute to Strategic Objective 1 of the GEF5 Focal Area Strategy (BD1), 'Improve the Sustainability of Protected Area Systems', Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas. Component 2 of the project is focused entirely on improving the management of existing MPAs in the RM, and developing new approaches to protection of critically important coastal and marine ecosystems in other places.

The project also contributes to the achievement of Objective 3 of the GEF5 Land Degradation Strategy (LD3), which is to 'Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape'. The project will focus on specific issues related to watershed erosion and its interaction with the downstream areas on Rodrigues.

Country eligibility:

The project is country driven. As a party to the UN Convention on Biodiversity (CBD), the RM is committed to implementation of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas and the Programme of Work on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity.

The revised NBSAP, currently in preparation, will set new national biodiversity targets in response to the Aichi Targets, and will integrate the new aspects of the CBD Strategic Plan, such as mainstreaming and anchoring planning to national development frameworks, valuing ecosystem services and promoting ecosystem-based adaptation and resilience. The previous 2006-2015 NBSAP called for new MPAs and required the approach of community participation in marine conservation, which will be a strong thread in this project.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage

NA (No changes since PIF approval)

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

The Republic of Mauritius (RM) forms part of the Mascarene Archipelago, along with Reunion Island (France). These islands share a common geological origin in the volcanism of the Réunion hotspot beneath the Mascarene Plateau and form a distinct ecoregion with a unique flora and fauna, sharing many similarities in terms of their biodiversity; the tropical climate, topography and several millions of years of isolation.

The PRODOC provides a country-specific analysis on underlying financial, economic and policy drivers behind the current situation of climatic vulnerability that prevails in the country and in the project areas in particular. The project justification is underpinned by technical reports, contextual analysis and application of the Tracking Tool.

The project aims to conserve and sustainably manage coastal and marine biodiversity in the RM, using the proxy of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) identified through the study commissioned by the government of Mauritius in 2008. ESAs are defined as areas that are rich in biodiversity and that provide essential ecosystem services, but that suffer from growing anthropogenic pressures. The 2009 ESA Study classified ESAs according to 14 different 'Types' grouped under five 'ESA Systems': 1) Wetlands; 2) Shore; 3) Offshore; 4) Forests; and 5) Stable Supply (of Water). Over 1,300 ESA locations in total have been identified, mapped and assessed in Mauritius and Rodrigues.

The six main coastal and marine ESA types (coastal wetlands, sand beaches and dunes, coral reefs, seagrass and algal beds, mangroves, and intertidal mud flats) that are the focus of the project cover 39,395 ha and include sites that are high in biodiversity values and important for the generation of ecosystem services (e.g. shoreline maintenance, storm protection, fishery production, tourism and leisure, soil formation and retention, water provision and flood control). The recommendations emanating from the ESA study in relation to these ESA types have largely not been implemented. Key habitats along the coast and in near shore waters of the RM face high anthropogenic pressures but remain largely unprotected and are not being sustainably managed.

Addressing the conservation and management of marine and coastal biodiversity at species level in the RM would be very complex given the high diversity and so this project will use ecosystems as a proxy. Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) are ecosystems that were defined in the RM through the spatially-based study commissioned by the then Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development and National Development Unit in 2008. Used in a number of countries (e.g. Europe, Canada) as a planning tool for environmental management, ESAs are sites that have, or that with remedial action could potentially have, special environmental attributes worthy of retention or maintenance. They may thus be habitats for rare and endangered species, remnant vegetation with diverse or unique biological communities, and sensitive terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems.

In the case of the RM, an ESA was defined as an area that is rich in biodiversity and that provides essential ecosystem services, but that suffers from growing anthropogenic pressures. The ESA project resulted in a geo-referenced database including over 1,300 ESA locations that have been identified, mapped and assessed, as well as a draft policy, legal and management framework to support their protection and management. The ESAs are classified according to 14 different 'ESA Types' grouped under five 'ESA Systems': 1) Wetlands; 2) Shore; 3) Offshore; 4) Forests; and 5) Stable Supply (of Water).

This new project addresses primarily six coastal and marine ESA types (Table 1): seagrass and algal beds, coral reefs, sand beaches and dunes, intertidal mud flats, coastal wetlands, and mangroves. The total area of these ecosystems is just under 41,000 ha, of which about 60% lies in Rodrigues and 40% in Mauritius.

Table 2: Ecosystems to be addressed by the project – area in hectares

ESA Type	ESA system	Mauritius	Rodrigues	TOTAL
Seagrass and Algal Beds (ESA type 3.a)	Offshore	3,279	17,765	21,044
Coral Reefs (ESA type 3.b)	Offshore	6,306	7,005	13,311
Sand Beach and Dunes (ESA type 2.a)	Shore	2,885	80 ²	2,893
Inter-tidal Mudflats (ESA type 1.f)	Wetlands	919	656	1,575
Coastal wetlands ³ (ESA type 1.a)	Wetlands	406	0	406
Mangroves (ESA type 1.e)	Wetlands	145	24	169
TOTAL Ecosystem area to be addressed by the project		13,940	25,530	39,470

N.B: The figures for total area are approximate and vary in accuracy between ESA types depending on the extent to which there has been ground-truthing and updating of the database.

The project will indirectly address four of the remaining eight ESA types as follows:

- Islets (ESA type 1.f, Offshore System) – total area 1,450 ha. This ESA will be addressed through interventions relating to improving integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) and through improved management of the surrounding water. Islets designated as protected are considered part of the terrestrial protected area system; they are primarily important for terrestrial biodiversity which is a focus for this project, but which is covered by the PAN project.
- Rivers and streams (ESA type 1.d, Wetlands System) – this ESA type will be addressed where activities in the coastal zone impact on estuaries (i.e. through interventions relating to improving ICZM), as the estuaries of many rivers are critically important conservation areas and sites of key marine and coastal biodiversity; the ICZM planning that is undertaken will also positively impact on this ESA type further inland, as threats such as pollution and sedimentation will need to be addressed.
- Forests (ESA types 4a and 4b, Forest System) – coastal forest will be addressed in ICZM interventions, but Forest ESAs are being directly addressed through the PAN project.
- Steep slopes (ESA type 5 b, Stable Supply System) – a large area of the RM is covered by steep slopes ESAs. Activities on steep slopes are responsible for many negative impacts on marine and coastal biodiversity (notably sedimentation and pollution); the project does not have the resources to address all steep slopes directly in the RM but interventions relating to improving ICZM will address this ESA, and the demonstration project on Rodrigues in Component 3 will have direct relevance to this ESA type.

Seagrass and algal beds make up just over 50% of the total ESAs to be addressed; coral reefs account for just over 30%, and the other ESA types cover much smaller areas, notably coastal wetlands (total of 406 ha only) and mangroves (169 ha only). In Mauritius, coral reefs are of greatest importance (about 42% of total coastal and marine ecosystem coverage), followed by seagrass and algal beds (22%) and sand beach and dunes (19%). In Rodrigues, seagrass and algal beds are the principle ESA as a result of the large lagoon (almost 70%), followed by coral reefs (27%); here there is very little sand beach/dune ecosystem type and no coastal wetland.

Three management categories have been defined for the ESAs and provide the basis for developing appropriate management approaches. The proposed generic policy approach for Category 1 ESAs (for which the primary management objective is conservation, and rehabilitation if required) is that they should be protected intact; all development in or on the ESA should be prohibited, as well as development outside the ESA that will adversely affect the ESA, unless mitigation measures that will prevent such adverse effects on the ESA can be implemented. In the case of coral reefs, mud flat and sea grass beds this policy also applies to category 2 ESAs, and for mangroves to all three

² In the ESA study, area of sand beach and dune is given as 8 ha but this is thought to be an error as the actual area is closer to 80 ha

³ This ESA type is also often referred to by the term “coastal marshland”

categories. The presence of a coral reef, seagrass bed, mangrove area and intertidal mud flat within a Marine Park means that they are by definition Category 1. Thus protected areas will be a key mechanism for protection and management of the biodiversity that makes up these ecosystems.

A.5 Incremental /Additional cost reasoning

The incremental cost reasoning describes the incremental or additional activities requesting for GEF financing and the associated global environmental benefits to be delivered by the project.

The project will assist the RM in meeting its commitments under a number of multi-lateral environmental treaties as follows:

- **CBD:** The project will contribute to the achievement of many of the Aichi targets (see Section 8) notably those related to mainstreaming of biodiversity and to the establishment and effective management of a national system of protected areas, thus also helping with implementation of the CBD's Programme of Work on Protected Areas and the Programme of Work on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity. It will also contribute to protection of one of the Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs) as required by the CBD ; Blue Bay is listed as one of the 39 EBSAs in the Southern Indian Ocean , meeting six of the seven criteria that have been defined for EBSAs. The project will contribute to protection and management of this area.
- **Ramsar Convention:** the project will support improved management of 2 Ramsar sites (Pointe d'Esny and Blue Bay).
- **World Heritage Convention:** The project will support management of the marine buffer zone of the Le Morne Cultural WHS.
- **UNCCD:** The project will apply an integrated natural resource management for sustainably managing land, as per the terminology commonly used within the Convention. This work will be carried out under Component 3, which focuses on erosion control and ecosystem services restoration. It will be part of a reef-to-ridge approach in selected sites, keeping in mind that the project's main focus is on coastal and marine biodiversity, and with the expected benefit of managing ecosystems affected by land degradation, namely steep slopes and wetlands.

The IUCN Red List of threatened animals includes the Green Turtle (*Chelonia mydas*), Hawksbill Turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*), Small Giant Clam (*Tridacna maxima*), Bénéitier de Rosewater (*Tridacna rosewateri*) and Blainville's Beaked Whale (*Mesoplodon densirostris*) all of which occur in the waters of the RM. Over 100 coastal and marine species (including corals) in the RM feature in CITES appendices as threatened or endangered. The project will contribute to improved conservation status for these species, and will also help to protect a marine Important Bird Area for foraging seabirds in waters adjacent to Round I and Serpent I, as proposed under the Nairobi Convention.

The ESAs that will be addressed by the project are all globally threatened ecosystems. Coral reefs are particularly at risk and the project's activities are expected to have a positive impact, through a range of mechanisms, on all the reefs surrounding the islands of Mauritius and Rodrigues. It will also directly benefit coastal wetlands, another highly threatened ecosystem, as well as the other marine and coastal ESAs on which there is a focus including sea grass beds, sandy beaches and dunes and intertidal mud flats. As a result of project interventions it is expected that fish stocks in the lagoon areas will recuperate and the marine trophic chain will be in better balance, and a range of other key ecosystem services restored.

Development Benefits:

The project will support the Government's national development priorities in terms of promoting an ocean economy, by encouraging and helping to establish a sustainable approach to the use of marine and coastal biodiversity and natural resources. As described in section 2.2.1 it will help to improve gender equality at all levels amongst marine and coastal stakeholders, empowering women and through this helping to reduce poverty.

The project will contribute to development of the tourism sector (Component 1), by supporting the establishment of a voluntary certification process which will encourage the industry to act responsibly and minimize damage to marine and coastal diversity. This will help to ensure long-term sustainability of the industry, and help to ensure that small-scale operators can participate fairly and benefit equally from these resources.

Component 2 focuses on improving protection for marine and coastal ESAs, which will provide healthier habitat for commercially valuable species and ultimately lead to more productive fisheries and enhanced livelihoods for coastal communities and those involved in the fishing industry. The activities to encourage the effective enforcement of no-take areas and marine reserves, to demonstrate their benefits and promote compliance, will in particular help to improve the health of the fisheries sector.

The demonstration project to reduce soil erosion, to be carried out under Component 3, will lead to more sustainable agriculture on Rodrigues, and potentially also Mauritius, as the techniques to be trialed will be able to be replicated subsequently.

The project's alternative from the baseline is shown below:

Table 3: Project's alternative from the baseline

Current Baseline	Alternative
Coastal and marine biodiversity and ecosystem resilience in Mauritius and Rodrigues will continue to be threatened and impacted by economic activities that fragment habitats and affect species. Threats may increase with the development of the ocean economy, and will be compounded by other anthropogenic stressors (land-based pollution, climate change and ocean acidification).	Local government level ICZM plans are developed and effectively implemented, addressing threats to biodiversity and ecosystem integrity across the lagoons and watersheds of Mauritius and Rodrigues. Critically sensitive areas containing marine and coastal ESAs are designated as set asides and protected from physical development that could degrade their values and ecosystem services. The tourism sector is actively engaged in biodiversity and ecosystem management, deriving direct benefits from it that outweigh costs.
The ICZM framework will continue to operate on a small-scale, ad hoc project approach and fail to promote an integrated approach that takes biodiversity and ecosystem services sufficiently into consideration	Biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem services are incorporated into all relevant operational permitting/licensing systems, including EIA, effectively changing management practices within the land-use planning, tourism and other physical development sectors.
MPA management effectiveness will continue to be low across the RM with limited financial resources dedicated to it.	At least 20,000 ha of marine and coastal habitat throughout the RM benefit from protection as MPAs of varying designations with improved management and a framework for investments that involves both the tourism sector and communities through sustainable livelihoods.
Lagoon areas continue to be impacted by unsustainable land use practices upstream.	SLM techniques and practices are demonstrated and implemented that reduce land-based threats to ecosystem integrity in lagoon areas and are replicated, with a particular focus on Rodrigues.
Wetlands near built-up areas will continue	Critical wetlands located in urban and tourist areas are valued and sustainably managed with the involvement

Current Baseline	Alternative
to be backfilled and dumped.	of the surrounding communities for the many ecosystem services that they provide and the benefits that these provide.

A.6. Risks

During the PPG phase, project risks were updated from those presented in the PIF.

Table 4: Project Risks

IDENTIFIED RISKS,	MITIGATION MEASURES
The supporting legislation and regulatory framework that will ensure that project interventions are sustainable in the long term is not enacted, and priorities to develop the ocean economy take precedence	The project will provide legal expertise and support that will help to encourage the government to enact and/or revise the necessary laws or regulations to protect and sustainably manage coastal and marine ESAs (with particular emphasis on wetlands for which legislation is notably lacking). At the same time the project will help to develop a stewardship, and where appropriate, voluntary approach to conservation and management within stakeholder groups and coastal communities, which will help to reduce the need for enforcement and the regulatory approach.
Institutional responsibilities for CZM and MPAs remain diffuse with no collaboration framework.	Components 1 and 2 of the project have been specifically designed to foster collaboration among responsible partners. MOI will play a lead project implementation role and will ensure coordination and collaboration among the different entities. The role delegated to other entities by MOI will be formalised through agreements (e.g. MOUs) with clear TOR. An analysis of institutional and governance arrangements for MPA management is to be undertaken as part of Output 2 and this will help to clarify the roles and responsibilities of agencies and the support that can be provided by civil society.
Supporting infrastructure and national arrangements for long term maintenance of a knowledge management system for marine and coastal biodiversity does not materialize during the life of the project	The project will liaise closely with on-going initiatives in the various responsible partners involved in collating data and information and making this available to decision-makers and the public. It will also promote understanding of the need for sharing information and ensuring that all those with interest in marine and coastal biodiversity can access the information they need. The project will also encourage the use of cost-effective, simple and easy to maintain processes and software in the development of such systems.
Local level ICZM plans are completed (on paper) but never implemented.	The project will develop and explore various ways and modalities of implementing the proposed ridge-to-reef plans in line within the ICZM Framework, through Component 1 activities, particular Output 1.1.4 (awareness raising to ensure that all stakeholders understand the need for such plans), Output 1.2.1 (analytical review of ICZM to date), Output 1.2.2 (demonstration plans for one District on Mauritius and for Rodrigues), and Output 1.2.3 (training and capacity building which will ensure that staff and agencies have the required skills and capabilities). These activities will increase the chances of the plans being effectively implemented and of the relevant stakeholders being involved in sector-specific and location-specific actions.
Fishers and coastal communities see the no-take zones in Rodrigues and in the Marine Parks in Mauritius as damaging to	The project will mitigate the risk of no-take zones failing to produce the desired results by developing, with the affected communities, a livelihoods programme. A sound basis for this has been established by the GEF SGP,

IDENTIFIED RISKS,	MITIGATION MEASURES
their livelihoods and fail to respect rules of access.	and experiences of previous projects will be used, and recommendations from recently prepared livelihood strategies will be used.
Expectations towards the engagement of the tourism sector prove ambitious.	Specialised technical assistance will be contracted to ensure that the tourism industry is fully engaged; activities to be carried out under Output 1.3 have been developed in close collaboration with MOTEC, AHRIM and interested individual tourist operators. Certification has been tried with some success in the Seychelles and the project will ensure that experience from the Seychelles is used to replicate successful approaches.
The level of threat to biodiversity and ecosystem services is higher than assumed.	The project builds on the thorough analysis of threats to biodiversity and ecosystem services carried out through the ESA Study. Although threats are very serious, these are well understood and there is evidence of gradually increasing capacity to address them, including at systemic level (e.g. policies, laws and finance). Management capacity across all the responsible entities will be enhanced through the project and thus opportunities for addressing threats will be increased. Threats from climate change present a growing trend, particularly in the form of sea water warming and acidification, sea level rise, and increased frequency and intensity of storms, which will have a significant impact on marine and coastal biodiversity, but the RM is participating in a range of regional initiatives designed to build resilience in both ecosystems and coastal communities, as well as capacity in all stakeholders to undertake appropriate mitigation actions.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

Table 5 lists several closely-related on-going donor-funded national and regional programmes and suggests ways in which collaboration with the project might be beneficial.

Table 1: Matrix of Collaboration

INITIATIVES / INTERVENTIONS	HOW COLLABORATION WITH THE PROJECT WILL BE ENSURED
UNDP-GEF Project Expanding coverage and strengthening management effectiveness of the protected area network on the island of Mauritius (the PAN Project)	The project will collaborate closely with the PAN project which addresses forest ESAs and thus complements the coastal and marine biodiversity focus, although the PAN project addresses Mauritius only (not Rodrigues). The PAN project has many activities that relate to or complement activities within the marine and coastal biodiversity project and the latter will build on and collaborate closely with these including: development of a strategy for expansion of the national protected area network; strengthening of the legal and institutional framework for management of protected areas and development of a strategic plan for establishment of a protected area institution (which may have lessons learned for governance of MPAs); and the development of an integrated financing strategy to be based largely on tourism and land stewardship which will provide important pointers for the investment framework of MPAs.
UNDP/AFB Climate Change Adaptation Programme in the Coastal Zone of Mauritius	This project, funded through the UNFCCC Adaptation Fund and running from 2012-2018, is hosted by MOESDDBM and is closely linked given its focus on the coastal zone. The project is aimed at combating beach erosion and flood risk in three coastal sites (Mon Choisy, Riviere des Galets, and Quatre Soeurs) with various infrastructure (e.g. sloped rock mounds offshore to deflect waves, public buildings on stilts) and natural protection (e.g. mangroves and other shoreline vegetation) mechanisms. The project is assessing the effectiveness of such coastal protection measures and helping to develop an early warning system. The project will also aim to ensure that all policies, strategies, plans, and regulations recognize climate change impacts in the coastal zone over the next 50 years and will provide information on climate change to the public and decision-makers through the CCIC. An additional activity is a pilot project on coral farming in 5 sites, underway through MOEMRFSOI.

INITIATIVES / INTERVENTIONS	HOW COLLABORATION WITH THE PROJECT WILL BE ENSURED
	The marine and coastal biodiversity project will collaborate closely with this project particularly in relation to the outputs under Component 1.
UNDP-GEF National Biodiversity Planning to Support the Implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan in Mauritius NBSAP	<p>This project, led by the MOAFS, runs to 2016 and has the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) A participative stocktaking exercise on biodiversity planning to develop national biodiversity targets in response to the global Aichi Targets; (2) Revision/updating of the NBSAP (3) Strengthening national frameworks for resource mobilization, Convention reporting and exchange mechanisms. <p>There are also associated activities in terms of ecosystem valuation (primarily inland ecosystems), and the establishment of a clearing house mechanism</p>
Projet de Gestion Durable des Zones Côtières des pays de la COI – Indian Ocean Commission (GDZCOI)	<p>This regional project, funded by the COI, FFEM (and the ADB for the Comores component) covering Mauritius (Rodrigues), Madagascar and Comores is aimed at gathering and disseminating experiences and progress in ICZM and protection of marine and coastal biodiversity, and developing good ICZM practices at pilot sites, including appropriate governance, protection of marine and coastal biodiversity, management of watersheds, and ecosystem evaluation. Activities to be supported by the project include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regional/international exchange programmes for capacity building on marine conservation 2. Feasibility study for Rodrigues to be considered as Biosphere Reserve at the UNESCO 3. Development of a regional database on good practices of ICZM and marine biodiversity 4. Application of ICZM good practices on 3 pilot sites: St Marie (Madagascar), Moheli (Comores) & Rodrigues (Mauritius) <p>The project will collaborate closely with the GDZCOI in relation to Output 1.2</p>
ISLANDS project - COI	<p>Currently in its second phase but due to complete in 2017, this project includes a number of activities, of which the following are related to the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the establishment of a regional coral reef facility • development of the Coral Reef Information System (CRIS) • Coral reef monitoring review (completed and published) <p>The project should ensure appropriate linkages with these initiatives when developing activities relating to coral reefs.</p>
The coastal, marine and island specific biodiversity management in East African and Indian Ocean states – COI	<p>Funded by EU; budget 15 million euros; project period 2014-2018</p> <p>This project covers the COI countries including RM, and is aimed at strengthening national and regional capacities, at all levels, in managing coastal, marine and island-specific biodiversity resources and ecosystems. It includes components on (1) improving and harmonising policies and institutional framework; (2) education, awareness-raising and communications particularly aimed at decision makers; (3) improving mechanisms for sharing data relating to biodiversity; (4) establishment of regional biodiversity thematic centres; and (5) a small grants programme for projects relating to biodiversity and sustainable livelihoods. The project will develop appropriate linkages and will be able to benefit from the regional experiences being developed</p>
UNDP-GEF The Western Indian Ocean Large Marine Ecosystems Strategic Action Programme Policy Harmonisation and Institutional Reform (WIO LME SAPPHIRE)	Currently being planned for implementation 2015-2020; builds on the previous project ASCLME; includes components on policy harmonisation and management reforms, capacity building, integrating the ecosystem-based management approach into Local Economic Development Plans at selected pilot sites; ecosystem-based practices among artisanal fisheries. For Mauritius, plans have been made to build on MID Linkage with related projects to ensure co-ordination. Linkages to be developed.
WIO-SAP Partnerships for the Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Protection of the Western Indian Ocean from Land Based Sources and Activities	2 nd Phase of WIO-LAB programme; activities currently being defined but will address water pollution and degradation of critical habitats from land-based impacts and will therefore be relevant. The project will develop linkages as WIO-SAP progresses.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE

B.1 Stakeholder engagement in project implementation

The Mauritius Oceanography Institute will be responsible for overall project supervision, with key responsibilities, particularly for Component 2, lying with other parts of the Ministry of Ocean Economy notably the Fisheries Department (Marine Conservation Division and Fisheries Protection Service). Other lead agencies include the Rodrigues Regional Assembly (activities across all three components) and the Ministry of Environment (responsible for Component 1). Given the cross-cutting nature of the project, these partners will work in close co-operation with Ministry of Housing & Lands and Ministry of Tourism. Ministry of Agro-Industry & Food Security (National Parks & Conservation Service) will lead activities under the second output of Component 3 (coastal wetlands conservation). Close liaison will be maintained with relevant District Councils through the Ministry of Local Government. The project will collaborate with NGOs (including inter alia: MMCS, MWF, Reef Conservation, Eco-Sud and Shoals Rodrigues) the private sector and academic and research institutions, and the University of Mauritius.

The project will focus its stakeholder engagement at two levels of intervention: (i) working with national and local public institutions and agencies to strengthen their capacity to effectively protect and manage coastal and marine ecosystems and their associated biodiversity, and to align project activities with government's strategic priorities; and (ii) working directly with civil society organizations, formal and informal use rights holders, and private individuals to mitigate impacts and optimize benefits of project activities. However, a thorough stakeholder analysis will need to be undertaken once the project starts to ensure appropriate and adequate representation of all interested parties in the participatory work planned through the project and to identify the organisations to be represented on the Project Steering Committee (PSC). The PSC will include government agencies, NGOs and private sector representatives; membership will be determined during the inception phase of the project and agreed at the inception workshop.

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

The Government of Mauritius adopted a rights-based National Gender Policy Framework (NGPF) in 2008, which stipulates that Ministries, Departments and Agencies develop their own specific gender policies to achieve gender equality and women's empowerment in their sectoral mandate areas. These policies are to be implemented through their programmes, interventions, human resource and operational management, budget allocations, execution monitoring and evaluation. The NGPF also promotes decentralised, context-specific, participatory local development and social mobilisation to achieve gender-responsive social transformation and innovation. All Ministries have such gender policies and are currently developing action plans for implementation. The RRA has developed its Gender Policy, as required by the NGPF. It highlights how women's livelihoods have become vulnerable to climate change and environmental degradation and need to be a key focus of policy and planning measures.

Based on the analysis undertaken during the PPG, the key gender and social equity issues to be addressed by the project are:

- The gender division of labour in coastal communities, with men dominating beach- and lagoon-based leisure, economic, and entrepreneurial activities particularly where these are "motorised" (e.g. involving use of boats, vehicles etc.) and women focus on activities such as gleaning for bait and in octopus fishing, especially in Rodrigues. Men also tend to predominate in illegal activities and in practices that damage coastal and marine biodiversity, as the focus group discussions across the different sites in Mauritius have highlighted. Acceptance of such gender imbalances contributes to tolerance of the use of destructive practices, which is exacerbated by inadequate enforcement and management.
- The lack of robust, national and local data on gender-based and other spatially disaggregated, educational, income, age, and ethnic inequalities and de facto discrimination impedes effective planning, appropriate allocation of resources and development of effective sectoral, fiscal and broader overarching macroeconomic policies.

- At present, ICZM policies, planning and implementation mechanisms as well as data collection and planning instruments do not incorporate fully social, economic and cultural realities as experienced by the diversity of stakeholders involved (i.e. women, men, boys and girls). The literature review and the results of stakeholder discussions held during the PPG all point to the need to tackle environmental concerns holistically. Support for alternative livelihoods is an important precondition for adopting sustainable practices and the project will commission a community survey to generate the socio economic and spatially-contextualised data to complement the district level Relative Development Index and also as part of the community-based mechanisms for tracking change and creating peer to peer learning networks across project sites both in Mauritius and Rodrigues. Through its partnership with GEF SGP, the project will generate policy relevant knowledge to foster the integrated mainstreaming of sustainable development goals at coastal level.
- Unpaid care work combined with low pay and long hours in paid employment are major barriers to women's economic and political empowerment. In addition, there is insufficient qualitative and subjective data on perceptions and attitudes, mind sets in regard to gender norms, and this perpetuates inequality.

A key project strategy is to reduce the gender bias which assumes that men are the main or sole breadwinner and household head, and thus are the chief recipients of household income. It will explicitly assess, design, monitor and track implementation from this standpoint and distinguish women and men as household beneficiaries of project benefits. In line with the policies outline above, gender-responsive monitoring indicators will be developed, used and regularly assessed for their continued relevance. Care will also be taken to ensure that: women's participation in project activities is not hampered by unpaid care work, and that alternative care arrangements are considered as part of development of sustainable and alternative livelihoods; that women's participation does not worsen their unpaid work load; and that the project does not take advantage of gender biases in income to offer women benefits that are lower compared to men. A household-based approach will be used throughout the project for economic empowerment activities. Both international and local gender experts will be hired to provide the necessary expertise for implementation of the project.

The project will address the barriers identified above and the requirements of the gender policies and strategies of the GEF, UNDP, RM and Rodrigues in a number of ways:

- a. Promote broader multi-generational, gender-sensitive community engagement/stewardship in the protection and sustainable management of coastal and marine biodiversity;
- b. Build capacity across all social groups, including women and youth, for coastal management and sustainable use of marine and coastal resources, and develop a good understanding of the issues involved in all sectors of society; and
- c. Promote and enhance alternative livelihoods that benefit women, young unemployed men and/or those engaged in vulnerable and/or precarious jobs, and other marginalised groups and that reduce pressure and damaging impacts on marine and coastal biodiversity.

B.3 Cost-effectiveness reflected in project design

The strategic focus of project investment in the mainstreaming of marine and coastal biodiversity in the tourism and coastal development sectors, and the improvement of management effectiveness of MPAs will lead to overall long term savings in conservation and sustainable management of ecosystem services which at present depends on an ad hoc project-based approach, whereby activities tend to be discontinued even if considered potentially effective, and then initiated again later with the burden of start-up costs, recovery of information and recruitment of new personnel.

A small short-term catalytic investment by the project in identifying appropriate financing mechanisms for MPAs, in collaboration with the protected area financing work undertaken through the PAN, will provide the groundwork for

improving the future long-term financial viability of MPAs in the RM. A comparatively small investment by the project in rationalizing and strengthening the institutional competencies of MPA agencies will help to focus the optimal deployment of limited resources and capacity in the ongoing improvement of the management effectiveness of MPAs in the RM. Project support for improvement in proficiency and skills of MPA management staff within these institutions will also ensure that the productivity and effectiveness of the limited human resources available to these institutions is enhanced and optimally deployed.

Project support in reforming and updating the policy framework and, where appropriate, enabling legislation for protection and management of marine and coastal ESAs, with modest costs, result in substantive long term returns, including: creating an enabling regulatory framework for the mainstreaming of management of marine and coastal biodiversity particularly in the coastal development and tourism sectors; clarifying institutional roles and responsibilities for marine and coastal biodiversity protection and management; better integrating and aligning MPAs with other sectoral development programs; and strengthening the cooperative governance of MPAs. The project will promote a participatory approach which is increasingly being recognized as one of the most cost-effective mechanisms for ensuring the effective implementation and long-term sustainability of MPAs and ICZM plans, in that local communities and other stakeholders start to take responsibility themselves for compliance with regulations and implementation of management activities.

A modest investment in testing the cost-effectiveness of ecosystem service restoration and sustainable management techniques in a number of demonstration sites will contribute to significantly improving the future costs and effectiveness of these operations.

C. BUDGETED M & E PLAN

Table 6: Project Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget USD Excluding project team staff time	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	PM PMU (Project Management Unit – GoM-UNDP) UNDP CO, UNDP GEF	Indicative cost: USD20,000	Within first two months of project start up with the full team on board
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	UNDP GEF RTA/PM will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members. PMU, esp. M&E expert	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on output and implementation	Oversight by PM PMU, esp. M&E expert Implementation teams	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation. Indicative cost is USD50,000	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	PM PMU UNDP CO UNDP RTA UNDP GEF	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	PM and team	None	Quarterly

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget USD Excluding project team staff time	Time frame
Mid-term Review	PM PMU UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost: USD44,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Terminal Evaluation	PM PMU UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost : USD44,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Audit	UNDP CO PM PMU	Indicative cost per year: USD3,000 (USD18,000 total)	Yearly
Visits to field sites	UNDP CO UNDP RCU (as appropriate) Government representatives	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly for UNDP CO, as required by UNDP RCU
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		USD 176,000 (+/- 2.5% of total GEF budget)	


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

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

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Mr. Dharam Dev MANRAJ	Financial Secretary	Ministry of Finance and Economic Development	07/31/2013

B. GEF AGENCY (IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP- GEF Executive Coordinator.		January 16, 2016	Caroline Petersen, Sr. Technical Advisor for Ecosystems and Biodiversity	-	Caroline.petersen@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

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

Chapter 6:	<u><i>Project Results Framework</i></u>	Pages 88-93
6.1	<u><i>Programmatic Links</i></u>	
6.2	<u><i>Logframe</i></u>	

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS

(From GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comments at PIF Stage

Comments	Responses
STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF), dtd. February 21, 2014	
<p>Overall assessment: 2 - Minor revision required. STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions</p>	<p>UNDP acknowledges the comments and provides a response to comments herein.</p> <p><i>See specific comments from STAP and response below.</i></p>
<p>STAP Comments transcribed:</p> <p>STAP welcomes the submission of this well thought through and clearly presented concept for a project intending to mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services into coastal zone management and into the operations and policies of the tourism and physical development sectors through an integrated management approach based on the ESAs.</p> <p>The concept is a model PIF submission in almost all respects. The proposal is clear, coherent and concise. The linkages between the problem, the barriers and the proposed outputs and outcomes are logical and are presented very clearly. The presented Outcome indicators are all relevant and appropriately presented.</p> <p>The problem, root causes and principal barriers are well defined and described. The baseline activities are well documented and clearly presented, as is the baseline scenario.</p> <p>The GEBs are evident and the incremental cost reasoning is presented convincingly.</p> <p>The proposed project certainly has elements of innovation and a large potential for being scaled-up. The rationale for the sustainability of its results is acceptable and</p>	<p>UNDP welcomes the positive and inspiring STAP Review.</p> <p><u>Response to COMMENT #1</u> The project has a rather full agenda of issues to address. During the PPG stage, it was felt that the issue of IAS requires a separate intervention, noting that much of the work on forests and IAS has advanced substantially through the PAN Project.</p> <p>Yet, within Component 3, with respect to ecosystem restoration, due attention will be paid to the IAS issues.</p> <p><u>Response to COMMENT #2</u> A risk pertaining to Climate Change was added. Refer to PRODOC Table 9.</p>

Comments	Responses
STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF), dtd. February 21, 2014	
<p>credible.</p> <p>The principal stakeholders are defined clearly as are their roles in the project. The importance of gender considerations to the project's design and implementation is also well recognized.</p> <p>The principal risks are defined well and the proposed mitigation measures are realistic in terms of their implementation potential.</p> <p>[RELEVANT COMMENT #1] Considering the importance given to invasive alien species as threats to biodiversity and ecosystem services, STAP would propose that additional details about them (i.e. the main invasive species; what exactly do they threaten and how) should be provided at this stage.</p> <p>[RELEVANT COMMENT #2] Although global environmental change is mentioned in the text (section 7), including the specific threats of warming waters (bleaching) and acidification to corals, paradoxically it does not appear in the risk table. A footnote mentions that this is a slowly emerging threat but given the nature of the ESAs that the project will work in, current trends and the 5-year timeline of the project, we would argue that this is a present and growing as opposed to just an emerging threat and requires more analysis. This should receive further attention during the PPG, along with the definition of appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>This project will fit in well with other ongoing initiatives and will build upon the results of previous initiatives. Coordination with other projects and initiatives should not be difficult but the specific mechanism(s) and procedures for ensuring this will require further development during the PPG.</p> <p>In summary, this well developed and presented concept satisfies all essential requirements for a successful initiative.</p>	
Comments from USA - Feb 2014	
<p>The United States strongly supports this UNDP GEF concept in Mauritius. This project will be an excellent case study that will yield important models and examples of environmental protection and marine resource governance in a relatively large, populated island with multiple economic and environmental pressures. As a prime tourist location, Mauritius will be able to lead by example in balancing economic and</p>	<p>UNDP welcomes the positive and inspiring review by Council member USA. From the content of the comments, no particular response is required.</p>

Comments	Responses
<i>STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF), dtd. February 21, 2014</i>	
environmental priorities through this project. The Marine Protected Area Management plan and support from a variety of stakeholders included in this project provide promise for a long-term sustainability of marine resource protection efforts.	

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

A. DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF PPG ACTIVITIES AND FINANCING STATUS

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$130,000

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Project scope and strategy defined, and GEF full proposal documentation prepared and approved	130,000.00	94,225.97	35774.03
Total	130,000.00	94,225.97	35774.03

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

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

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

NA