



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| GEF ID: | 5514 | | |
| Country/Region: | Mauritius | | |
| Project Title: | Mainstreaming Biodiversity into the Management of the Coastal Zone in the Republic of Mauritius | | |
| GEF Agency: | UNDP | GEF Agency Project ID: | 4843 (UNDP) |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund | GEF Focal Area (s): | Multi Focal Area |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | BD-2; BD-1; LD-3; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$130,000 | Project Grant: | \$4,664,521 |
| Co-financing: | \$20,400,000 | Total Project Cost: | \$25,194,521 |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | March 03, 2014 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Jaime Cavalier | Agency Contact Person: | Fabiana Issler, |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| Eligibility | 1. Is the participating country eligible ? | 8-14-13 Yes. Mauritius is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared | |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | 8-14-13 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP for \$5,579,682 dated July 31st, 2013. Cleared | |
| Resource Availability | 3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): | | |
| | • the STAR allocation? | 8-14-13 No. The project is requesting BD \$4,689,885 and LD \$889,797 and the current allocations are BD \$4,440,000 | |

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| | | and \$850,000M. The total request (\$5,579,682) exceeds the allowed used of "flexible funding" of up to \$200K from other focal areas by \$89,682 = [\$5,579,682-(\$4,689,885 + \$889,797 + \$200K)]. Please adjust accordingly. 8-22-14 This was properly addressed in the Response to GEF Comments and the Revised PIF. The new LoE will be provided in due course. Cleared | |
| | • the focal area allocation? | 8-14-13 See above | |
| | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | NA | |
| | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | NA | |
| | • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | NA | |
| | • focal area set-aside? | NA | |
| Strategic Alignment | 4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i> | 8-14-13 Yes. BD-1, BD-2 and LD-3. Aichi Targets 4, 10,11,12,14 and 15. Cleared | |
| | 5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant | 8-14-13 Yes. The National Environmental Policy (NEP, 2008); the Forestry Policy of 2006; the Fisheries Act No 27 of 2007; the | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|---|--|
| | conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP? | National Tourism Policy (2005/6); the Sustainable Land Management (draft) Policy and Investment Plan (2011). The NBSAP is currently being updated/revised to incorporate the Aichi Targets. The project will also serve as a key implementation tool for the Mauritius' Integrated Coastal Zone Management Framework (2010). Cleared | |
| Project Design | 6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions? | 8-14-13 Yes. See detailed description of baseline projects on P.7, and table 4 on page 13 for detailed baseline investments. Cleared | |
| | 7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed? | 8-14-13 The project has the following components and associated outcomes. Component 1. Landscape level planning and sectoral mainstreaming: i) Threats to biodiversity and ecosystem function are addressed across six landscapes containing 27,000 ha of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) with critical importance for biodiversity and the supply of ecosystem services (Total Area 150,000 ha), ii) Reduction in pressures to Coastal Wetlands, Shore and Offshore ESAs Systems in general and specifically within target landscapes (e.g. loss of coastal wetland habitats, coral trampling and unsustainable fishing), iii) Tourism sector funding channeled to biodiversity increase. | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|---|--|
| | | <p>Component 2. Integration of MPA management into the wider landscapes: i) Threats to biodiversity in the offshore environment are mitigated and fish stocks protected in at least 8,000 ha of seascapes through the improved management of MPAs and no-take zones.</p> <p>Component 3. Erosion control in sensitive areas: i) Erosion and soil loss are reduced in 200 ha in erosion-prone watersheds, ii) Ecosystem services restored in 15.4 ha in freshwater wetlands + 23.9 ha of associated buffer.</p> <p>QUESTIONS:</p> <p>Component 1.</p> <p>1) Are "landscape level management plans" really an effective tool for conservation? What are the chances that these plans get completed (on paper) and never implemented?</p> <p>How strong is the legal system in Mauritius to ensure that the proposed "operational permitting/licensing systems governing land use in coastal zones" get issued under strict environmental guidance (i.e. EIA), applied and ENFORCED?</p> <p>2) Why go for a "national certification label for tourism enterprises" when there are some international labels with high standards and recognition?</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>COMPONENT 3.</p> <p>1) The no-take-zones, perhaps the most important component of a project for sustainable fisheries, have proven to be difficult to establish and maintained because they are seen as net losses by the local communities. What makes the project proponents think that they will work in this project? This idea usually takes years to get underway.</p> <p>8-22-14 This was properly addressed in the Response to GEF Comments and the Revised PIF. Cleared</p> | |
| | 8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate? | <p>8-14-13 There is a general description of the GEBs for Mauritius as an island, but not for the target sites. What are the GEBs in the 6 EAS selected for the project that made them outstanding from the 1,300 ESA locations identified, mapped and assessed in Mauritius and Rodrigues? Please provide as much specific information as possible. Thanks.</p> <p>8-22-14 This was properly addressed in the Response to GEF Comments and the Revised PIF. Cleared</p> | |
| | 9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such | | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| | benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits? | | |
| | 10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained? | 8-14-13 Yes. See information on page 10. Cleared | |
| | 11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience) | 8-14-13 Please elaborate on the risk that the Landscape Level Management Plants, developed on paper, will never be implemented due to changes in policies and/or the lack of financial resources to get them done. How often UNDP does see these plants perfectly designed and never implemented in countries in the regional with similar political and socio-economic structures? Please add the response to A.3 page 10 of PIF. The no-take-zones, perhaps the most important component of a project for sustainable fisheries, have proven to be difficult to establish and maintained because they are seen as net losses by the local communities. Please elaborate on this point in the risk section. 8-22-14 This was properly addressed in the Response to GEF Comments and the Revised PIF. Cleared | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| | 12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | 8-14-13 Yes. Information provided on item A.4. Page 11. Cleared | |
| | 13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. | 8-14-13 Innovation is embedded in the project's land/seascape approach to changing the way biodiversity and ecosystem services are managed across the landscape. The ESAs will be afforded higher protection, while also allowing for sustainable economic development in the same economic and geographic space. This has not yet been done before in Mauritius. Another innovation aspect pertains to the use of open-access spatially-based technology to avail critical ESA information to a wide range of sectors. Sustainability and replicability of the project. These two elements are part of the design of the financial aspects of various activities: (i) the project will build upon existing land use regulation systems and making them much more conservation compatible; (ii) the project will finance the overlay of biodiversity/ecosystem management planning and implementation, so that these can be absorbed by existing systems and entities (iii) the work on MPA financial sustainability engineered through Output 2.2. Sustainability will also be ensured through consistent capacity building measures engendered by the project, benefitting government entities and other stakeholders. The project is highly replicable, because the | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-------------------|--|---|--|
| | | landscape approach can be easily applied to other sites throughout Mauritius and in the region, in particular in a SIDS context. Cleared | |
| | 14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes? | | |
| | 15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits? | | |
| Project Financing | 16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | 8-14-13 Yes. Assuming that all the co-financing (and baseline projects) becomes effective during project implementation. Cleared | |
| | 17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed? | 8-14-13 The co-financing is \$20M at a ratio of 1:5 Cleared | |
| | 18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate? | 8-14-13 The co-financing ratio for project management is 1:4 Cleared | |
| | 19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line | 8-14-13 PPG is for \$130K which is in line with the current policies. Cleared | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval,</u> if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund? | | |
| | 20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | NA | |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | | |
| | 22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | |
| Agency Responses | 23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from: | | |
| | • STAP? | | |
| | • Convention Secretariat? | | |
| | • The Council? | | |
| | • Other GEF Agencies? | | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | 24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended? | 8-14-13 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 3,7, 8 and 11. 8-22-14 This was properly addressed in the Response to GEF Comments and the Revised PIF. The new LoE will be provided in due course. Cleared | |
| | 25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|--|--|
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended? | | |
| | First review* | August 14, 2013 | |
| Review Date (s) | Additional review (as necessary) | August 22, 2013 | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | |
| | | | |

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**