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**part i: project Information**

**GEFSEC Project ID:** 3526

**gef agency Project ID:** 3749

**Country:** Republic of Mauritius

**Project Title:** Expanding Coverage and Strengthening Management Effectiveness of the Terrestrial Protected Area Network on the Island of Mauritius

**GEF Agency:** UNDP

**Other Executing partner(s):** Ministry of Agro-Industry, Food Production and Security

**GEF Focal Area(s):** Biodiversity**:** SO-1 Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

**GEF-4 Strategic program(s)**: BD-SP3: Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks

**Name of parent program/umbrella project:** N/A

1. **Project framework**

| **Project Objective**: To expand and ensure effective management of the protected area network to safeguard threatened biodiversity. | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Components | Type | **Expected Outcomes** | Expected Outputs | Indicative GEF Financing\* | | **Indicative Co-financing\*** | | **Total ($)** |
| ($) | % | ($) | % |
| 1. Systemic framework for Protected Area (PA) expansion improved | TA | Policy development, legal reform and strategic planning facilitate the expansion and effective management of the terrestrial PAN (across both public and private lands) of the island of Mauritius.   * The terrestrial Protected Area Network (PAN) is expanded from a baseline of 7259 ha[[1]](#footnote-2)to ca.14,920 ha (or 8% of the land area): 11,700 of state protected area and 3,220ha of private protected area * Systemic capacity for the PAN shows an improvement from a baseline of 50% to 78% * Financial sustainability of the PAN shows significant improvement from a baseline of 17% to >45% at end of project (EOP) * A broad communications and awareness programme reaches an audience of 100,000 people; outreach programmes directly reach 500 people; experiential learning programmes directly reach 300 people and 10 key decision-makers from 4 institutions are effectively lobbied | (i) *Enabling policy for PA expansion and management prepared*: best practice reviewed; vision principles and values for PAN defined; PA classification system rationalised; PA establishment processes developed; operational guidelines for PAs prepared; governance arrangements identified; M&E requirements described; institutional roles and responsibilities clarified.  (ii) *Legislative and regulatory framework for the PAN is updated and reformed*: legal working group established; recommendations for legislative and regulatory reform prepared; recommendations on the alignment of PA legislation with complementary legislation developed; legislative amendments prepared; stakeholder consultation on legal and regulatory reform facilitated.  (iii) *Rationale for PA expansion in place, and conservation stewardship strategy and tools established*: socio-economic and environmental business case developed; short- and long-term PA expansion targets defined; strategic approach to, and mechanism for, expansion identified; conservation stewardship approach developed; action plan for piloting conservation stewardship developed; suite of regulatory, optional and negotiable incentives established; medium-term human resource, equipment and budget needs spelt out.  (iv) *Business-oriented financial and business plan is prepared for PAN*: financial baseline defined; financial needs defined; functionality of financial management systems assessed; efficacy of financing mechanisms evaluated; institutional and legal reform needs identified; implementation programme developed.  (v) *Support for the conservation of native biodiversity is improved*: communication and awareness programme developed; communication resources and media designed and produced; outreach programmes initiated; experiential learning programmes piloted; road show for decision-makers established; opportunities for PPP’s initiated. | 478,000 | 22 | 1,700,000 | 78 | 2,178,000 |
| 2. PA Institutional framework strengthened | TA | Functional PA authorities are better able to utilize scarce funds and human resources in the planning, management, and/or oversight of public and privately administered PAs   * Institutional capacity for the PAN shows an improvement from a baseline of 56% to 65%; individual capacity improves from a baseline of 62% to 82% * Total operational (including HR and capital) budget allocation for the PAN increases from US2.3m at baseline to >US$4.1 at EOP * By the EOP, 12 of the 16 land types (baseline 8 of 16), 2 ecological corridors (0 at baseline) and 182 wild populations of rare and threatened species (134 at baseline) are represented in the expanded PAN | (i) *Management and governance options for the PAN reviewed*: SIDS best-practice reviewed; cost-benefit of alternative institutional options analyzed; organizational change management plan developed and implemented; international best practice in PA governance reviewed; governance model for PAN developed; multi stakeholder joint management arrangements developed for PAN.  (ii) *Strategic planning for PA institutions completed*: institutional mission statement developed; SWOT analysis undertaken; institutional goals, strategies and objective defined; performance management system developed; MTEF budget projections developed; implementation roles and responsibilities clarified.  (iii) *Financial sustainability of PA institutions improved*: Financial and business planning tools cost-effectively utilized by FS and NPCS staff; income from external donor funding agencies increased; PAN tourism routes and packages developed and promoted; tourism concession opportunity developed; feasibility of payments for environmental services assessed; opportunities for entry and other user fee systems evaluated and implemented.  (iv) *Conservation stewardship unit established and pilot programme implemented*: conservation stewardship unit staffed and equipped; affected landowners visited; internal cost-analyses conducted; negotiations initiated; stewardship agreements concluded; property management plans prepared; PA proclamations completed; incentives implemented; stewardship agreements administered.  (v) *Skills and competencies of PA staff improved*: current and desired skills and competence standards determined; institutional skills development and training programmes developed; short-course training and development programmes for 40 PA staff implemented; mentoring and career-pathing implemented for four senior PA staff; train-the-trainers programme initiated for IAS and ecosystem restoration supervisors; specialist technical skills in IAS control and ecosystem restoration implemented by supervisors; collaboration with counterpart conservation agencies initiated. | 745,000 | 25 | 2,220,800 | 75 | 2,965,800 |
| 3. Operational know-how in place to contain threats | TA | PA operations abate threats to the PAN using cost effective methods   * METT scores for state protected areas increases from 37% to >55% * Average cost of control of IAS decreases from US$9000 to US$1,500/ha for initial clearing and from US$1000 to <US$500 for follow-up clearing * Area under active IAS and ecosystem restoration management increases from a baseline of 60ha to >400ha * 95% of state PA’s boundaries secured and enforced (from a baseline of 50%) | (i) *Integrated management plan prepared for BRGNP*: park planning team constituted; 5-year strategic management plan completed; subsidiary plans prepared; annual plan of operations developed and updated annually; park performance evaluated annually.  (ii) *Cost-effective IAS control measures and ecosystem techniques developed and tested*: IAS coordinator appointed; demonstration sites demarcated; adaptive work programme developed to test the cost-effectiveness of different techniques, tools, methodologies and approaches in demonstration sites; IAS control and ecosystem restoration work programme implemented under different management regimes; knowledge management system maintained.  (iii) *Enforcement and compliance capability improved*: PA boundaries demarcated; enforcement staff equipped; incident management response systems developed; volunteer ‘ranger service’ established; cooperative governance arrangements in enforcement improved.  (iv) *Information management system for recording, exchanging and disseminating information in place*: Critical PA information needs identified; existing data collated; priority data collected; data converted into electronic format; information management system designed and populated; hardware, software and networking installed; decision-support tools developed; information management system maintained. | 2,377,000 | 26 | 6,667,000 | 74 | 9,044,000 |
| 4. Project management |  | | | 400,000 | 25 | 1,176,600 | 75 | 1,576,600 |
| **Project Costs** |  | | | 4,000,000 | 25 | 11,764,400 | 75 | 15,764,400 |

**B. Sources of confirmed Co-financing for the project** (expand the table line items as necessary)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Name of Co-financier (source)*** | ***Classification*** | ***Type*** | ***Project*** | ***%***\* |
| Ministry of Agro Industry, Food Production and Security | Nat'l Gov't | In-kind | 3,600,000 | 30.6 |
| Ministry of Environment and National Development Unit | Nat'l Gov't | In-kind | 587,400 | 5 |
| Baie Du Cap Estates LTD | Private Sector | In-kind | 80,000 | 0.7 |
| Bioculture | Private Sector | In-kind | 422,000 | 3.6 |
| CIE Sucriere De Bel Ombre Ltd. | Private Sector | In-kind | 1,200,000 | 10.2 |
| Flacq United Estates Ltd. | Private Sector | In-kind | 300,000 | 2.5 |
| The Medine Sugar Estates Co. Ltd. | Private Sector | In-kind | 2,000,000 | 17 |
| The Mount Sugar Estate Co. Ltd | Private Sector | In-kind | 125,000 | 1.1 |
| Deep River-Beau Champ Limited | Private Sector | In-kind | 250,000 | 2.1 |
| Mauritian Wildlife Foundation | NGO | In-kind | 3,200,000 | 27.2 |
| **Total Co-financing** | | | 11,764,400 | 100% |

**C.**  F**inancing Plan Summary For The Project ($)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Project Preparation a*** | ***Project***  ***B*** | ***Total***  ***c = a + b*** | ***Agency Fee*** | ***For comparison:***  ***GEF and Co-financing at PIF*** |
| GEF financing | 150,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,150,000 | 415,000 | 4,000,000 |
| Co-financing | 158,900 | 11,764,400 | 11,923,300 |  | 6,000,000 |
| **Total** | **308,900** | **15,764,400** | **16, 073,300** | **415,000** | **10,000,000** |

**D.**  **GEF Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Focal Area(s) and Country(ies)1**

N/A

**E. Consultants working for technical assistance components**:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Component*** | ***Estimated person weeks (GEF Only)*** | ***GEF amount($)*** | ***Co-financing ($)\**** | ***Project total ($)*** |
| *Local consultants\* [Sub-total]* | *561* | *561,000* | *54,968* | *615,968* |
| Protected area planning and management consultant | 70 | 70,000 |  | 70,000 |
| Legal advisor | 24 | 24,000 |  | 24,000 |
| Business consulting service provider | 36 | 36,000 |  | 36,000 |
| Marketing and communications service provider | 80 | 80,000 |  | 80,000 |
| Institutional development specialist | 40 | 40,000 |  | 40,000 |
| Strategic planning consultant | 65 | 65,000 |  | 65,000 |
| Nature-based tourism development specialist | 40 | 40,000 |  | 40,000 |
| Training service provider | 30 | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |
| IAS control and ecosystem rehabilitation coordinator | 80 | 80,000 |  | 80,000 |
| Information management system specialist | 45 | 45,000 |  | 45,000 |
| Monitoring and evaluation review consultant | 35 | 35,000 |  | 35,000 |
| Evaluation experts | 10 | 10,000 |  | 10,000 |
| Auditor | 6 | 6,000 |  | 6,000 |
| Provision of general workers for maintenance of PAs \*\* | - |  | 54,968 | 54,968 |
| *International consultants\* [Sub-total]* | *100* | *300,000* | *0* | *300,000* |
| Protected Area planning and management specialist | 40 | 120,000 |  | 120,000 |
| Environmental law specialist | 10 | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |
| Land stewardship specialist | 10 | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |
| Environmental economist | 12 | 36,000 |  | 36,000 |
| Skills training service provider | 10 | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |
| Evaluation experts for mid-term and final evaluation | 18 | 54,000 |  | 54,000 |
| **Total** | **661** | **861,000** | **54,968** | **915,968** |

*\* Details are provided in Annex C.*

*\*\* Refer to MoE’s co-financing letter*

**f. Project management Budget/cost**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Cost Items*** | ***Total Estimated person weeks (GEF only)*** | ***GEF amount $*** | ***Co-financing ($)\**** | ***Project total ($)*** |
| *Local consultants\** |  |  |  |  |
| Project Manager (@$42K per year over 4 years) | 240 | 142,545 | 0 | 142,545 |
| Project Assistant (@$24K per year over 4 years) | 240 | 81,455 | 0 | 81,455 |
| Gov. support: Representation in Steering Committee (plus procurement, HR, drivers etc.) | - | 0 | 17,169 | 17,169 |
| International consultants\* (CTA) | 50 | 150,000 | 0 | 150,000 |
| Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications\* |  | 26,000 | 515,263 | 541,263 |
| Travel\* |  |  |  | 0 |
| Others\*\* |  |  | 643,568 | 643,568 |
| **Total** | **530** | **400,000** | **1,176,000** | **1,576,000** |

*\* Details are provided in Annex C..*

*\*\* Details are provided in Annex E*

*\*\*\* Represents the government’s contribution to the project management (refer to co-financing letters, in particular that of MoE) plus the pro-rata indicative cost of managing various initiatives, projects and programmes that constitute the co-financing for this project.*

**G.** **Does the project include a “non-grant” instrument?** yes [ ] no [X]

**H. describe the budgeted m &E Plan:**

The project’s M&E Plan is thoroughly described in the UNDP Project Document (PRODOC). For more detail, refer to Section I, Part IV: ‘Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget’. The table below provides a summary.

| **Type of M&E activity** | **Responsible Parties** | **Budget (US$)** | **Time frame** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Inception Workshop | Project Coordinator  UNDP CO  UNDP GEF | Cost: 10,000 | Within first two months of project start up |
| Inception Report | Project Team  UNDP CO | None | Immediately following IW |
| Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Purpose Indicators | Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members | Indicative cost: 15,000  Cost to be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop. | Start, mid and end of project |
| Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis) | Oversight by Project Manager  Project team | Indicative cost: 32,000 (8,000/annum)  Cost to be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation. | Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans |
| ARR and PIR | Project Team  UNDP-CO  UNDP-GEF | None | Annually |
| Quarterly progress reports | Project team | None | Quarterly |
| CDRs | Project Manager | None | Quarterly |
| Issues Log | Project Manager  UNDP CO Programme Staff | None | Quarterly |
| Risks Log | Project Manager  UNDP CO Programme Staff | None | Quarterly |
| Lessons Learned Log | Project Manager  UNDP CO Programme Staff | None | Quarterly |
| Mid-term Evaluation | Project team  UNDP- CO  UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit  External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) | Cost: 40,000 | At the mid-point of project implementation. |
| Final Evaluation | Project team,  UNDP-CO  UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit  External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) | Cost: 40,000 | At the end of project implementation |
| Terminal Report | Project team  UNDP-CO  local consultant | 0 | At least one month before the end of the project |
| Lessons learned | Project team  UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit (suggested formats for documenting best practices, etc) | Cost :12,000 (average 3,000 per year) | Annually |
| Audit | UNDP-CO  Project team | Cost: 8,000 | Annually |
| **TOTAL indicative COST**  *Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses* | | **US$ 157,000** | |

part ii: project justification:

1. **State the issue, how the project seeks to address it, and the expected global environmental benefits to be delivered:**

For more detail, refer to the UNDP PRODOC, Section I, PART II: ‘Strategy’. In terms of the project rationale and the expected global biodiversity benefits, the summary below applies.

The long-term solution proposed by the proposed project is a reconfigured network of private and state protected areas that is designed to safeguard a representative sample of Mauritius’s terrestrial biodiversity under an effective and adaptive management regime. This ideal solution requires that PA agencies have adequate systemic, institutional and operational capacity to: (i) identify, prioritize and target gaps in representation that can be filled through protected area expansion, and complementary conservation, efforts on private and state-owned land; (ii) develop regulatory drivers and an incentives framework to support PA expansion, and complementary conservation, efforts on private and state-owned land; (iii) establish and administer a conservation stewardship program to implement PA expansion initiatives on privately owned or managed land; (iv) effectively plan, resource and manage an expanded PAN comprising both private and state protected areas; (v) mitigate the threats to, and pressures on, the unique biodiversity contained within the expanded PAN; (vi) ensure better integration of the PAN into the country’s socio-economic development priorities, in particular development of the tourism industry, to ensure its long-term financial sustainability; and (vi) respond effectively to the needs of, and meaningfully involve, different stakeholder groups in the ongoing planning and operational management of the expanded PAN.

Three sets of barriers are currently impeding efforts to secure the conservation status and ecological integrity of the remaining natural habitats on private and state land in Mauritius. These are: i) capacity deficits at the systemic level; ii) limited capacities at the institutional level; and iii) weak technical capability at the operational level.

In order to overcome these barriers and achieve the project objective of ‘*expand*(ing) *and ensure*(ing*) effective management of the protected area network to safeguard threatened biodiversity’*, the project’s intervention has been organised into three **components**:

Component 1: Systemic framework for PA expansion improved

Work under this component will support the amendment, streamlining and harmonisation of the policy, legislative and regulatory framework to enable improvement in the representivity, conservation security, financing and active management of a national system of protected areas. A conservation stewardship programme will be designed to underpin the negotiation of voluntary conservation agreements with private leaseholders and landowners that enables their designation as formal protected areas. Incentive mechanisms and tools that could support the implementation of this stewardship programme will be developed, tested, and their efficacy assessed. A business-oriented financial plan for an expanded PAN (comprising a matrix of private and state owned land) will be prepared. To support and complement efforts to expand the protected area network, a concurrent communication, education and awareness programme will be initiated, targeting key political and institutional decision-makers and affected landowners, leaseholders and local use groups

Component 2: PA institutional framework strengthened

Work under this component will involve undertaking a cost-benefit analysis of the institutional and governance options for the PAN. Based on the outcomes of this cost-benefit analysis, an institutional development plan will be developed to guide the reform of the institutional structures responsible for PA management, clarify the mandated roles and responsibilities of each institution and rationalise the cooperative governance structures. Strategic/ business planning processes for the responsible PA institution/s will then be supported to ensure the allocation of resources to institutional priorities and to achieve cost-effective conservation outcomes. The efficacy of a number of different financing mechanisms proposed in the financial and business plan for the PAN (see Output 1.4) will be piloted tested, evaluated and adapted (based on lessons learned) within the relevant PA institutions. A conservation stewardship unit will be established and staffed within the most appropriate conservation agency to implement the conservation stewardship programme developed in component 1 (see Output 1.3). An intensive staff training programme will be developed and implemented to strengthen the skills and competencies of PA staff.

Component 3: Operational know-how in place to contain threats

Work under this component will support the preparation of integrated management plans for the individual protected areas. Within the framework of these management plans (and the institutional strategic plan/s developed in component 2), an IAS control programme will be scaled up in 3 demonstration sites to test the most cost-effective techniques, implementation arrangements and tools through a ‘learning by doing’ continual improvement system developed for the project. To complement this scaled-up IAS control, procedures and protocols will be developed for the identification and phased introduction of biological control agents for selected plant invasives. Rehabilitation and restoration models and techniques for different habitats under IAS control and fire management will be tested, evaluated and implemented in demonstration sites. With the expansion of protected areas in fire-prone habitats, a fire management strategy will be developed and fire incident procedures and protocols established. The effective deployment, and equipping, of compliance and enforcement capabilities across the PAN will be supported. An information support system for communication and exchange of information within and across the project will be developed and maintained.

Activities under these three components will be focused at two levels of intervention: (i) the national level, through working with public institutions and agencies to develop the systemic, institutional and individual capacity to expand and effectively manage the PAN; and (ii) the local level, through working directly with the target stakeholder groups, rights holders and landowners in the *in situ* implementation of PA expansion and operational management activities.

The increment of the project in terms of **global environmental benefits** is represented by: (i) adding 6,893 ha of terrestrial landscapes under protection; (ii) increasing management effectiveness at the PA level (from a METT baseline of <37% -65% to a METT target of all PAs scoring >55% and IUCN category II PAs >70%); (iii) improving the overall PA institutional capacity (from baseline of 56% in the Capacity Assessment Scorecard to >65%); and (iv) increasing the financial sustainability of the PAN (from a financial sustainability baseline score of 17% to >45%). In the long-term (by 2015 and beyond) threats such as the spread of invasive alien species; illegal spread of agriculture; unsustainable deer farming practices; illegal harvesting of forest products; and uncontrolled wildfires will be contained at the level of the entire expanded terrestrial PA network of the country, covering >14,920 ha. Implementation of the CBD PoWPA by Mauritius will be facilitated by project activities, especially Goals 1.1, 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4.

The GEF financing for the project totals US$ 4,000,000. Total co-financing for the project total US$ 11,764,400 broken down into: a) US$ 1,700,000 for Component 1; b) US$ 2,220,800 for Component 2; c) US$ 7,443,600 for Component 3; and d) US$ 400,000 for project management. Co-financing is provided the Government (MoA, MoE NDU), private land owners and MWF.

1. Describe the consistency of the project with national and / or regional priorities/ plans:

The text that follows has been extracted from the UNDP PRODOC, Section I, Part II: Strategy, chapter ‘Project consistency with national priorities/plans’.

At a national level, the *National Environmental Policy* (NEP, 2008) defines the overarching environmental objectives and strategies for Government of Mauritius. The NEP in turn provides for the implementation of the *National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan* (NBSAP, 2006) and *Forestry Policy* (FP, 2006). The project is consistent with the FP by specifically contributing to the: (i) expansion of the formal protection of critical forests of national importance; (ii) development of incentives for rehabilitation, restoration and reforestation of native forests in sensitive areas; and (iii) research, planning, regulation, cooperation and operational support in the control of invasive alien species. The project is also directly aligned with work programmes 1a) (terrestrial PAN) and 1 d) (adaptive management of PAN) of the NBSAP. It will make a substantive contribution to meeting the performance targets of the NBSAP (10% of terrestrial area in PAN by 2015; at least 1000 ha of PAN under intensive management; and costed and scheduled management plans that enables adaptive management for all PAs).

The *National Development Strategy* (NDS, 2004) provides for the designation of a network of ‘Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA). The draft *Strategic Management Plan for Environmentally Sensitive Areas* (SMPESA, 2009) explicitly identifies these areas and seeks to provide for the protection and conservation of Category 1 and Category 2 ESA’s. The project will support the implementation of the SMPESA in the category 1 and 2 areas.

1. **Describe the consistency of the project with** [**gef strategies**](http://gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Templates_and_Guidelines/C31-10%20Revised%20Focal%20Area%20Strategies-07-23-07_Final.pdf) **and strategic programs:**

The text that follows has been summarized from the following chapters in the UNDP PRODOC: (1) PART II: Strategy: Project ‘Rationale and Policy Conformity’ / ‘Fit with the GEF Focal Area Strategy and Strategic Programme’; (2) Section I, Part II: Strategy, chapter ‘Country Ownership: Country Eligibility and Country Drivenness’.

The project is aligned with Strategic Objective (SO) 1 of the Biodiversity focal area, ‘Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems’. The project will contribute to this SO by increasing the spatial extent of protected areas in Mauritius, within the context of a ‘sustainable protected area system’ design; consolidating and strengthening the enabling legal, planning and institutional framework for the expansion and effective management of terrestrial protected areas; and strengthening the capacity (strategies, tools, mechanisms, knowledge, skills and resources) to support the operational management and financing of PAs. More specifically, the project complies with the eligibility criteria for the Strategic Programme (SP) on Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks. The focus of the SP is on ensuring better terrestrial ecosystem representation through filling ecosystem coverage gaps, an overarching objective of the project. Ancillary support will be provided to improve the operational efficiency of the terrestrial PAN, to ensure that resources allocated to the additional PA results in a management effort that is consistent with levels across the PAN as a whole.

The project will contribute to the achievement of GEF’s main indicators under this priority programming area as follows:

| **Relevant GEF-4 BD Strategic Program (SO)** | **Expected outcomes** | **Relevant GEF-4 BD Indicators** | **Project contribution to GEF-4 BD Indicators** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strengthened Terrestrial Protected Area Networks | Improved ecosystem coverage of under-represented terrestrial ecosystems areas as part of national protected area system  Improved management of terrestrial protected areas | Terrestrial ecosystem coverage in national protected area systems  Protected area management effectiveness as measured by individual protected area scorecards | Terrestrial protected area system coverage increases from a baseline of 8,027ha (4%) to 14,920ha (7.4%)  METT scores of state protected areas increase from a baseline of 37-65% to all PAs >50%  Financial sustainability scorecard increases from 17% to >45%  Capacity development scorecard increases from a baseline of 50%, 56% and 62% to 78%, 65% and 82% for the systemic, institutional and individual capacity scores respectively |

As a party to the CBD, Mauritius is committed to implement the Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA). A preliminary analysis of key gaps in the country’s implementation of the CBD PoWPA was undertaken during the preparation of this project. Several PoWPA Goals stood out as high priorities, including: Goal 1.1 (ecological representivity); Goal 1.4 (site-based participatory planning); Goal 2.1 Action 2.1.2 (integration of communities and private sector into management); Goal 3.1 (economic valuation, positive incentives and enabling environment); Goal 3.2 (building capacities for establishing and managing PAs) and Goal 3.4 (financial sustainability). Component 1 of this project contributes towards addressing PoWPA Goals 1.1, 3.1 and 3.4, while Component 2 deals in part with Goal 2.1, 3.2 and 3.4 and Component 3 responds to selected activities of Goals 1.4, 2.1 and 3.2. The project specifically conforms to the COP 9 decision IX/18 on prioritising the implementation of PoWPA in the SIDS.

1. **justify the type of financing support provided with the gef resources.**

The project objective will thus be achieved primarily through the provision of technical assistance. No loan or revolving fund mechanisms are considered appropriate, and therefore grant-type funding is considered adequate to enable successful delivery of project outcomes.

A thorough justification for this request is provided in the UNDP PRODOC.

1. **Outline the Coordination with other related initiatives:**

Mauritius has established as a priority a comprehensive and strategic programme to protect its biodiversity and fulfill global environmental priorities. Efforts to improve national capacities for coastal zone management are currently being spearheaded. Furthermore, a GEF MSP is underway to strengthen the MPA network (*Partnerships for Marine Protected Areas in Mauritius* *and Rodrigues*). This initiative is exploring among other issues, the utility of adopting co-management network models between government, local communities and the private sector for the management of MPA sites. Mauritius is therefore moving towards to a sustainable management of its Protected Area System covering both Marine and Terrestrial Protected Areas. The proposed project will fill a major unmet need in Mauritius, namely coverage and management effectiveness of the PAN established to conserve terrestrial ecosystems. As the management challenges and institutions responsible for managing terrestrial ecosystems differ markedly from those in coastal and marine ecosystems, a separate project is justified to deal with the terrestrial PAN. Interventions will be structured to ensure this effort complements ongoing interventions.

The design and development of the protected area network will be integrated into the land information systems supported by the GEF-funded *Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management* (SLM) *in Mauritius*. The project will align the proposed incentives framework for the incorporation of private land into the PAN with the regulatory and economic incentive frameworks developed by the SLM project for sustainable practices on non-forest land. In addition, the project will accommodate lessons gleaned from two previous initiatives, the GEF -funded pilot project *Restoration of Highly Degraded and Threatened Native Forests in Mauritius*. It will use the explicit lessons documented from this pilot CMA in the Black River Gorges National Park to restore biodiversity at the level of the forest ecosystem. The project will also draw on the lessons learnt from: (i) pilot GEF restoration projects managed by MWF on Rodrigues, Ile aux Aigrettes and Round Island (*Biodiversity Restoration* and *Restoration of Round Island*); (ii) upland restoration projects managed by MWF (one on herbicide use, one on superfence trials); and the (iii) UNEP-GEF WIO-LaB (*Addressing Land-Based Activities in the Western Indian Ocean*) pilot ecosystem restoration project implemented by the NPCS in the BRGNP, to guide project design. The project will contributes to the implementation of the *Management Plan for Environmentally Sensitive Areas* (SMPESA, 2009) by negotiating conservation stewardship agreements with private landowners and leaseholders with land designated as Category 1 or 2 ESA where they overlap with the priority areas for PA expansion.

1. **Discuss the value-added of GEF involvement in the project demonstrated through** [**incremental reasoning**](http://gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Documents/Council_Documents__(PDF_DOC)/GEF_31/C.31.12%20Operational%20Guidelines%20for%20Incremental%20Costs.pdf):

For more detail, refer to the UNDP PRODOC.

The Project’s baseline is described in Section I, Part I ‘Baseline analysis’. The ‘Incremental reasoning and expected global, national and local benefits’ are described in the relevant chapter with same title under Section I, Part II: Strategy. Section II, Part II contains the ‘Incremental Cost Analysis’.

The table below provides a summary of the incremental cost analysis:

| **Cost/Benefit** | **Baseline**  **(B)** | **Alternative**  **(A)** | **Increment**  **(A-B)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BENEFITS** | | | |
| **Global benefits** | Continued reduction in populations of native fauna and flora  Continuous land conversion and habitat fragmentation | The alternate scenario will ensure improvement of population of native fauna and flora, prevention of further land conversion and land fragmentation, expansion of PA, and more effective PA management. | Identified barriers are: i) capacity deficient at the systemic level, ii) limited capacities at the institutional level, and iii) weak technical capacity at the operation level. |
| **National and local benefits** | Reduced ecosystem goods and services derived from terrestrial ecosystems due to land conversion and habitat fragmentation and spread of invasive species | Under the alternative scenario, Mauritius will benefit from medium – long term increases in ecosystem services and other economic benefits from nature-based tourism because of increased ecosystem resiliency, increases populations of endemic and native species and effective protected area management (including improvement of facilities for tourists). | Enabling national policy for a representative system of PA is formulated; updated and reformed legislative and regulatory framework for the PAN; rationally expanded terrestrial PA coverage; established conservation stewardship strategy and tolls for guided implementation; business-oriented financial and business plan prepared for PAN; improved awareness of the need to conserve native biodiversity; reviewed management and governance options for the PAN; completed strategic planning for PA institution; improved financial sustainability of PA institutions; development of integrated management plan for Black River Gorges NP; developed and tested cost-effectiveness IAS control measures, ecosystem restoration techniques ; improved public PA agencies’ capability for enforcement and compliance; established information management system for recording, exchanging and information dissemination . |
| **COSTS** | | | |
| **Outcome 1:**  ***Systemic framework for PA expansion improved*** | - Expansion of the conservation estate:  $ 5,070,000  (GoM: $5,060,000  Private: $ 10,000) | -The enabling legal framework for the PAN for provision of the designation, establishment, expansion, and management of a representative system of protected areas.  - Updated and reformed legislative and regulatory framework for PAN  - PA expansion in place and conservation stewardship strategy and tools established to guide implementation  - Business-oriented financial and business plan prepared for PAN for financial diversification  - Improved capacity of relevant stakeholders for planning, development and management, administration of the PAN  - Improved awareness of conservation of native biodiversity and increase of the public appreciation for Mauritius’ unique biodiversity | |  | | --- | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |   GoM: $ 1,500,000  NGO: $ 200,000  GEF: $ 478,000 |
| **Sub-total baseline:**  **$ 5,070,000** | **Sub-total alternative: $ 7,248,000** | **Sub-total increment:$ 2,178,000** |
| **Outcome 2:**  ***PA institutional framework strengthened*** | - Legislative reform:  $ 250,000  (GoM: $ 250,000)  - Financing of state PAs :  $ 2,360,000  (GoM: $ 2,360,000)  - Nature-based tourism and recreation  : $ 220,000  (GoM: $170,000,  Private: $ 50,000) | - The management of the protected areas comprising the protected area network directed by approved management plans  - Improved staffing component, capacity, resources and skills within the responsible institution for key planning, management and operational requirements  - Options for improvement of the financing of PAs explored, developed, and testes  - Established conservation stewardship to facilitate the voluntary proclamation of privately owned, or managed, land as a protected area  - Increased incentive for private landholders to initiate and sustain invasive alien cleaning and rehabilitation activities | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  |   GoM: $1,220,800  Private  Sector: $1,000,000  GEF: $745,000 |
| **Sub-total baseline:**  **$ 2,830,000** | **Sub-total alternative: $ 5,795,800** | **Sub-total increment: $ 2,965,800** |
| **Outcome 3:**  ***Operational know-how in place to contain threats*** | - Conservation of privately owned or leased land: $ 140,000  (Private: $ 140,000)  - Control of IAS on state-owned land on mainland:  $ 154,000  (GoM: $154,000)  - Control of IAS on state-owned land on the islets:  $ 47,000  (GoM: $ 47,000)  - Restoration of degraded land: $ 38,000  (GoM: $ 30,000,  Private: $ 8,000)  - Propagation of native plants for restoration programmes in PAs, and maintenance of captive breeding programmes for reintroduction into PAs  $ 235,000  (estimated combined  GoM and NGO: $ 175,000,  Estimated combined NGO and Private:  $ 60,000)  - Information Management : $15,000  (estimated combined GoM and NGO: $15,000) | - Effectively monitored and controlled he illegal activities in PAs and other environmentally sensitive areas due to improved capacities of public PA agencies  - PA resources, information and expertise effectively deployed and coordinated  - Increased incentive for private landowners to initiate and sustain invasive alien cleaning and rehabilitation activities  - Alternative and cost effective methods of integrated weed management developed, tested and replicated | |  | | --- | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |   GoM: $1,066,600  NGO: $2,700,000  Private  Sector: $ 2,900,400  GEF: $2,377,000 |
| **Sub-total baseline:**  **$ 629,000** | **Sub-total alternative: $9,673,000** | **Sub-total increment: $9,044,000** |
| **Project Management** | | | **GoM: $400,000**  **NGO: $300,000**  **Private: $476,600**  **GEF: $400,000** |
| **TOTAL COSTS** | **TOTAL BASELINE:**  **$ 8,529,000** | **TOTAL ALTERNATIVE:**  **$ 22,716,800** | **TOTAL INCREMENT:**  **GoM: $ 4,187,400**  **NGO: $ 3,200,000**  **Private: $ $4,377,000**  **GEF: $ 4,000,000**    **TOTAL: $ 15,764,400** |

1. **Indicate risks, including climate change risks, that might prevent the project objective(s) from being achieved and outline risk management measures:**

The following table has been extracted from the UNDP PRODOC, Section I, PART II: Strategy, chapter ‘Risks and Assumptions’.

| **Risk** | **risk Rating** | **Risk mitigation measures** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The legal reform processes become prolonged and drawn out, resulting in delays to the expansion of the PAN into privately owned and leased areas of high biodiversity value. | H | The project will facilitate the establishment and functioning of a legal working group, within the exisiting governance framework of the NBSAP Committee, to guide and direct the legal reform processes. Legisaltive amendments that would enable, and incentivise, the formal designation of privately owned or managed land as PAs will be prioritised. Key stakeholder institutions, including the State Law Office, will be co-opted onto the working group to ensure cooperative problem-solving in the iterative drafting of the necessary legislative and regulatory amendments. The project will specifically contract an international, and counterpart national, specialist in environmental law to provide technical and specialist legal advisory support to the working group. The project will also support capacity development in the MoA to lead the legislative reform proposals through the formal approval process requirements. The implementation of PA expansion activities will then be programmed for years 3-5 of the project to provide sufficient time for the enabling legal reform processes to be completed. |
| Fears of expropriation and/or loss of rights hamper efforts to negotiate conservation stewardship agreements with private landowners and leaseholders | H | The project will facilitate the design, and piloting, of a conservation stewardship programme that will focus on the voluntary negotiation of a conservation stewardship agreement between an individual land owner/lessee and the relevant conservation agency. No option for expropriation of land or rights will be considered in this conservation stewardship programme. A focused communication campaign will be implemented by the programme staff to specifically respond to, and address landowners and leaseholder’s apprehensions about the programme. All affected landowners (i.e. those targeted for PA expansion efforts) would then be visited by conservation stewardship staff to introduce conservation stewardship, and the stewardship options. Specific concerns and fears of individual landowners/leaseholders will first be addressed by stewardship staff prior to initiation of any negotiation process. If successfully concluded, a conservation stewardship agreement would then enable the incorporation of private land (leased or freehold title) into the PAN without any loss of ownership or rights. Where an agreement is not successfully concluded (or even initiated in the case of reluctant landowners/lessees), the existing *status quo* would then be retained. A suite of incentives would be developed by, and used in, the project to encourage private landowners and leaseholders to conclude a conservation stewardship agreement. |
| A lack of agreement on the rationalisation of management authority for PAs sustains the fragmentation of, and institutional inefficiencies in, PA institutions | M | The need to strengthen the institutional effectiveness of the PA authorities responsible for the PAN is widely recognised by government as a strategic area requiring intervention (NBSAP and Forestry Policy, 2006). The consultative processes with government institutions undertaken during the PPG phase secured an institutional and political commitment to at least critically review, and assess, the cost-effectiveness of alternative options for the management and governance of protected areas identified during the PPG phase. This commitment will now be sustained in the project implementation phase through ongoing high level discussions with government, mediated by the MoA and UNDP. The project will focus GEF resources on continuing and building on the consultation processes with, and between, affected institutions to effect the necessary institutional reforms. The PSC will maintain and coordinate the commitment of partner public institutions in the implementation of agreed institutional and governance reforms. |
| Private landowners and leaseholders do not see sufficient incentive to include their land in the PAN without compromising the income generating opportunities from their landholdings | M | The elements of a comprehensive incentive ‘toolbox’ were developed during the PPG phase. These incentives included: (i) direct financial incentives (lease fee, compensation for loss of development rights, conservation payments, subsidized materials and equipment, tax relief, VAT exemptions, tax deductions, interest free loans, performance bonds, etc.); (ii) indirect financial incentives (land swaps, limited development rights, provision of bulk infrastructure, etc.); and (iii) non-financial incentives (technical support, skills and capacity building, marketing, formal recognition, etc.). The mechanics of each of these incentives will be further developed during the first two years of the project and, as required, legislative and regulatory amendments made to enable their implementation. The efficacy of a suite of pre-selected incentives will then be tested during the implementation of the pilot conservation stewardship programme from year 3 onward. Based on the response of landowners and leaseholders to each of these incentives, the ‘toolbox’ will be continuously adapted and updated to ensure their usefulness to private landowners and leaseholders. |
| The cost of the IAS control program inhibits the scaling up of demonstration sites to the landscape level | M | Significant funds are already being spent by the GM on managing IAS, but this is being disbursed in a spatially fragmented, uncoordinated and inefficient manner. Cost-effective techniques, implementation arrangements and tools for the control of invasive alien plant and animal species will be developed, implemented and tested by the project to make better use of these resources. Project investments in initial clearing will also reduce the long-term costs of maintaining these areas.  Additional income generating opportunities will also be identified and facilitated to icrease resources available for IAS clearing, follow-up and restoration programs at a landscape scale. |
| The effects of climate change will further degrade the conservation value of both the existing protected areas and those targeted for designation as protected areas, and increase the costs of their rehabilitation | **L** | The development of the terrestrial PAN for Mauritius will seek to integrate the protected area system into the country’s evolving climate change adaptation strategy, particularly in terms of its important role as a buffer to the economically important agricultural and tourism industries. The spatial priorities for expansion of the PAN are directed, in part, at increasing the resilience of the PAN to the impacts of climate change by improving the connectivity between formal protected areas and other conservation areas at the landscape scale. It will seek to achieve this through the: (i) establishment of upland-lowland corridors from the base of mountains (or even sea shore) to mountain peaks; (ii) preservation of terrestrial-marine links where they still exist; (iii) preservation of landscape connectivity; (iv) restoration of landscape linkages where necessary; and (v) restoration of keystone ecosystem drivers (e.g. establishment of populations of land tortoise). |

1. **explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design**:

The text that follows has been reproduced from the UNDP PRODOC, Section I, Part II: Strategy, chapter ‘Cost Effectiveness’

The project is considered cost-effective for the following primary reasons:

(i) The strategic focus of project investment in the expansion of the PAN to create larger, more physically networked protected areas comprising a matrix of private and state land will yield an improvement in the management effectiveness of these areas by: (i) improving their ecological integrity and resilience; (ii) providing more secure passage for migrating fauna; (iii) building partnerships between the state and private landowners in conserving native biodiversity; (iv) improving opportunities for recreational and nature-based tourism enterprise to generate income streams to cross-subsidize management costs of the PAN; (v) rationalizing the use of sparse staff, equipment and finances; (vi) reducing the area:boundary ratios and associated enforcement and compliance costs; and (vii) reducing the impacts of adjacent land uses.

(ii) A conservation stewardship approach is increasingly being recognized as one of the most cost-effective mechanisms for securing the protection of privately owned land of high conservation value. Traditional PA establishment costs for privately owned land - typically involving land acquisition or expropriation - may vary between US$500-1000/ha. Conversely the costs of negotiating conservation stewardship agreements with private landowners are estimated at less than US$50/ha resulting in considerable savings to the severely under-resourced PA institutions in Mauritius. Similarly, the operational management costs of PAs by the public PA agencies, though highly variable in space and time is roughly estimated at US$100/ha/annum (excluding IAS control and ecosystem restoration). The equivalent level of operational management by individual landowners is estimated at approximately 60% of these costs, i.e. US$60/ha/annum (excluding the cost of financial incentives, notably for IAS control and ecosystem restoration), again a considerable saving.

(iii) A small short-term catalytic investment by the project in identifying appropriate financing mechanisms for the PAN, and testing the efficacy of a sub-set of these, will provide the groundwork for improving the future long-term financial viability of the PAN in Mauritius.

(iv) Project support in reforming and updating the enabling legislation for the PAN will, with modest costs, result in substantive long term returns, including: (a) creating an enabling regulatory framework for the future establishment of private protected areas in Mauritius; (b) strengthening the long-term legal tenure of protected areas; (c) clarifying institutional roles and responsibilities in the planning, administration and management of PAs; (d) better integrating and aligning PAs with other sectoral development programs; and (e) strengthening the cooperative governance of the PAN.

(v) A comparatively small investment by the project in rationalizing and strengthening the institutional competencies of PA agencies will help to focus the optimal deployment of limited resources and capacity in the ongoing improvement of the management effectiveness of the PAN in Mauritius. Project support to the focused improvement of the proficiency and skills of protected area 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.

(vi) A modest investment in testing the cost-effectiveness of IAS control and ecosystem restoration techniques in a number of demonstration sites will contribute to significantly improving the future costs (and effectiveness) of these operations. With the improvement in the costs and efficiencies of clearing, follow-up and subsequent restoration interventions (as required), the extent of the areas cleared, maintained and rehabilitated by PA institutions can be significantly increased using the current financial resources and capacity already being deployed by the GM. The successful introduction of biological control agents will further reduce the invasive capacity of selected species, and the subsequent mechanical/chemical costs of control of these species.

(vii) The cost-effectiveness of the project is further enhanced through the systematic integration of protected areas into the national development-planning framework and sectoral strategies, notably in the nature-based tourism sector. This will ensure the simultaneous attainment of biodiversity conservation objectives in the pursuit of economic development. The project will thus seek in the long-term to share the financial pressures of, and opportunities in, the management of the PAN with the private sector. This will ensure more cost-effective management of protected areas when compared to the current command and control systems of management

Alternate project approaches were considered, and are discussed here in the light of cost-effectiveness. The alternatives to this project explored include:

1. *No project*: There is currently no capacity in the NPCS and FS to finance or initiate a PA expansion programme to achieve the objectives of the NBSAP (10% of terrestrial area within PAN by 2015), and particularly not the implementation of a conservation stewardship programme on private landholdings. Without focused GEF support, initiatives to expand the PAN will continue to be addressed in an *ad hoc* and opportunistic manner, with an increasing political and public cynicism about the inherent value of the PAN. The privately owned and leased areas targeted for inclusion into the PAN will then remain unprotected, and the biodiversity value of these areas will increasingly come under pressure from other more productive land uses by landowners. Any delays in GEF investments would require more resources in order to reverse the ongoing decline in both the existing PAN and in those areas of high biodiversity significance that are targeted for future incorporation.
2. *Investment in the entire terrestrial and marine network of protected areas*: Due to the severe capacity constraints of the responsible PA agencies, it was considered more prudent to focus on the terrestrial protected areas of mainland Mauritius, and specifically on developing the capacity of those institutions responsible for their planning and management (primarily the FS and NPCS). This project would complement and build on lessons learnt from the UNDP/GEF *Partnerships for Marine Protected Areas in Mauritius and Rodrigues* project. A number of project activities linked primarily to systemic and institutional capacity building (e.g. preparation of a ‘National Policy for Protected Areas’, preparation of a ‘PAN Expansion Strategy’, legislative and regulatory reform, public awareness programs and review of management and governance options) will be developed to more inclusively address the entire protected area system (i.e. MPAs and PAs in Rodrigues) in Mauritius.
3. *A more comprehensive project that addresses land use planning, sustainable land use management and the mainstreaming of biodiversity into the different economic sectors*: The design and development of the protected area network has been specifically designed to complement the GEF-funded *Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management* (SLM) *in Mauritius* in order to achieve the broader sustainable development objectives for Mauritius.

Costs incurred in project implementation will focus only on those additional actions required to provide key incremental assistance to the government in undertaking reforms in the design, planning, operational management and governance of the PAN. The project will seek to complement and build on the existing baseline activities and institutional capacities, as well as the use of existing infrastructure and equipment.

**part iii: institutional coordination and support**

**A. Institutional arrangement:**

N/A

**B. Project Implementation Arrangement**:

The project’s management and implementation arrangements are more fully described in the UNDP PRODOC. For more detail, refer to Section I, Part III: ‘Management Arrangements’. The text and figure that follows provides a summary:

The project will be implemented over a period of five years. The Ministry of Agro-Industry, Food Production and Security (MoA*)* is the government institution responsible for the implementation of the project and will act as the *Executing Agency* (EA). UNDP is the *Implementing Agency* (IA) for the project. The project is nationally executed (NEX), in line with the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA, 1974) between the UNDP and the Government of Mauritius, and the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for 2009-2011.

The MoA will take overall responsibility for the project implementation, and the timely and verifiable attainment of project objectives and outcomes. It will provide support to, and inputs for, the implementation of all project activities. The MoA will nominate a high level official who will serve as the National Project Director (NPD) for the project implementation. The NPD will chair the Project Steering Committee (PSC), and be responsible for providing government oversight and guidance to the project implementation The NPD will not be paid from the project funds, but will represent a Government in kind contribution to the Project. The NPD will be technically supported by a Chief Technical Adviser (CTA). The CTA will support the provision of the required technical inputs, reviewing and preparing Terms of Reference and reviewing the outputs of consultants and other sub-contractors. The CTA will be recruited using standard UNDP-CO recruitment procedures and will report directly to the NPD.

Working closely with the MoA, the UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) will be responsible for: (i) providing financial and audit services to the project; (ii) recruitment of project staff and contracting of consultants and service providers; (iii) overseeing financial expenditures against project budgets approved by PSC; (iv) appointment of independent financial auditors and evaluators; and (iv) ensuring that all activities including procurement and financial services are carried out in strict compliance with UNDP/GEF procedures. A UNDP staff member will be assigned with the responsibility for the day-to-day management and control over project finance.

A *National Project Steering Committee* (PSC)will be convened by the MoA, and will serve as the project’s coordination and decision-making body. The PSC will include representation of all the key project stakeholders. The PSC meetings will be chaired by the NPD. It will meet according the necessity, but not less than once in 4 months, to review project progress, approve project work plans and approve major project deliverables. The PSC is responsible for ensuring that the project remains on course to deliver products of the required quality to meet the outcomes defined in the project document.

The day-to-day administration of the project will be carried out by a *Project Coordinating Unit* (PCU), comprising a Project Manager (PM) and Project Assistant, who will be located within MoA offices (NPCS or FS). The project staff will be recruited using standard UNDP recruitment procedures. The PM will, with the support of the Project Assistant, manage the implementation of all project activities. The Project Manager will liaise and work closely with all partner institutions to link the project with complementary national programs and initiatives. The PM is accountable to the MoA and the PSC for the quality, timeliness and effectiveness of the activities carried out, as well as for the use of funds. The PM will also be technically supported by contracted national and international service providers. Recruitment of specialist services for the project will be done by the PM, in consultation with the UNDP and the MoA.

**part iv: explain the alignment of project design with the original PIF**:

The project design is fully in line with the PIF, except for the co-financing which is larger than initially foreseen. The components, outcomes and outputs identified in the PIF have been validated and further elaborated with a few adjustments and improvements.

**part v: Agency(ies) certification**

|  |
| --- |
| This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO Endorsement. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agency Coordinator, Agency name** | **Signature** | **Date**  ***(Month, day, year)*** | **Project Contact Person** | **Telephone** | **Email Address** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Annex A: Project Results Framework**

| **Objective/ Outcome** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **End of Project target** | **Source of Information** | **Risks and assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective**  To expand, and ensure effective management of, the protected area network to safeguard threatened biodiversity | Coverage (ha) of the terrestrial **formal** protected area network of mainland Mauritius and the islets:  State protected areas  Private protected areas | 8,027ha  0ha | 11,700ha  3,220ha | Protected Area Information System  Annual Reports of FS and NPCS  Ministry of Housing and Lands Land Use/Class database  MoE NDU ESA database | Assumptions:   * The government commits to an incremental growth in the grant funding allocation to finance the protected area network * The financial reporting of the MoA (FS and NPCS) develops dedicated budget codes for PA planning and management functions   Risks:   * The legal reform processes to support the effective management and expansion of the PAN become prolonged and drawn out |
| Total operational budget (including HR and capital budget) allocation (US$) for protected area management | ~US$2.3m | >US$4.1m | Audited financial reports of FS and NPCS  Audited financial reports of NEF and NCF  Audited financial reports of MWF |
| Financial sustainability score (%) for national systems of protected areas | 17% | >45% | Annual Financial Sustainability Scorecard |
| Capacity development indicator score (%) for protected area system:  Systemic  Institutional  Individual | 50%  56%  62% | 78%  65%  82% | Annual Institutional Capacity Development Scorecard |
| METT scores for different categories of formal protected areas on mainland Mauritius and the islets  National Parks (2)  Bird Sanctuary (1)  Nature Reserves (14)  Forest Reserves (3) | 40% & 58%  57%  37-65%  <37% | All > 70%  > 65%  All > 60%  All > 55% | METT applied at Mid-Term and Final Evaluation |
| **Outcome 1**  Systemic framework for PA expansion improved | **Outputs:**  1.1: Enabling national policy for a representative system of protected areas is formulated  1.2: Legislative and regulatory framework for the PAN is updated and reformed  1.3: Rationale for PA expansion in place, and conservation stewardship strategy and tools established to guide implementation  1.4: Business-oriented financial and business plan prepared for PAN  1.5: Awareness of the need to conserve native biodiversity is improved | | | | |
| Number of ‘Land Types’[[2]](#footnote-3) included in the PAN | 8 of 16 | 12 of 16 | Protected Area Information System | Assumptions:   * Legislative and regulatory reforms are supported and adopted by Government, and provide for the establishment of private protected areas * Land designated as category 1 and category 2 ESA’s will remain under some form of protection or conservation in the medium-term * Distributional data of threatened native species is being updated and maintained   Risks:   * The effects of climate change degrades the conservation value of areas targeted for PAN expansion |
| Ecological corridors and marine-terrestrial linkages incorporated into the PAN | None | 2  (1 in South; 1 in North)[[3]](#footnote-4) | Protected Area Information System  Ministry of Housing and Lands Land Use/Class database  MoE NDU ESA database |
| Number of rare and threatened plant species (of 231 with a known distribution) having at least 1 wild population represented in the PAN.  Previously considered extinct  Extirpated in the wild  Critically endangered  Endangered  Vulnerable | 2  1  44  25  62 | 6  2  70  33  71 | Protected Area Information System  Mauritius Herbarium |
| Reach (estimated number of people) of the communications and awareness programme  Broad-based communications (estimated number of audience receiving different media message)  Outreach programmes (number of people attending)  Experiential learning programmes (number of people attending)  Lobbying of key decision-makers (number of people and institutions) | n/a  n/a  n/a  n/a | 100,000  500  300  10 of 4 | Project Reports |
| **Outcome 2**  PA institutional framework strengthened | **Outputs**  2.1: Management and governance options for the PAN reviewed.  2.2: Strategic planning for PA institutions completed  2.3: Financial sustainability of PA institutions improved  2.4: Conservation stewardship unit established and pilot programme implemented  2.5: Skills and competencies of PA staff improved | | | | |
| Number of strategic plans prepared for PA institutions that are linked to the MTEF | 0 | 2 | Annual Reports of FS and NPCS | Assumptions:   * Stakeholder institutions constructively engage in the identification of the most cost-effective institutional and governance arrangements for the PAN * The individual PA institutions maintain a clear mandate and unequivocal authority to fulfil oversight and management obligations for the protected area network   Risks:   * Government institutions cannot agree on the rationalisation of the management authority for PAs * Fears of expropriation and/or loss of rights hamper efforts to negotiate conservation stewardship agreements * Insufficient incentives are created to facilitate conservation stewardship negotiations |
| Income from other sources (i.e. non- state budget allocation), as a percentage of the total operational budget of the PAN | 33% | 54% | Audited financial reports of FS and NPCS  Audited financial reports of NEF and NCF  Audited financial reports of MWF |
| Number of tourism concessions awarded | 0 | 1 | Concession agreements |
| Number of private landowners concluding stewardship agreements:  Informal, non-binding, agreements  Formal, legally binding, agreements | 0  0 | >6  >2 | Stewardship agreements  Project reports |
| Number of planning support and operational PA staff completing specialised training and/or skills development programs  Short course training  Mentoring programme  Train-the-trainers programme  IAS and ecosystem restoration skills development  Partnering agreements with counterpart institutions | 0  0  0  0  0 | >40  5  5  50  3 | Training reports  Project reports  Annual reports of FS and NPCS |
| **Outcome 3**  Operational know-how in place to contain threats | **Outputs**  3.1: Integrated management plan prepared for Black River Gorges National Park  3.2: Cost-effective IAS control measures, and ecosystem restoration techniques, developed and tested  3.3: Enforcement and compliance capability improved  3.4: Information management system for recording, exchanging and disseminating information in place | | | | |
| Number of protected areas with updated and approved management plans | 1 | >3 | Annual reports of FS and NPCS | Assumptions:   * A generic management planning format for PAs is adopted by all responsible PA institutions * The Government sustains, or improves, its financial commitment to IAS control and ecosystem restoration * Biological control agents will remain under development by other countries for targeted IAS, and available for release within the time frame of the project * Stakeholder groups continue to work collaboratively in IAS control and ecosystem restoration * Information to support the planning and management of the PAN is made available by existing public and private data suppliers   Risks:   * The high costs of IAS clearing and maintenance inhibits the scaling up of the IAS control program across the PAN network on the mainland and islets |
| Extent of area (ha) under active IAS management and ecosystem restoration | 60 | >400 | Annual reports of FS and NPCS  Project Reports |
| Average cost (US$/ha) of IAS control and ecosystem restoration  Initial clearing and first follow-up  Subsequent follow-ups | US$9,000  US$1,000 | US$1,500  US$500 | Protected Area Information System |
| % of PAs with no, or poorly, demarcated boundaries | 95% | <50% | Project reports  Annual reports of FS and NPCS |

**Annex B: Responses to Project Reviews**

Comments received from GEF Secretariat dated 06 November, 2007

| **Comment** | **Response** |
| --- | --- |
| The NBSAP is not on the web site. Please post it. | The NBSAP has yet to be finalized. The country has informed us that the document will be submitted to the CBD for posting once finalized. |
| The financial resources committed to the project do not correspond to the amounts in the PIF. Please review the figures in the letter, stating the total, the project cost and the agency fee. | The figures stated in the OFP letter are accurate and distinguish between the amounts allocated for the PPG, the full project and agency fee. The Government has endorsed funding for a total amount of US$ 4,565,000, including an FSP of US$ 4,000,000, a PPG of US$ 150,000 and IA fees at 10% of the total FSP + PPG.  However, we were advised by the GEF SEC registry that if the PPG application is not submitted together with the PIF, the amounts should be excluded from the finance tables. While we do not understand the reason for this—we complied (we indicated in foot note 2 that Mauritius would be applying for a PPG amounting to U$150,000 from GEF—additional to the requested grant). Accordingly, the PIF states the amount for the FSP (4,000,000) and the IA fee on the FSP portion, which adds up to US$ 4,400,000.  We have adjusted the PIF to include the PPG amount, bringing the total GEF allocation to US$ 4,565,000 including an FSP of US$ 4,000,000, PPG of US$ 150,000 and IA fees of US$ 415,000. |
| Submission dates viz 50% rule. | The country has identified this project as its top priority under GEF IV, and has committed the bulk of its RAF resources to it. In an agreement reached with GEF SEC via an exchange of letters, the PIF has been submitted now for pipeline entry, even though the amount requested is greater than 50% of the allocation in the first half of the RAF. The country is seeking technical clearance of the PIF. Once received, a PPG would be requested allowing preparation of the project to commence. The PIF would only be submitted to the Work Programme in the second half GEF IV. We have attached the correspondence between the GEF SEC and the Government of Mauritius, which the Government has shared with us. The Expected Date of Work Program Approval—as stated in the PIF is July 2008. |
| It is not clear why policy and legal reforms are needed to create Protected Areas under component 1, if Protected Areas have been created. | A new policy and legal framework is needed to address the following :  - It is true that Protected Areas have been created on State land, and Privately owned Mountain and River Reserves exist. However, the latter have limited security, and while aimed at reducing deforestation, permit land uses that have adverse impacts on biodiversity. For example there are few controls on deer ranching in these areas, and overstocking is leading to forest degradation. Similarly, there are few if any controls on invasive species. Accordingly, this category of Reserve does not provide a robust framework for protecting biodiversity. Technically, such Reserves also lie outside of the National PA System. There is a need to establish a new category of Private Reserve geared to biodiversity conservation, geared to nature-based tourism and other conservation compatible land uses, characterized by high levels of enforcement, and providing for long term security through the placement of easements on land or other means. 2. To integrate biodiversity management into the management objectives of Mountain and River Reserves.  - Although a number of policy documents identify the need to expand the protected area estate, there are no explicit, prioritized targets (linked to future pressures on biodiversity) set to direct the strategic expansion of the protected area estate. This is urgently needed.  - The statutory framework provides little technical guidance in the drafting of management plans for PAs. There are no norms and standards for PA management. Many of the PAs, particularly nature reserves and forest reserves still do not have an approved management plan and management is largely *ad hoc*.  - There is no corporate plan for the NPCS to strategically direct its activities and resources. The National Forestry Action Plan has not yet been drafted and the strategic direction for the management of protected areas under the control of the Forestry Services remains unclear.  - Although there are proposals in development, there is still no time-bound strategic plan with associated resource allocation, for the management and control of invasive alien plant and animal species.  This is now clarified in the PIF (see paragraph 5) |
| The second component includes reconfiguration of the structure and function of the institutional framework. This component is unlikely to provide tangible results over the life of the project.  Because this component aims at restructuring two sub divisions of the Ministry of Agriculture (Forestry Service and the National parks and Conservation Service) it is not clear if this is going to result in political tensions between the two. Please Explain. The Political risks associated with restructuring of the government agencies in charge of the PAs should be addressed. | The experience from PA systems strengthening projects undertaken in the region is that institutional reforms if properly planned and undertaken with strong Government backing—as in this case—can pay immediate dividends. These may accrues from improvements in activity coordination, better deployment of staff and other resources, and the improvement in cost effectiveness at the operational level.  The project has strong Government backing, and the planned institutional reforms have already been discussed as part of a recent review of the PAN. We consider the political risk to be low. However, we have added this risk to the risk matrix and will, working with Government, monitor and take steps to avoid tensions. |
| It is not clear why there are no investments proposed (for component 1/ 3). All financial resources are going to be used for TA. The Reasons for not investing in basic management are not clear. It is difficult to see how the components are going to have an impact without investments (these components are TA only). Would it be possible to move some of the Government co-funding from TA to investment? | There is an issue here with terminology. We understand investment, based on the GEF’s definition (in the Council paper submitted to the June 2007 Council (GEF/C.31/5) to be: “interventions where GEF grant funding is linked to or mimics loan operations or guarantees on con quasi-commercial conditions”(page 3 para 13). This project does not meet this criterion, which is why it was listed as a TA project. The project will however support investment in PA management --defined more broadly. This includes investment in PA operations: boundary demarcation, and basic infrastructure, such as fire breaks, trails and interpretation centers. Moreover it will be making a direct investment in threat abatement—such as in IAS control and fire management. The infrastructure heavy components will be largely co-financed although the GEF will also make an investment necessary equipment and infrastructure for threat abatement. A detailed financing plan will be developed during project preparation.  We have clarified this in the Project Framework, and Para 6. |
| This project should draw lessons and build linkages with the two previously- and relevant GEF-funded projects in Mauritius: Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Mauritius (ID 2403) and the Restoration of Highly Degraded and Threatened Native Forests in Mauritius (ID 356). | As indicated in the PIF, this is intended. |
| The type and role of the functional partnerships between public and private stakeholders is not clear. It is not clear either how these partnerships will be maintained beyond the life of the project. Please provide examples of these partnerships. | There are currently limited operational partnerships between the public and private sector in the management, development and commercialization of PAs. The exact nature of the partnerships will be established during further project preparation. However, it is anticipated that the following types of measures will be introduced:  - Partnerships between the PA authorities, private reserves and the tourism industry through the industry association, and private companies to develop new tourism products including interpreted biodiversity routes, specialized tours to see endangered species, such as the pink Pigeon or Echo parakeet, development of interpretation materials, investment in PA infrastructure and marketing.  - Partnerships between PA authorities and Private reserves to plan and execute PA operations (planning, capacity building and threat controls. The seeds of such partnerships have already been established, brokered through NGOs such as the Mauritian Wildlife Foundation.  - Establishment of joint management systems, including decision making structures to coordinate PA management on public and adjacent private lands—an example would be controls over fire and IAS.  Economic and financial analyses will be undertaken during project preparation. These will set the basis for leveraging public and private moneys (as has successfully been done elsewhere in the region) to finance work undertaken through the partnerships. Fund mobilization has already been identified as a discrete project output. |
| Is the necessary policy and regulatory framework needed to give incentives for private owners to include their lands in their PAN in place, or will this get started as a result of the project. In either case, please elaborate on the likelihood of these laws and regulations passing through the legislature? | The PAN has largely operated hitherto in isolation to the larger development context of the country. The economy of Mauritius has depended on the sugar industry and sun and sands tourism. The former industry is expected to decline, with the loss of preferential access to markets in Europe in 2008. This means that the country will be become more dependent on the tourism industry. There is a need to expand the tourism product, and the Government has realized that the PAN can provide a framework for attracting more discerning and ecologically conscious tourists. To be effective, the area of the PAN will need to increase. A macro-economic review is currently underway, and provides an opportunity to assess the incentives needed to encourage private landowners to include their lands in the PAN. The incentive framework will be put in place with support from the project. This is an opportune moment for pursuit of the initiative, given changes in the economic landscape and the reform processes needed to adjust to expected economic pressures. |

**Annex c: key consultants to be hired for the project using GEF resources**

### Project Manager

Duties and Responsibilities

* Supervise and coordinate the production of project outputs, as per the project document;
* Mobilize all project inputs in accordance with UNDP procedures for nationally executed projects;
* Supervise and coordinate the work of all project staff, consultants and sub-contractors;
* Coordinate the recruitment and selection of project personnel;
* Prepare and revise project work and financial plans, as required by UNDP;
* Liaise with UNDP, relevant government agencies, and all project partners, including donor organizations and NGOs for effective coordination of all project activities;
* Facilitate administrative backstopping to subcontractors and training activities supported by the Project;
* Oversee and ensure timely submission of the Inception Report, Combined Project Implementation Review/Annual Project Report (PIR/APR), Technical reports, quarterly financial reports, and other reports as may be required by UNDP, GEF, DGA and other oversight agencies;
* Disseminate project reports and respond to queries from concerned stakeholders;
* Report progress of project to the steering committees, and ensure the fulfilment of steering committees directives.
* Oversee the exchange and sharing of experiences and lessons learned with relevant community based integrated conservation and development projects nationally and internationally;
* Ensures the timely and effective implementation of all components of the project;
* Assist community groups, municipalities, NGOs, staff, students and others with development of essential skills through training workshops and on the job training thereby upgrading their institutional capabilities;
* Coordinate and assists scientific institutions with the initiation and implementation of all field studies and monitoring components of the project
* Assists and advises the teams responsible for documentaries, TV spots, guidebooks and awareness campaign, field studies, etc; and
* Carry regular, announced and unannounced inspections of all sites and the activities of any project site management units.

### Project assistant

Duties and Responsibilities

* Collect, register and maintain all information on project activities;
* Contribute to the preparation and implementation of progress reports;
* Monitor project activities, budgets and financial expenditures;
* Advise all project counterparts on applicable administrative procedures and ensures their proper implementation;
* Maintain project correspondence and communication;
* Support the preparations of project work-plans and operational and financial planning processes;
* Assist in procurement and recruitment processes;
* Assist in the preparation of payments requests for operational expenses, salaries, insurance, etc. against project budgets and work plans;
* Follow-up on timely disbursements by UNDP CO;
* Receive, screen and distribute correspondence and attach necessary background information;
* Prepare routine correspondence and memoranda for Project Managers signature;
* Assist in logistical organization of meetings, training and workshops;
* Prepare agendas and arrange field visits, appointments and meetings both internal and external related to the project activities and write minutes from the meetings;
* Maintain project filing system;
* Maintain records over project equipment inventory; and
* Perform other duties as required.

### Chief Technical Adviser

Duties and Responsibilities

* Provide technical support to the National Project Director, Project Manager and other government counterparts in the areas of project management and planning, management of site activities, monitoring, and impact assessment;
* Support the Project Manager in preparing Terms of Reference for consultants and sub-contractors, and assist in the selection and recruitment process;
* Support the Project Manager in coordinating the work of all consultants and sub-contractors, ensuring the timely delivery of expected outputs, and ensuring an effective synergy among the various sub-contracted activities;
* Assist the National Project Director and Project Manager in the preparation of the Combined Project Implementation Review/Annual Project Report (PIR/APR), inception report, technical reports, quarterly financial reports for submission to UNDP, the GEF, other donors and Government Departments, as required;
* Assist the National Project Director and Project Manager in mobilizing staff and consultants in the conduct of a mid-term project evaluation, and in undertaking revisions in the implementation program and strategy based on evaluation results;
* Assist the National Project Director and Project Manager in liaison work with project partners, donor organizations, NGOs and other groups to ensure effective coordination of project activities;
* Support the Project Manager in documenting lessons from project implementation and make recommendations to the Steering Committee for more effective implementation and coordination of project activities; and
* Perform other tasks as may be requested by the National Project Director and Project Manager.

### Overview of Inputs from Technical Assistance Consultants financed by GEF

| **Position Titles** | **$/**  **person week\*** | **Estimated person weeks\*\*** | **Tasks to be performed** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **For Project Management** | | | |
| *Local* |  |  |  |
| Project Manager | 593.93939 | 240 | See Above |
| Project Assistant | 339.39394 | 240 |
| *International* |  |  |  |
| Chief Technical Advisor | 3000 | 50 | See Above |
| Justification for Travel, if any: Domestic travel to project sites will be necessary for the National Coordinator and CTA (mostly by road). Detailed justification is provided in the Total Budget and Workplan, including its notes. | | | |
| **For Technical Assistance** | | | |
| *Local* |  |  |  |
| Protected area planning and management consultant | 1000 | 70 | In collaboration with the international protected area planning and management specialist:  Output 1.1 - Conduct a global review of best practice in PA planning and management; define the vision, principles and values for a PAN; rationalise and align the PA classification system and management objectives with IUCN guidelines; develop a standardised approach to PA establishment processes for different PA categories; prepare operational guidelines for PA planning and management; identify the governance arrangements for different categories of PAs and for the PAN; define the M&E requirements for the PAN; identify the institutional roles and responsibilities for the PAN; consultatively prepare the ‘national policy for protected areas in Mauritius’  Output 1.3 - Develop the ‘case’ for the expansion of the PAN; define explicit spatial targets for the expansion of the PAN; identify the approach to, and mechanisms for, the expansion of the PAN; consultatively prepare a ‘PAN expansion strategy for Mauritius’  Output 3.1 – Consultatively prepare a medium-term SMP for the BRGNP; prepare subsidiary plans for BRGNP; support the preparation of an AOP for BRGNP; facilitate the review and evaluation of park performance in implementing the AOP |
| Legal advisor | 1000 | 24 | In collaboration with the international specialist in environmental law:  Output 1.2 - Make recommendations for legislative and regulatory reform to PA legislation; make recommendations on how to better align PA legislation with other complementary legislation; draft specific amendments to PA legislation and regulations. |
| Business consulting service provider | 1000 | 36 | Output 1.4 - Update the financial baseline for the PAN; identify the medium-term ‘financial gap’ for the PAN; assess the functionality of the current PA agencies financial management systems; evaluate the feasibility of different financing mechanisms for the PAN; define the legal and structural requirements for viable PAN financing mechanisms; consultatively prepare a ‘financial and business plan for the PAN’  Output 2.3 – Assess the pricing structures for entry, and other user fees, across the PAN; determine the optimal fee structures for tourism/recreational concessions |
| Marketing and communications service provider | 1000 | 80 | Output 1.5 - Design marketing and communications materials and media; implement a broad-based media communications campaign |
| Institutional development specialist | 1000 | 40 | In collaboration with the international protected area planning and management consultants, undertake the following:  Output 2.1 - Review international and regional best practice in PA governance; identify alternative institutional models; review the cost-effectiveness of different institutional models; assess the feasibility of the preferred institutional model; develop an organisational change management plan to guide institutional restructuring processes; develop a cooperative governance model for protected areas; facilitate the establishment of cooperative governance structures for different categories of PAs |
| Strategic planning consultant | 1000 | 65 | Output 2.2 – For each institutions: define the institutional mission; undertake a SWOT analysis; describe the institutional medium-term goals, strategies and objectives; establish outcomes, outputs; develop performance management indicators; and targets; collate MTEF budget allocations; describe roles and responsibilities; identify indicative timelines for deliverables; consultatively prepare a ‘Strategic Plan’ and ‘Annual Performance Plan’ |
| Nature-based tourism development specialist | 1000 | 40 | Output 2.3 - Develop and market tourism routes and packages across the PAN; assess and develop tourist/recreational concessioning opportunities; support the implementation of entry and other user fees in PAs; establish and maintain a tourism working group to guide and support the development of nature-based tourism products across the PAN |
| Training service provider | 1000 | 30 | Output 2.5 - assess the current skills base and competence of protected area agency staff; identify the critical skills and competence gaps; source and/or develop relevant short-course training programs; facilitate the implementation of all training and skills development programs; oversee the mentoring and career development program for senior management staff of the FS and NPCS; facilitate the establishment of knowledge exchange programs with relevant counterpart conservation agencies and international NGO’s |
| IAS control and ecosystem rehabilitation coordinator | 1000 | 80 | Output 3. 2 - Identify the exact location of each IAS demonstration site; develop an adaptive work program for each demonstration site to ensure that the objectives of this output are achieved; monitor and review the implementation of the work plans; closely collaborate with the NPCS, FS and private landowner/s in the development, implementation and review of the work plans; collate and maintain information on lessons learnt and reports produced; report back on progress |
| Information management system specialist | 1000 | 45 | Output 3.4 - identifying the scope of information needs; developing data and information collection methodologies; collating existing and new information; converting information into electronic datasets; designing and establishing an electronic information management system; identifying hardware, software and networking requirements; developing user interfaces to assist decision-making; developing data access and maintenance protocols; and training designated staff members from NPCS and FS in GIS, geospatial database administration, non-spatial data management and applications development |
| Monitoring and evaluation review consultant | 1000 | 35 | Participate in drafting mid-term and final evaluation report/s; local liaison with project team, government and UNDP during project evaluation; liaison with the counterpart international monitoring and evaluation expert; participate in discussions to realign the project time-table/log frame at the mid-term stage |
| Evaluation experts | 1000 | 10 | The standard UNDP/GEF project evaluation TOR will be used. This will include: participate, alongside the international consultants, in the mid-term and final evaluation of the project, in order to assess the project progress, achievement of results and impacts; develop draft evaluation report and discuss it with the project team, government and UNDP; as necessary, participate in discussions to realign the project time-table/logframe at the mid-term stage |
| Auditor | 1000 | 6 | Mid-term and final independent audit of project expenditure as per UNDP/GEF standard ToR |
| *International* |  |  |  |
| Protected Area planning and management specialist | 3000 | 40 | In collaboration with the national protected area planning and management consultant:  Output 1.1 - Conduct a global review of best practice in PA planning and management; define what constitutes a formal protected area for Mauritius; define the vision, principles and values for a PAN; rationalise and align the PA classification system and management objectives with IUCN guidelines; develop a standardised approach to PA establishment processes for different PA categories; prepare operational guidelines for PA planning and management; identify the governance arrangements for different categories of PAs and for the PAN; define the M&E requirements for the PAN; identify the institutional roles and responsibilities for the PAN; consultatively prepare the ‘national policy for protected areas in Mauritius’  Output 1.3 - Develop the ‘case’ for the expansion of the PAN; define explicit spatial targets for the expansion of the PAN; identify the approach to, and mechanisms for, the expansion of the PAN; consultatively prepare a ‘PAN expansion strategy for Mauritius’  Output 2.1 – Support the cost-benefit analysis of institutional and governance options for the PAN  Output 2.2 – Support the preparation of strategic and annual performance plans for PA institutions  Output 2.3 – Support the development of tourism/recreational concession processes in the PAN  Output 3.1 – Consultatively prepare a medium-term SMP for the BRGNP; prepare subsidiary plans for BRGNP; support the preparation of an AOP for BRGNP; facilitate the review and evaluation of park performance in implementing the AOP |
| Environmental law specialist | 3000 | 10 | In collaboration with the national legal advisor:  Output 1.2  Review international best practice in PA legislation; make recommendations for legislative and regulatory reform to PA legislation in Mauritius; make recommendations on how to better align PA legislation with other complementary legislation; consultatively draft specific amendments to PA legislation and regulations |
| Land stewardship specialist | 3000 | 10 | In collaboration with the national and international protected area planning and management consultants:  Output 1.3  Develop a strategic approach to conservation stewardship; identify the explicit activities needed to pilot conservation stewardship in the PAN; define the financial and human resource requirements for conservation stewardship; clarify the institutional roles and responsibilities for conservation stewardship; describe the knowledge management requirements for conservation stewardship; develop stewardship procedures and templates; develop a suite of regulatory, optional and negotiable incentives for private landholders; identify mechanisms to integrate conservation stewardship into the ESA strategies and legislation; consultatively prepare a ‘strategy and implementation plan for a pilot stewardship programme’ |
| Environmental economist | 3000 | 12 | Output 2.3 - Assess the feasibility of, and mechanisms for, payments for environmental services; assess the |
| Skills training service provider | 3000 | 10 | Output 2.5 - develop the skills and competence standards for protected areas; assess the current skills base and competence of protected area agency staff; identify the critical skills and competence gaps; source and/or develop relevant short-course training programs; facilitate the implementation of all training and skills development programs; oversee the mentoring and career development program for senior management staff of the FS and NPCS; facilitate the establishment of knowledge exchange programs with relevant counterpart conservation agencies and international NGO’s |
| Evaluation experts for mid-term and final evaluation | 3000 | 18 | The standard UNDP/GEF project evaluation TOR will be used. This will include:  Lead the mid-term and the final evaluations; Work with the local evaluation consultant in order to assess the project progress, achievement of results and impacts; develop draft evaluation report and discuss it with the project team, government and UNDP; As necessary participate in discussions to extract lessons for UNDP and GEF |
| Justification for Travel, if any: Domestic travel to project sites will be necessary for several technical assistance consultants. Detailed justification is provided in the Total Budget and Workplan, including its notes. | | | |

**Annex d: status of implementation of project preparation activities and the use of funds**

1. **explain if the ppg objective has been achieved through the ppg activities undertaken.**

The PPG objective has been achieved in full:

* The GEF Project Document, and accompanying CEO Endorsement documentation, has been prepared and submitted to the GEF; and
* Stakeholders were sensitized about the need to consolidate and strengthen Mauritius’ PA network through: (i) the promotion of conservation stewardship on privately owned or leased land; and (ii) the need to improve the cost-effectiveness of management approaches to the mitigation of threats to biodiversity within the PAN.

More specifically, the following PPG outputs have been achieved:

* Baseline data collected, information gap analysis completed and capacity assessments undertaken;
* Strategic action plans developed to guide project interventions;
* Full project activities scoped;
* Institutional arrangements agreed, budget prepared and M&E Plan developed;
* Co-financing mobilised and formally confirmed; and
* Full project design endorsed by relevant stakeholders.

For more detail on the stakeholder engagement during project preparation, please refer to PRODOC Section IV: Additional Information, Part XI Stakeholder Involvement Plan.

1. **describe findings that might affect the project design or any concerns on project implementation, if any:**

There are no findings that would fundamentally affect the project design. During project preparation, meetings were held with the MoE NDU to clarify the alignment of project activities with the identification of, and future management arrangements for, Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA’s).

1. **provide detailed funding amount of the ppg activities and their implementation status in the table below:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Project Preparation Activities Approved*** | ***Implementation Status*** | ***GEF Amount ($)*** | | | | ***Co-financing***  ***($)*** |
| ***Amount Approved*** | ***Amount spent to date*** | ***Amount Committed*** | ***Uncommitted Amount\**** |
| Assessment of terrestrial biodiversity priority areas | Completed | 29,000 | 10,015.77 | 18,984 | 0 | 47,670 |
| Economic valuation and financing plan for the terrestrial PAN | Completed | 22,000 | 8,282.19 | 13,718 | 0 | 7,500 |
| Assessment of management effectiveness, analysis of legal and institutional framework and development of incentives system | Completed | 20,000 | 9,700 | 10,300 | 0 | 39,725 |
| IAS strategy and action plan development for the PAN | Completed | 26,000 | 10,490.79 | 15,509 | 0 | 4,950 |
| Project scoping and definition | Completed | 53,000 | 53,000 | 0 | 0 | 82,618 |
| **Total** |  | 150,000 | 91,489 | 58,511 | 0 | 182,463 |

**annex E: total budget and work plan**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Short Title:** | 3749 Mauritius PAN - Terrestrial Protected Areas Network |
| **Award ID:** | [to be added when the budget is entered into Atlas] |
| **Award Title:** | PIMS 3749 Mauritius PAN Project |
| **Business Unit:** | B0356 |
| **Project Title:** | Expanding coverage and strengthening management effectiveness of the Protected Area Network on the Island of Mauritius |
| **Implementing Partner (Executing Agency)** | Ministry of Agriculture, Food Production and Security- MoA |

| **GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity** | **Responsible Party/**  **Implementing Agent** | **Fund ID** | **Donor Name** | **Atlas Account Code** | **ATLAS Budget Description** | **Amount Year 1**  **(USD)** | **Amount Year 2**  **(USD)** | **Amount Year 3**  **(USD)** | **Amount Year 4**  **(USD)** | **Amount Year 5**  **(USD)** | **Total (USD)** | **Budget note** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **COMPONENT 1:**  Systemic framework for PA expansion improved | **MoA** | **62000** | **GEF** | 71200 | International consultants | 40,000 | 50,000 | 24,000 | 10,000 | 5,000 | 129,000 | 1 |
| 71300 | Local consultants | 35,000 | 45,000 | 23,000 | 5,000 | 6,000 | 114,000 | 2 |
| 71600 | Travel | 4,000 | 6,000 | 3,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 17,000 | 3 |
| 72100 | Contractual service companies | 15,000 | 55,000 | 20,000 | 5,000 | 0 | 95,000 | 4 |
| 74200 | Audio-visual and printing production costs | 20,000 | 45,000 | 25,000 | 15,000 | 10,000 | 115,000 | 5 |
| 74500 | Miscellaneous | 2,000 | 3,500 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 500 | 8,000 | 6 |
| **Total Outcome 1** | | **116,000** | **204,500** | **96,000** | **38,000** | **23,500** | **478,000** |  |
| **COMPONENT 2:**  PA institutional framework strengthened | **MoA** | **62000** | **GEF** | 71200 | International consultants | 3,000 | 36,000 | 40,000 | 15,000 | 11,000 | 105,000 | 7 |
| 71300 | Local consultants | 15,000 | 95,000 | 135,000 | 155,000 | 123,000 | 523,000 | 8 |
| 71600 | Travel | 1,000 | 4,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 6,000 | 35,000 | 9 |
| 72200 | Equipment and furniture | 0 | 0 | 20,000 | 6,000 | 0 | 26,000 | 10 |
| 72800 | Information technology equipment | 0 | 1,000 | 20,000 | 12,000 | 5,000 | 38,000 | 11 |
| 74200 | Audio-visual and printing production costs | 0 | 1,000 | 4,500 | 3,500 | 1,000 | 10,000 | 12 |
| 74500 | Miscellaneous | 2,000 | 3,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 8,000 | 13 |
| **Total Outcome 2** | | **21,000** | **140,000** | **232,500** | **204,500** | **147,000** | **745,000** |  |
| **COMPONENT 3:**  Operational know-how in place to contain threats | **MoA** | **62000** | **GEF** | 71200 | International consultants | 28,000 | 18,000 | 15,000 | 0 | 15,000 | 76,000 | 14 |
| 71300 | Local consultants | 46,000 | 65,000 | 65,000 | 37,000 | 30,000 | 243,000 | 15 |
| 71600 | Travel | 6,000 | 8,000 | 10,000 | 8,000 | 6,000 | 38,000 | 16 |
| 72100 | Contractual service companies | 95,000 | 252,000 | 380,000 | 420,000 | 310,000 | 1,457,000 | 17 |
| 72200 | Equipment and furniture | 55,000 | 110,000 | 122,000 | 58,000 | 15,000 | 360,000 | 18 |
| 72300 | Materials and goods | 15,000 | 55,000 | 45,000 | 35,000 | 15,000 | 165,000 | 19 |
| 72800 | Information technology equipment | 0 | 28,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 34,000 | 20 |
| 74500 | Miscellaneous | 1,000 | 1,500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 4,000 | 21 |
| **Total Outcome 3** | | **246,000** | **537,500** | **639,500** | **560,500** | **393,500** | **2,377,000** |  |
| **PROJECT MANAGEMENT** | **MoA** | **62000** | **GEF** | 71200 | International consultants | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 150,000 | 22 |
| 71300 | Local consultants | 44,800 | 44,800 | 44,800 | 44,800 | 44,800 | 224,000 | 23 |
| 72200 | Equipment and furniture | 12,000 | 0 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 0 | 14,000 | 24 |
| 72800 | Information technology equipment | 9,000 | 1,500 | 500 | 500 | 0 | 11,500 | 25 |
| 74500 | Miscellaneous | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 500 | 26 |
| **Total Project Management** | | **95,900** | **76,400** | **76,400** | **76,400** | **74,900** | **400,000** |  |
|  |  |  |  | **PROJECT TOTAL** | | **478,900** | **958,400** | **1,044,400** | **879,400** | **638,900** | **4,000,000** |  |

| **Budget Notes** | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Costs of contractual appointment of land stewardship specialist and environmental law specialist. *Pro rata* costs of contractual appointment of protected area planning and management specialist and monitoring and evaluation experts (for mid-term and final evaluation) |
| 2 | Costs of contractual appointment of business consulting service provider. *Pro rata* costs of contractual appointment of protected area planning and management consultant; legal advisor; evaluation review consultant and evaluation experts |
| 3 | *Pro rata* travel costs for international consultants and project staff. In-country travel costs for contracted specialists associated with: stakeholder engagement in the development of the national policy for PAs; preparation of the PAN expansion strategy; stakeholder engagement in the development of a strategy and implementation plan for a pilot conservation stewardship programme; assessment of the financial baselines for the PAN; implementation of outreach programmes; implementation of experiential learning programmes in PAs; and project monitoring and evaluation. Average in-country travel costs estimated at US$0.40/km |
| 4 | Costs of contractual appointment of Marketing and Communications business on retainer contract |
| 5 | Production and printing costs of communications resources and media (newsletters, brochures, fact sheets, website, booklets, radio inserts, TV inserts, DVDs, etc.) |
| 6 | Costs associated with organizing focused specialized stakeholder engagement workshops and hosting issue-based stakeholder workshops (venue, catering, facilitation, printing, translation, etc.) |
| 7 | Costs of contractual appointment of environmental economist and skills training service provider. *Pro rata* costs of contractual appointment of protected area planning and management specialist and monitoring and evaluation experts (for mid-term and final evaluation) |
| 8 | Costs of contractual appointment of institutional development specialist, strategic planning consultant, nature-based tourism development specialist and training service provider. *Pro rata* costs of contractual appointment of protected area planning and management consultant; legal advisor; evaluation review consultant and evaluation experts. Costs of contractual appointment of a financial management advisor and a programme developer/fund-raiser for the PAN, to be positioned within the MoA organisational structure. Costs of contractual appointment of conservation stewardship project unit staff (1 project manager and 3 stewardship facilitators) that are to be placed within the MoA organisational structure. |
| 9 | *Pro rata* travel costs for international consultants and project staff. In-country travel costs for contracted specialists associated with: stakeholder engagement i.r.o. management and governance arrangements for PAN; institutional stakeholder involvement in strategic and annual planning processes for PA institutions; design of alternative PAN tourism routes and packages ; assessing tourism concessioning options; and project monitoring and evaluation. Estimated travel costs of conservation stewardship staff in visiting private landowners and rights holders in areas targeted for PA expansion. Average in-country travel costs estimated at US$0.40/km |
| 10 | Acquisition of office equipment for 4 stewardship unit staff (stewardship manager and stewardship facilitators), the financial management advisor and the programme developer/fund-raiser – desks, chairs, tables, filing cabinets, bookcases and stationery |
| 11 | Acquisition of Laptops (6@US$1400), software licenses (6@US$800), portable hard drive (2@US$200), printer (2@US$300), data projector (1@US$800) and mobile phone contracts (6@US$3000) and other peripherals (@US5000) for 4 conservation stewardship unit staff, the financial management advisor and the programme developer/fund-raiser |
| 12 | Costs associated with the printing of training materials and the preparation of training programs using different communication media (e.g. web-based learning, DVD, presentation media, etc) |
| 13 | Costs associated with organizing focused specialized stakeholder engagement workshops and hosting issue-based stakeholder workshops (venue, catering, facilitation, printing, translation, etc.) |
| 14 | *Pro rata* costs of contractual appointment of protected area planning and management specialist and monitoring and evaluation experts (for mid-term and final evaluation) |
| 15 | Costs of contractual appointment of IAS Coordinator (54 months) and information management systems specialist. *Pro rata* costs of contractual appointment of protected area planning and management consultant; evaluation review consultant; evaluation experts and auditor. Costs of short-term contractual appointment of surveyors, biological research and monitoring staff, data collection staff and an incident response specialist |
| 16 | *Pro rata* travel costs for international consultants and project staff. In-country travel costs for contracted specialists associated with: stakeholder engagement in preparation of the integrated management plan for BRGNP; and survey of PA boundaries. Travel costs for enforcement and compliance volunteer rangers and volunteers involved in IAS control and ecosystem restoration programmes in PAs. Travel costs for transport of IAS control and ecosystem rehabilitation teams. Average in-country travel costs estimated at US$0.40/km |
| 17 | Costs of contracting/employing specialist IAS control teams (using different implementation options, including labor pools, MWF, NPCS and FS staff, independent contractors and private landowner farm labor) to implement the IAS control and ecosystem restoration program in the four demonstration sites. |
| 18 | Incremental costs of boundary fencing, survey beacons and signage for demarcation of PA boundaries. Co-financing of safety equipment, communications equipment, GPS’s, digital cameras and binoculars for PA enforcement and compliance staff and volunteers. Co-financing of chemicals, mechanical tools (e.g. tree poppers, slashers, chemical sprayers, axes, chainsaws), safety equipment (gloves, overalls, helmets, boots, etc), dyes, predator control stations and fencing for the four IAS control and ecosystem restoration demonstration sites. |
| 19 | Procurement of native plants (@US$4000/ha) and tortoises (@US$450/tortoise), as required, for the ecosystem restoration program in the demonstration sites Procurement of pre-screened bio-control agents for targeted IAS’s. |
| 20 | Procurement of dedicated data server (US$5,000), GIS and database management software (US$20,000) and high speed data network connection (US$1000 rental/annum). Procurement of electronic databases, as required. |
| 21 | Costs associated with organizing focused specialized stakeholder engagement workshops and hosting issue-based stakeholder workshops (venue, catering, facilitation, printing, translation, etc.) |
| 22 | Costs of contractual appointment of Chief Technical Advisor |
| 23 | Costs of contractual appointment of Project Manager and Project Assistant |
| 24 | Acquisition of office equipment for project manager and project assistant – desks, chairs, tables, filing cabinets, bookcases and stationery |
| 25 | Acquisition of 2 Laptops (2@US$1400), software licenses (2@US$800), portable hard drive (1@US$200), printer (1@US$300), data projector (1@US$800) and mobile phone contracts (2@US$3000) and other peripherals (@US1200) |
| 26 | Insurance, bank charges and other sundries for project coordinating unit |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Summary of Funds: [[4]](#footnote-5)** |  |  | |  |  | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Year 4** | **Year 5** | **TOTAL** |
|  |  |  |  | | **GEF** | **478,900** | **958,400** | **1,044,400** | **879,400** | **638,900** | **4,000,000** |
|  |  |  |  | | **National Govt** | **604,713** | **1,188,734** | **1,045,598** | **782,258** | **566,098** | **4,187,400** |
|  |  |  |  | | **MWF** | **359,011** | **763,941** | **847,277** | **723,304** | **506,467** | **3,200,000** |
|  |  |  |  | | **Private** | **377,680** | **951,545** | **1,220,617** | **1,070,798** | **756,360** | **4,377,000** |
|  |  |  |  | | **TOTAL** | **1,820,304** | **3,862,620** | **4,157,892** | **3,455,760** | **2,467,825** | **15,764,400** |

1. The project will provide an investment of technical assistance that enables conservation agencies in Mauritius to more effectively manage, and expand, its protected area estate beyond the project term. The target in the national biodiversity strategy is for 10% of the land area to be constituted in the PA network. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. The following land types have been classified for the mainland: Central intermediate lava plateau; Central late lava plateau; Chamarel inter-mountain valley flat & slopes; Eastern coastal valley flats & slopes; Late lava plains & inland slopes; Lower mountain slopes; NE, E & southern intermediate lava plains & slopes; NW intermediate lava plains & slopes; Riverine lands; Sand beaches & dunes; Western coastal valleys, plains & slopes; Central uplands early lava plains & slopes; Inland water body; Old volcanic mountain & gorges; Coastal salt marshes; and Lakes. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. The targeted areas are: (i) the southern corridor stretching from the SW of the island (Le Morne/Souliac/Chamarelle) across to the Bamboo mountains; and (ii) the northern corridor stretching from the NE (Le Pouce/Port Louis) across to the Aubin/Roches Noires area). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. All co-financing (cash and in-kind) that is not passing through UNDP. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)