

MID TERM REVIEW REPORT:

**MAINSTREAMING BIODIVERSITY INTO THE
MANAGEMENT OF THE COASTAL ZONE IN THE
REPUBLIC OF MAURITIUS**

Date: 7 September 2020

Prepared by :
Jan Rijpma, International Consultant,
Laurence Reno, National Consultant

Basic Report Information:

Project Title	Mainstreaming Biodiversity into the Management of the Coastal Zone in the Republic of Mauritius		
UNDP Project ID (PIMS #):	4843	PIF Approval Date:	5 February 2014
GEF Project ID (PMIS #):	5514	CEO Endorsement Date:	31 March 2016
ATLAS Business Unit, Award # Proj. ID:	00090446 00096201	Project Document (ProDoc) Signature Date (date project began):	22 June 2016
Country(ies):	MUS	Date project manager hired:	1 June 2017
Region:	Africa	Inception Workshop date:	13 July 2017
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Midterm Review completion date:	
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective:	BD2- Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors	Planned planed closing date:	30 June 2021
Trust Fund [indicate GEF TF, LDCF, SCCF, NPIF]:	GEF TF	If revised, proposed op. closing date:	30 June 2022
Executing Agency/Implementing Partner:	Ministry of Blue Economy, marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping		
Other execution partners:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of Environment, Solid Waste and Climate Change - Ministry of Agro-Industry and Food Security - Department of Continental Shelf, Marine Zone Administration and Exploration - Ministry of Housing and Land Use; - Ministry of Tourism - Rodrigues Regional Authority - Reef Conservation 		

MTR team members: Jan Rijpma, International Consultant; Laurence Reno, National Consultant

Acknowledgements:

The Mid Term Review Team would like to thank UNDP Country Office, in particular Amanda Serumaga, Resident Representative; Satyaheet Ramchurn, Head of Environment Unit; Sujitha Sekharan, International Operations Manager. The Team wants to acknowledge and thank the Project Management Unit: Parmananda Ragen, Project Manager; Samanta Hardas, Project Assistant; The Project Chief technical Adviser, Dr. David Vousden, and the National Project Director, Mr. J.D.P. Labonne. And finally, the UNDP-GEF Regional technical Adviser, Penny Stock, all project implementers, stakeholders, consultants and whoever we talked to but may have inadvertently been left out.

Stay safe!

Table of Contents

Basic Report Information:	2
Acronyms and Abbreviations	5
Executive Summary	6
1. Introduction	11
2. Project Description and Background Context	12
3. Findings	14
3.1. Project Strategy	14
3.1.1. Project Design	14
3.1.2. Results Framework/ Logframe	15
3.2. Progress Towards Results	16
3.2.1. Progress towards outcomes analysis	17
3.2.2. Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective	19
3.3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	20
3.3.1. Management Arrangements	20
3.3.2. Adaptive Management	22
3.3.3. Work planning	23
3.3.4. Finance and co-finance	24
3.3.5. Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems	25
3.3.6. Stakeholder engagement	25
3.3.7. Communications	26
3.3.8. Gender mainstreaming in project implementation.	26
3.4. Sustainability	26
3.4.1. Financial risks to sustainability	27
3.4.2. Socio-economic risks to sustainability	28
3.4.3. Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability	28
3.4.4. Environmental risks to sustainability	29
4. Conclusions and Recommendations	29
4.1. Conclusions	29
4.2. Recommendations	31
5. ANNEXES	34
Annex 1: Detailed Terms of Reference for Independent Mid Term Review of the Project Mainstreaming Biodiversity into the Management of the Coastal Zone in The Republic of Mauritius	34
Annex 2: Proposed Work Plan MTR	42

ANNEX 3: List of documents reviewed.....	43
ANNEX 4: List of persons interviewed.....	44
ANNEX 5: MTR evaluative matrix.....	46
ANNEX 6: Updated logical framework	49
ANNEX 7: Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:.....	60
ANNEX 8: Key Project Milestones / Dates	84
ANNEX 9 : Updated Project Document Risk log.....	85
ANNEX 10: Ratings Scales	92
ANNEX 11: Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form	93
ANNEX 12: Signed MTR final report clearance form	94
Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report ...	95
Annexed in a separate file: Relevant midterm tracking tools	95

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AKNL	Aret Kokin Nu Laplaz
BD	Biodiversity
COVID(-19)	Corona Virus Disease - 2019
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DCSMZAE	Department of Continental Shelf, Maritime Zone Administration and Exploration
ESA	Ecologically Sensitive Area
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IEO	Independent Evaluation Office
IP	Implementing Partner
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
MID	Maurice Ile Durable
MoAIFS	Ministry of Agro-Industries and Food Security
MoBEMRFS	Ministry of Blue Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping
MOEMRFS	Ministry of Ocean Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping
MoESWMCC	Ministry of Environment, Solid Waste Management and Climate Change
MoFED	Ministry of Finance and Economic Development
MoGECDWF	Ministry of Gender Equality, Child Development and Family Welfare
MoHL	Ministry of Housing and Lands
MOI	Mauritius Oceanographic Institute
MoLG	Ministry of Local Government
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTR	Mid Term review
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NEX	National Execution
NIM	National Implementation
NPCS	National Parks and Conservation Services
NPD	National Project Director
NSDI	National Spatial Data Infrastructure
OPS	Outline Planning Scheme
PIF	Project Identification Form
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PM	Project Manager
PMU	Project Management unit
PPG	Project Preparation Grant
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RFP	Request for Proposal
RRA	Rodrigues Regional Assembly
RTA	Regional technical Adviser
SECU	Social Environment compliance Unit
SESP	Socio-Economic and Environmental Screening Procedures
SGP	Small Grants Programme
TOC	Theory of Change
TOR	Terms of Reference
TT	Tracking Tool
UNDP	United Nations Development programme
VMCA	Voluntary Marine Conservation Area

Executive Summary

Project Information Table:

Project Title	Mainstreaming Biodiversity into the Management of the Coastal Zone in the Republic of Mauritius		
UNDP Project ID (PIMS #):	4843	PIF Approval Date:	5 January 2014
GEF Project ID (PMIS #):	5514	CEO Endorsement Date:	31 March 2016
ATLAS Business Unit, Award # Proj. ID:	00090446 00096201	Project Document (ProDoc) Signature Date (date project began):	22 June 2016
Country(ies):	MUS	Date project manager hired:	1 June 2017
Region:	Africa	Inception Workshop date:	13 July 2017
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Midterm Review completion date:	
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective:	BD2- Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors	Planned planed closing date:	30 June 2021
Trust Fund [indicate GEF TF, LDCF, SCCF, NPIF]:	GEF TF	If revised, proposed operational closing date:	30 June 2022
Executing Agency/Implementing Partner:	Ministry of Blue Economy, marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping		
Other execution partners:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of Environment, Solid Waste and Climate Change - Ministry of Agro-Industry and Food Security - Department of Continental Shelf, Marine Zone Administration and Exploration - Ministry of Housing and Land; - Ministry of Tourism - Rodrigues Regional Authority - Reef Conservation 		
Project Financing	<i>at CEO endorsement (US\$)</i>	<i>at Midterm Review (US\$)*</i>	
[1] GEF financing:	4,664,521	Disbursed as of 30 June 2020: 2,245,191	
[2] UNDP contribution:	70,000	0	
[3] Government:	9,392,208	14,179,383	
[4] Other partners:	7,676,969	466,200	
[5] Total co-financing [2 + 3+ 4]:	17,139,177	14,645,583 (85%)	

Project Description:

Mauritius forms part of the Western Indian Ocean Islands, one of the 25 internationally recognized global biodiversity 'hotspots'. The tropical climate, topography and history of isolation of Mauritius, has resulted in the evolution of a diverse biota with a high degree of endemism. However, land clearance and forest degradation has already impacted more than 90% of Mauritius Island's land surface. Most of the useable land on the island of Mauritius has been put to productive use, but coastal ecosystems and adjacent landscapes still maintain their basic ecological functions.

The **objective** of the project is to mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services into coastal zone management (CZM) and into the operations and policies of the tourism and physical development sectors through a 'land- and seascape wide' integrated management approach based on the Environmental Sensitive Areas' (ESAs) inventory and assessment.

The **Outcomes** of the project are:

Outcome 1: Threats to biodiversity and ecosystem function are addressed by ensuring that 27,000 ha marine and coastal Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) are an integral part of planning and implementation mechanisms relating to coastal development and the tourism sector.

Outcome 2: Threats to marine and coastal biodiversity are mitigated and fishery resources protected in at least 20,000 ha of seascapes through the improved management of MPAs and no-take zones.

Outcome 3: Erosion control and ecosystem services restoration: erosion and soil loss are reduced in 200h of erosion-prone water sheds; and ecosystem services are restored in 100 ha of coastal wetlands.

The total cost of the project is USD 21.81 million, financed through a Global Environment Facility (GEF) grant of USD 4.66 million and with USD 13.30 million in co-financing (USD 9.4 million from the government, and \$7.75 million from other sources (NGO, private sector and UNDP). UNDP, as the GEF Implementing Agency, is responsible for the oversight and quality assurance of the execution of GEF resources. The Government Implementing Partner (IP) is the new Ministry of Blue Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping.

The project document was signed in June 2016, and the initial time-frame of the Project was 5 years. Implementation, however, started only in April 2017, due to a change in the Implementing Partner, and the PMU was recruited by June 2017. A Project Stakeholder Inception Workshop was held in July 2017, where the Project Document was validated, and the Logical Framework and Risk Log reviewed and updated.

Project Progress Summary:

Despite the late project start and further delays during the project implementation (late recruitment of CTA, some protracted procurement, AKNL complaint and subsequent SRM and SECU investigations, COVID-19 pandemic and “lockdown”), the project progressed quite well, thanks to effective and adaptive project management, solid procurement of consultants and good quality control by the CTA, PMU, PSC and TCs. The project seems largely “On Track” to achieve its targets or even surpass these in some areas. The project delivery rate recorded as at 30 June 2020 was US\$ 2,245,191 or 48%. At the time of the MTR, the overall project implementation rate (including pre-encumbrance) is 82%, with over 80% of the planned activities presented in its procurement plan already completed.

The Barriers to achieve the project objective are linked to the Indicators that are deemed “Not on Track”, and these are:

- Formalization and enactment of bills and regulations (this is not directly in the hands of the project; Wetland Bill is revised but waiting for validation and enactment; ESA Bill still needs to be revised);
- Formalization and implementation of the diverse Management Plans that have been developed (e.g. for MPAs, SEMPA, RAMSAR sites, District IMCZ plans, Fishing Reserves);
- Engagement of stakeholders in mainstreaming.

The following risks are still pertinent for the project:

- Inadequate legislation and regulatory framework;
- Unclear institutional responsibilities and implementation of ICZM and MPAs;
- Threat to biodiversity and ecosystem services through economic and development pressure;
- Uncertain financial sustainability of biodiversity conservation and protected areas.

In order to overcome the above barriers and mitigate the risks, the project needs to consolidate its results and intensify internal and external communication with all stakeholders to better relay the project objectives and results in order to achieve effective biodiversity mainstreaming.

MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table:

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	

Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: 5	Indicator 1 End Target seems overachieved, though this could not be independently verified (on the ground), and it is difficult to assess “improved management”. Indicators 2 and 3 seem well on Track, though the information, maps and management plans generated need now to be actioned.
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: 4	Servers installed, some information / maps etc. uploaded, though not yet validated, public and used. ESAs not yet formally protected, though delineation has now improved and will reportedly be used in Outline Planning Schemes. Activities on “Eco-labelling through the project cancelled, as this was already pursued by the Ministry with other support. Another activity around “Sustainable Tourism” is now proposed: Study of Carrying Capacity of Lagoons, with support of MoT and agreed by PSC. Therefore Indicators 8 and 9 not longer valid and new Indicator proposed in revised and updated Logical Framework.
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: 5	METT Tracking Tools scores are reportedly high and almost all nearly achieved End target. MTR has not been able to verify the reported METT scores on the ground. MPA and Reserves Areas and management reportedly increased, though MTR not able to verify on the ground. Financing gap for MPA management reduced and Government budgetary support for MPA has for now increased and reached the end-target, though impact of COVID pandemic on next budget will need to be awaited. Financial sustainability of MPA and Reserves questionable at the moment with tourism at standstill because of COVID Pandemic.
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: 4	Management Plans for RAMSAR sites developed, but implementation uncertain at the moment. Status of Private wetlands unknown. Enactment of Wetland and ESA Bills uncertain and unrealistic as Project Indicator. New revised Wetland Bill developed with Regulations being worked on. With new maps, delineation and information produced by Project, revision of old ESA Bill (2009) could be worked on. Indicator wording is proposed to be revised.
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	Rating: 5	Due to changes in IP and PSC, and late recruitment of PMU, the project started 1 year late. The CTA was only recruited after 2 years (in 2018). The chair of PSC and the NPD have changed a couple of times. There was a “slowdown” of activities in 2019-20 as instructed by UNDP because of a complaint lodged against the Project which was investigated by UNDP SRM and SECU. The COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 and subsequent “lockdown” in Mauritius also had consequences. Despite the above challenges, the project was well implemented, including through effective adaptive management, with at time of MTR some 80% delivery, and some quality and relevant results from good consultants. The Stakeholder Engagement and Communications need to be improved, following the Stakeholder Engagement and Communication plans (which were developed late in the project). Women’s participation in the project encouraged, though there are no specific indicators for that.
Sustainability	Rating: 4	Project Risks were revised upwards during the Project Inception Phase. The SESP Risk rating was “low”, mainly because most pertinent risks (mainly institutional and strategic risks) were not included. Risk rating at MTR is: Medium. The financial sustainability of the project results is uncertain, mainly because of the uncertain economic conditions following the COVID-a9 pandemic and the “lockdown” imposed. Further economic development following Business as Usual is a risk for biodiversity. A possible “Green COVID-19 Recovery” poses opportunities for mitigating this. Biodiversity needs further legal protection and clearer institutional mandates. This is to some degree addressed by the project, but needs more attention in future. The project has produced information, knowledge and tools that can help with this.

Summary of conclusions:

Project Strategy

1. The Project was well designed and the project Document well written, though no “Theory of Change” was developed and only very few Mid Term Targets were included.

2. Environmental and social risks were not sufficiently addressed at project development, and mitigation measures to address these risks may have been inadequate.
3. The focus on “mainstreaming” for this project is relevant and opportune. However, the MTR questions if the concept of “mainstreaming” was well understood and followed.
4. Consultations during project preparation (PPG) seemed sufficient and inclusive, but was not always continued during project implementation.
5. The MTR has reviewed the Logical Framework and no changes to Outcomes and Outputs are required. The MTR proposes amendments to some of the Indicators, baselines, targets, Assumptions and Risks.

Progress Towards Results

6. The project had a late and difficult start, and suffered some other delays during implementation.
7. A focus of the project was to provide protection for wetlands instead of revising an overarching ESA Bill.
8. The main barriers for achieving the project objective in the project time remaining and sustainability after project closure are: Formalization and enactment of wetland bill and regulations; Validation and implementation of the diverse Management Plans; Better engagement of stakeholders in Biodiversity Mainstreaming; Financial sustainability of biodiversity conservation.
9. Despite challenges, the project has progressed well with high delivery and has produced quality reports, plans, maps and other outputs.

Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

10. Project has been well implemented despite challenges, and demonstrated several good adaptive management practices.
11. The project was affected by a complaint from an NGO network and subsequent SRM negotiations and the SECU investigation. During this investigation the project was instructed to “go slow”, and the public report took very long to get published.
12. Despite setbacks, the project delivered some 80% of its budget (including pre-encumbrances). The available budget is sufficient to complete the planned activities, even when a no-cost extension is requested to make up for the time lost due to the mentioned delays.
13. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan (2019) and Communication and Awareness Strategy and Action Plan (2020) were developed late in the project and these are not yet properly actioned.
14. Although women were encouraged to take part in project activities, more can be done for effective gender mainstreaming, following also some good examples in Rodrigues.

Sustainability

15. The overall Risk Analysis rating changed at different times during the project and is not always clearly reported. At MTR the overall Risk to the project is considered as “Medium”.
16. Financial sustainability after project closure is unclear, especially given the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.
17. The overall sustainability rating, given all the risks and concerns mentioned above, is “Moderately Likely” but can slide to “Moderately Unlikely” if the key recommendations from this MTR are not taken into account.

Recommendation Summary Table

Rec #	Recommendation	Entity Responsible
A	Project Strategy	
A.1	The MoUs with Responsible Parties that have been recommended, prepared and discussed since the start of the project should be signed with urgency.	PMU, PSC
A.2	Amend the Project Logical Framework and Risk Log as proposed by the MTR	PSC

A.3	Build capacity and lay the foundation for Biodiversity Mainstreaming, through trainings following the “Training and Capacity Needs Assessment” that has been produced by the project.	PMU, MoBEMRFS
B	Progress Towards Results	
B.1	Validate and formalize the revised Wetland Bill, Maps of ESAs, Management Plans, ICZM plans and biodiversity valuation tools and measures.	PSC, MoBEMRFS
B.2	Consolidate, package and disseminate the knowledge, tools, plans and other outputs produced by the project thus far.	PMU
C	Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	
C.1	Organize a grand “Stock-take and awareness Workshop” with all stakeholders, to disseminate results and products, to chart the way forward for the project and achieve greater sustainability to re-engage with stakeholders and the general public.	PMU, IP
C.2	Strengthen gender mainstreaming in the project.	PMU, PSC
C.3	Request a no-cost project extension for 1 year. This extension is conditional to: - Implementing the Communications Plan; - Validation of products, tools and plans; - Provide clarity on the institutional responsibilities for the Wetland Bill; - Public availability of Maps and other products from the project.	PMU, MoBEMRFS, OFP, UNDP
C.4	Urgently recruit a Communication Specialist / Consultant / NGO to implement the Communication and Awareness Strategy and Action Plan.	PMU, MoBEMRFS, UNDP
D	Sustainability	
D.1	Review the proposed financing mechanisms for Biodiversity Conservation in the face of declining revenues from tourism and public financing.	PMU, UNDP, MoBEMRFS
D.2	Facilitate and support the Mainstreaming of Biodiversity Conservation in the possible COVID-19 Recovery Strategy and Packages in Mauritius.	PMU, MoBEMRFS, UNDP
D.3	UNDP to use the results of this and other environmental projects, and present this as a comprehensive, programmatic and portfolio approach to support more effective environmental governance in Mauritius.	UNDP

1. Introduction

This is the **Draft Final Report for the Mid Term Review (MTR) of the Project “Mainstreaming Biodiversity into the Management of the Coastal Zone in The Republic of Mauritius”**. Two consultants: Jan Rijpma, International Consultant, and Laurence Reno, National Consultant, were recruited in June 2020 to conduct this MTR. According to the TORs for this assignment (See Annex 1), the deliverables of the assignment are: MTR Inception Report (submitted on 06/07/2020), Draft Final Report (this report) and Final Report (by late August / early September). An MTR kick-off meeting with the Project Team, UNDP Mauritius Environment Focal Point and UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser (RTA) was held on 19/06/2020. See further the proposed Workplan of the MTR in Annex 2.

The **objective** of the Mid Term Review (MTR) is to assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR reviews the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability, the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation, highlights issues requiring decisions and actions, and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the remainder of the project's term.

The MTR should provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team followed a **collaborative and participatory approach** ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, the UNDP Mauritius Country Office, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser and other implementers and key stakeholders.

Relevant **documents** were received by the MTR team, as prepared by the Project Team. The MTR team has reviewed all the relevant sources of information, including documents prepared during the preparation phase, e.g. PIF, Project Document, Project Inception Report, Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, (Quarterly) Progress Reports, Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs), Project Workplans, Mission and Back To Office Reports, Workshop Reports, Consultancy inception, technical and final reports, Technical and Project Steering Committee Minutes, Project Tracking Tools, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considered useful for this evidence-based review, see also Annex 3.

A total of 56 relevant **stakeholders were interviewed** from 6 – 20 July 2020 (all virtually, mostly via Zoom, some via WhatsApp). Interviews targeted a diverse array of stakeholders, especially those with project responsibilities, project beneficiaries, government representatives, civil society organizations, academia, the private sector, local government officials, and national agency officials including the GEF OFP, see Annex 4 for a list of Interviews held. Because the MTR was home based, due to restrictions surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic, and interviews were held virtually, no project sites were visited.

A **Debrief** of the main MTR findings was held with the PMU, CTA and UNDP CO on 30 July, and a presentation for the Project Steering Committee was scheduled for 11th August. The PSC meeting, however, could not take place, since most persons and entities concerned were taken up because of the urgency surrounding salvaging a shipwreck and cleaning an oil spill that occurred at that time along the South East coast of Mauritius¹.

¹ On 25 July 2020, the M/S Wakashio shipwrecked on the coast of Mauritius on the coral reef just outside of the Blue Bay Marine Park, near Point D'Esney wetlands and other areas of great biodiversity importance. Some 1,000 tonnes of oil were spilt and an environmental emergency was declared. Efforts to control further oil spill were initiated on 6 August through installations of booms at strategic places to contain the oil slick, skimming of oil slick around the booms, and pumping of oil

For this MTR there were some **limitations**. The MTR was scheduled between June – September 2020 and took place during the still ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in many social and professional restrictions in many countries, including “lockdowns”, quarantines and social distancing measures. In Mauritius, at the time of undertaking the MTR, some restrictions were eased from June onwards, but international travel was still not allowed, and further caution with meetings was observed. International travel to Mauritius is still not possible during writing, and UNDP also restricts this. The MTR followed the guidance for undertaking evaluations (including MTRs) during COVID29 from the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) which mentions that *“MTRs/MTEs/TEs of Vertical Fund financed projects should proceed as scheduled using virtual means where possible”* and *“care should be taken to not place any consultant or stakeholders (national or international) in harm’s way and evaluation methodologies proposed should limit the exposure of stakeholders to the pandemic”*. Therefore, no site visits and interviews in person were undertaken.

Another element that influences this MTR was the receipt of a **complaint to the Project** by the NGO “Aret Kokin Nu Laplaz” (AKNL). A letter was received in late 2018, stating among others that *“by the end of the project, many ESAs will be lost through hotel development in the coastal zone”*, and the project is *“tantamount to greenwashing”* and a *“waste of money”*. A similar letter was subsequently sent to various organizations and dignitaries in February 2019, including to UNDP and GEF Headquarters. This matter was taken up by these organizations, and followed by several meetings, negotiations and an investigation through UNDP’s global Stakeholder Response Mechanism (SRM) and the Social and Environmental Compliance Unit (SECU). This has caused delays in project implementation as some activities were paused or moved only slowly. The SECU report was published for comments during the MTR on 11th July 2020.

The following Evaluation Categories were assessed for project progress; further reflected and detailed in the **Evaluative Framework** in Annex 5:

- i. Project Strategy
- ii. Progress Towards Results
- iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
- iv. Sustainability

2. Project Description and Background Context

Mauritius forms part of the Western Indian Ocean Islands, one of the 25 internationally recognized global biodiversity ‘hotspots’. The tropical climate, topography and history of isolation of Mauritius, has resulted in the evolution of a diverse biota with a high degree of endemism. However, land clearance and forest degradation has already impacted more than 90% of Mauritius Island’s land surface. Marine biodiversity is in a better condition, but is also threatened. Extensive reef systems surround all of the islands of the archipelago; Rodrigues, in particular, harbours a large reef expanse, three times the size of the island.

that was still on board the Wakashio onto another vessels and transfer to other places. The ship broke into two on 15 August. Some cleaning operations onshore (government, NGOs and voluntary) were also undertaken as from 8 August and this is still ongoing. The UN system has offered support and may facilitate assessments.

² “Evaluation planning and implementation during Covid-19” by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, March 2020.

Most of the useable land on the island of Mauritius has been put to productive use. In spite of the extensive degradation and transformation that has occurred in many areas, coastal ecosystems and adjacent landscapes still maintain their basic ecological functions. The coastal strip provides prime land for habitation, recreation and tourism, while seascapes provide the basis of food provision through fisheries and also the country's main touristic attraction—beaches, nautical sports and related activities. Lagoon habitats are especially important in this regard; they contribute to the overall productivity of coastal waters by supporting a variety of habitats, including salt marshes, seagrasses, and mangroves.

The **objective of the project** is to mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services into coastal zone management (CZM) and into the operations and policies of the tourism and physical development sectors through a 'land- and seascape wide' integrated management approach based on the Environmental Sensitive Areas' (ESAs) inventory and assessment. The project will achieve this through a three-pronged approach: (1) support the incorporation of ESA recommendations into policies and enforceable regulations pertaining to integrated coastal zone management (ICZM), thereby mitigating threats to biodiversity and ecosystem functions and resilience with a special focus on tourism and physical development in the coastal zone; (2) support the effective management of marine protected areas (MPAs) across the RM, given that they contain an important proportion of critically sensitive ESAs; and (3) demonstrate mechanisms to arrest land degradation in sensitive locations, focusing on reducing coastal erosion and sedimentation and helping to restore ecosystem functions in key wetland areas.

In the long-term, the expectation is that:

- The Republic of Mauritius has a sound, well managed information base and knowledge management system.
- The ICZM framework is fully implemented.
- The tourism industry contributes to conservation and management of marine and coastal biodiversity and the protection of vital ecosystems.
- MPAs cover all critically threatened marine and coastal biodiversity.
- The national MPA network is effectively managed and achieving its conservation objectives.
- Soil erosion is reduced and sustainable land use management is introduced in catchment areas.
- Coastal wetlands are protected and managed and deliver their full range of ecosystem services.

The **Outcomes of the project** are as follows:

Outcome 1: Threats to biodiversity and ecosystem function are addressed by ensuring that 27,000 ha marine and coastal Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) are an integral part of planning and implementation mechanisms relating to coastal development and the tourism sector.

Outcome 2: Threats to marine and coastal biodiversity are mitigated and fishery resources protected in at least 20,000 ha of seascapes through the improved management of MPAs and no-take zones.

Outcome 3: Erosion control and ecosystem services restoration: erosion and soil loss are reduced in 200h of erosion-prone water sheds; and ecosystem services are restored in 100 ha of coastal wetlands.

The Outcomes are further detailed in a number of **Outputs and Activities** that are described in the Project Document. The total cost of the project is USD 20.07 million, financed through a Global Environment Facility (GEF) grant of USD 4.66 million and with USD 13.30 million in co-financing. UNDP, as the GEF Implementing Agency, is responsible for the oversight and quality assurance of the execution of GEF resources. The Government Implementing Partner (IP) is the new Ministry of Blue Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping (MoBEMRFS - previous Ministry of Ocean Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping), which came in as IP after the initially proposed Mauritius Oceanographic Institute (MOI) declined to be the IP.

The project document was signed in June 2016, and the initial time-frame of the Project was 5 years. Implementation, however, started only in April 2017 and the PMU was recruited by June 2017. A

Project Stakeholder Inception Workshop was held in July 2017, where the Project Document was validated, and the Logical Framework and Risk Log reviewed and updated.

3. Findings

3.1. Project Strategy

3.1.1. Project Design

The **Project was well designed** and the project Document is well written. Lessons from previous and on-going projects in Mauritius and the region were taken into account, especially on “mainstreaming”. The Project is based on country priorities (“Biodiversity conservation in a growing economy”) and follows strategic guidance (e.g. NSDP, MID, etc.). The project, however, may not have fully considered all externalities, e.g. full political and economic environment, climate change, unforeseen CSO and political pressure, and clearly not a pandemic.

The focus on “mainstreaming” for this project is relevant and opportune, especially taking into account that seemingly many environmentally and biodiversity related strategies, policies, plans, programmes and projects are already in place for Mauritius. However, the MTR questions if the concept of “mainstreaming” is fully grasped and followed. For instance, the project focuses on integrating ESA into planning measures (*can indeed be considered mainstreaming*), strengthening MPAs (*mainstreaming?*) and control of erosion (*can be considered mainstreaming*) and ecosystem conservation (*mainstreaming?*). Some stakeholders also question the approach of the project and mention that more attention could be given to regulatory framework and enforcement (especially of ESAs), including rights of appeal to Government decisions and permits. This was mentioned by some CSOs, including the network “Aret Kokin nu Laplaz” (AKNL) that lodged a complaint against the project because it felt that the project didn’t address the most urgent and pertinent issues, namely development along the coast, including near or in ESAs. And although the emphasis by the project on quality consultancies seemed appropriate in order to build the information, knowledge and evidence base for improved mainstreaming, others would have liked to see more action on the ground, support to vulnerable groups and protection of ESAs (*“project produces paper”* and *“project lacks teeth”*).

Another drawback is that the MTR **didn’t find a Theory of Change** for the project, or evidence that this was used in project preparation³. This could have helped in even better directing and targeting project outcomes, outputs, activities and implementation. Although the Indicators were reviewed during the Project Inception Workshop, some of the **Indicator Targets, especially the METT scores, could have been further investigated and better articulated**. Only **few Mid Term Targets (MTR)** were included in the Logical Framework, which inhibited an impartial, quantitative judgment of project progress by the MTR team.

Environmental and social risks were also not sufficiently addressed at project development, and mitigation measures to address these risks may have been inadequate. Especially the low risk rating from the SESP seemed not realistic, in hindsight, also given the political pressure that later ensued; the risks mentioned in the SEPS did not seem to be the most urgent and sensitive ones. This was, in fact, already recognized during the Inception Workshop, where the Project’s risks were discussed and in almost all cases the risk rating was revised upwards. This should have been a call for better attention to and mitigation of risks, especially around the Operational / Political environment.

³ This was not yet mandatory for GEF projects at the time of Project development, but has since been introduced for GEF projects

Consultations during project preparation (PPG) were many and inclusive. Different perspectives on sustainable development were sought, but because of a fragmented political landscape, not all insights, especially from politically and environmentally oriented pressure groups, could be included within the Project Document. The ensuing pressure from CSOs to the project that was voiced later during project implementation revolved around a better protection of Biodiversity, with more focus on the ESAs. Though the ESA is central in the Project Document, even mentioned specifically in Outcomes and Outputs, some NGOs felt more could be done at regulating and enforcing ESAs, especially in an environment with increasing development pressure on vulnerable coastal zones.

The project document took the **approach of strengthening the evidence base for ESAs⁴**, and thereby provide opportunities to mainstream, e.g. in the land and marine use planning and permitting processes. Another focus was to provide protection for wetlands, as within the ESA set up, these ecosystems are not yet protected, with the other 13 ESAs are already to some extent nominally protected through other legislation, e.g. the EPA, Rivers, Beach Acts, etc. (though e.g. caves are also not protected).

There was therefore **an activity under the project devoted to the revision and enactment of a new Wetlands Bill**, rather than pushing for a consolidated ESA Bill as this proved difficult in a changing and tense political landscape, and with inadequate information and basis for legal protection of this complex issue⁵, as reported by many stakeholders. Though the project could still assist with producing information and evidence in order to provide a solid basis for the review the ESA Bill from 2009, it was thought more urgent by Government and the project to push for Wetland protection through a comprehensive, new and inclusive Wetland bill, to offer protection for these vulnerable and overlooked ecosystems that are under pressure and not valued adequately. Some pressure groups, however, during the course of the project did not agree and started to call for enactment and promulgation of an ESA Bill, with currently a petition on-going. This reasoning was also central in the complaint that was lodged against the project by AKNL, which called specifically called for enactment of the ESA Bill.

3.1.2. Results Framework/ Logframe

The **Project Logical framework has been reviewed**. This is based on the original Logical Framework from the Project Document, but also includes the additions / changes made during the Inception Workshop in 2017, additional targets as included by the CTA in 2018, the PIR and the MTR comments, see Annex 6.

On the whole the **Logical framework looks relevant and fit for purpose**, with relevant Project Objectives and Outcomes; these are not proposed to be changed or amended at MTR. Some updating, amendments and fine-tuning are offered through the comments of the MTR, especially on relevance and “SMART”ness of some indicators, baselines and targets, as well as some of the assumptions and risks. A drawback from the LogFrame was the near absence of Mid Term targets, which affected the work of the MTR (no impartial quantitative assessment possible).

Two indicators (No. 8 and 9) are proposed to be removed, as they concern an Output / Activity from Tourism that will no longer be pursued (on “eco-labelling” which was no longer required as such an activity was already undertaken). Instead one new Indicator is proposed, related to the new Project

⁴ As per the studies done in 2008-09, there are 14 Types of ESAs identified, grouped under five ‘ESA Systems’. An ESA Policy and Bill were also drafted, though these have not yet been promulgated. Six main coastal and marine ESA types are covered under this project.

⁵ ESAs deal with many systems, all complex and very different from one another. Wetlands, sand dunes, beaches, steep mountain slopes, rivers and river corridors, mudflats, each having its specificities with classes and types of regulations.

Activity for Sustainable Tourism on a study on the “Carrying Capacity of Lagoons in Mauritius” as proposed by the ministry of Tourism and agreed by the Project Steering Committee. A newly proposed Indicator to cater for this activity could be: “*Carrying Capacity of different activities in the Lagoons established*” (to be discussed and agreed by stakeholders).

No gender assessment has been carried during project development. The project only developed 4 disaggregated indicators in the LogFrame to account specifically for women's participation in project activities and the effects on them. One indicator is proposed to be removed (since it deals with “ecolabelling which is no longer an activity under the project). Two gender related indicators are proposed to be combined, as they consider the number of *males* and *females* benefitting from livelihood strengthening (indicators 8 and 9, now combined in one Indicator with reference to both “*males*” and “*females*”).

Different wording is also proposed for Indicator No. 17: “*Legislation passed*”, that at present seems unrealistic, with the project having no influence on passing of proposed new bills. Instead the following wording is proposed: “*Revised Wetland Bill and regulations finalized and submitted to the State Law Office for legislative drafting and to Parliament for enactment*”. Revision of ESA Bill could still be included; in fact in some ways ESAs are already formalized and used for permitting in Rodrigues under their RRA Act.

See a summary of the main changes proposed to some of the Indicator in the LogFrame below, with comments from MTR in *italics*

#	Indicator
Outcome 1: Threats to biodiversity and ecosystem function are addressed by ensuring that marine and coastal Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) are an integral part of planning and implementation mechanisms relating to coastal development and the tourism sector.	
8	Number of tourism operators participating in eco-labelling /tourism standards schemes ; <i>This Indicator can be removed, as Ecolabelling is no longer an activity under the Project</i>
9	Number of individuals (M/F) trained to participate in, and to manage/certify/etc the ecolabelling schemes in such a way that they address marine and coastal biodiversity. <i>This Indicator can be removed, as Ecolabelling is no longer an activity under the Project</i>
	<i>New proposed indicator for new Activity and Study on carrying Capacity: “Threshold level and management strategies for nautical activities in defined areas established”⁶.</i>
Outcome 2: Threats to marine and coastal biodiversity are mitigated and fishery resources protected in at least 20,000 ha of seascapes, through the improved management of MPAs and no-take zones.	
14 combine with Indicator 15.	Number of additional males <i>and females</i> benefitting from livelihoods strengthened through solutions for management of MPAs
Outcome 3: Erosion control and ecosystem services restoration: erosion and soil loss are reduced in 200 ha of erosion-prone watersheds; and ecosystem services are restored in 100 ha of coastal wetlands.	
17	Legislation passed. <i>Unrealistic indicator. Passing of legislation not dependent on Project. Stakeholders to discuss and decide on Indicator. Suggested new Indicator: “Revised Wetland Bill and regulations finalized and submitted to the State Law Office for legislative drafting and to Parliament for enactment”. (And possibly include: “ESA Bill reviewed”?)</i>

Other Targets are proposed to be further revised, and changes to critical Assumptions and risks are highlighted in the revised LogFrame, see Annex 6.

3.2. Progress Towards Results

⁶ As proposed by Ministry of Tourism

3.2.1. Progress towards outcomes analysis

This is detailed in the table “Progress Towards Outcomes” in Annex 7. It should be kept in mind that the MTR was conducted in July – August 2020, officially after the 4th year in the initially 5-year project (Initial Project Period from June 2016 to June 2021). In effect the MTR was conducted after 3 years of effective project implementation because the project started late (change of IP and chairpersons of PSC, late recruitment of PMU and CTA, with Inception Workshop held in July 2017, 1 year after official project signing and start). The project faced some also some further delays, i.e. late start of some consultancies, CSO complaint that turned into SRM and SECU investigations, and COVID-19 pandemic. The main results on progress are excerpted here:

Project Strategy	Indicator	Mid Level Assessment*	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
Objective: To mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services into coastal zone management and into the operations and policies of the tourism and physical development sectors in the Republic of Mauritius through a ‘land- and seascape wide’ integrated management approach based on the Environmental Sensitive Areas’ (ESAs) inventory and assessment.	Indicator 1: Area of coastal and marine ESAs under improved management or conservation status		S	No Mid Term targets. Indicator 1 End Target seems overachieved, though this could not be independently verified (on the ground), and it is difficult to assess “improved management”. Indicators 2 and 3 seem well on Track, though the information, maps and management plans generated need now to be actioned.
	Indicator 2: Average METT Scores for the 5 METT sites impacted by the project			
	Indicator 3: Policy effectiveness of ESA categorisation in key planning and decision making processes pertaining to coastal and marine areas			
Outcome 1: Threats to biodiversity and ecosystem function are addressed by ensuring that marine and coastal Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) are an integral part of planning and implementation mechanisms relating to coastal development and the tourism sector	Indicator 4: Spatial and policy information for all marine and coastal ESAs openly and freely available to all planning agencies, decision makers, stakeholders and to the general public, with due consideration to the different target audiences in the terms of data use and data applications		MS	Servers installed and system is undergoing testing and debugging. Some information / maps etc. uploaded, though not yet validated, public and used. ESAs not yet formally protected, though delineation has now improved and will reportedly be used in Outline Planning Schemes. Activities on “Eco-labelling through the project cancelled, as this was already pursued by the Ministry with other support. Another activity around “Sustainable Tourism” was proposed: Study of Carrying
	Indicator 5: Number and profile of persons(M/F) and organisations accessing coastal and marine biodiversity information using the tools and products developed by and/or influenced by the project			
	Indicator 6: For Rodrigues, existence of marine and coastal information and GIS unit			
	Indicator 7: Extent of Category 1 and, where required by the ESA Policy, Category 2 ESAs that are protected			

	<p>Indicator 8: Number of tourism operators participating in eco-labelling /tourism standards schemes</p>			Capacity of Lagoons, with support of MoT and sanctioned by PSC. Therefore Indicators 8 and 9 not longer valid and not assessed. A new Indicator is proposed in revised and updated Logical Framework: <i>“Threshold level and management strategies for nautical activities in defined areas established”</i> .
	<p>Indicator 9: Number of individuals (M/F) trained to participate in, and to manage/certify/etc the ecolabelling schemes in such a way that they address marine and coastal biodiversity</p>			
<p>Outcome 2: Threats to marine and coastal biodiversity are mitigated and fishery resources protected in at least 20,000 ha of seascapes, through the improved management of MPAs and no-take zones</p>	<p>Indicator 10: Protected area management effectiveness scores for each MPA as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) – see PRODOC Annex 3, Table 14</p>		S	METT scores are reportedly high and almost all nearly achieved End Target. MTR has not been able to verify the reported METT scores on the ground.
	<p>Indicator 11: Area (ha) of MPAs, either legally designated or established through MOUs with communities</p>			MPA and Reserves Areas and management reportedly increased, though MTR not able to verify on the ground.
	<p>Indicator 12: Key MPA finance indicators, as recorded by the SO1 TT, Financial Scorecard for the MPA Sub-system (see PRODOC Annex 3, Table 15)</p>			Financing gap for MPA management reduced to 11%, according to SO Tracking Tool (would need to be verified). Financial Scorecards for MPAs not established at MTR.
	<p>Indicator 13: Total operational budget (including HR and capital budget) allocation for MPA management</p>			Financial sustainability of MPA and Reserves questionable at the moment with tourism at standstill because of COVID Pandemic.
	<p>Indicator 14: Number of additional males benefitting from livelihoods strengthened through solutions for management of MPAs</p>			Government budgetary support for MPA has for now increased and reached the end-target, though impact of pandemic on next budget will need to be awaited.
	<p>Indicator 15: Number of additional females benefitting from livelihoods strengthened through solutions for management of MPAs</p>			
<p>Outcome 3: Erosion control and ecosystem services restoration: erosion and soil loss are reduced in 200 ha of erosion-prone water sheds; and ecosystem services are restored in 100 ha of coastal wetlands</p>	<p>Indicator 16: Area of coastal wetlands managed effectively</p>		MS	Management Plans for RAMSAR sites (Point D’Esney and Rivulet du Terre Rouge) developed, but implementation uncertain at the moment. Status of Private wetlands unknown.
	<p>Indicator 17: Legislation passed</p>			Indicator 17: Enactment of Bills and regulation uncertain and unrealistic as Project Indicator (not in the hands of Project). New revised Wetland Bill has been developed with Regulations being worked on. With new maps, delineation and information produced by Project, revision of old ESA Bill (2009)
	<p>Indicator 18: Area over which soil erosion techniques are successfully applied in Riviere Coco</p>			

			could be worked on. Indicator No. 17 wording is proposed to be revised (see “updated LogFrame”).
--	--	--	--

***Indicator Assessment Key:** **Green**= Achieved; **Yellow**= On target to be achieved; **Red**= Not on target to be achieved; **See Annex

3.2.2. Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

The Barriers to achieve the project objective are linked to the Indicators that are deemed “Not on Track” indicated above.

This pertains first of all especially to the **formalization and enactment of bills and regulations**. The achievement of this is not directly in the hands of the project. What would help in overcoming this barrier is putting all the produced information, knowledge, maps and management plans into action during the remainder of the project, so that a good foundation of Mainstreaming Biodiversity concerns in the coastal zone of Mauritius exists. This may also help in convincing government and law makers to enact the Wetland Bill and revise the ESA Bill (of 2009, and seemingly with inaccurate delineation that is dated now) with the new knowledge and delineation in hand. The use of ESA Maps into the Outline Planning Schemes (OPS - Land Use Planning tool at local, District level) and the uptake of the ESA into the RRA regulations in place in Rodrigues are already a good sign, that could be followed in other areas and monitored by the project.

Another Barrier is the uncertain **formalization and implementation of the diverse Management Plans** that have been developed (e.g. for MPAs, SEMPAs, RAMSAR sites, District IMCZ plans, Fishing Reserves). This will need validation and update of the authorities in charge of these areas and plans, that can be helped through the project by proper presentation, briefing and implementation following the Action Plans, etc.

Yet another barrier to the achievement of the project objective is the **engagement of stakeholders in mainstreaming**, in particular policy- and decision-makers, technicians, NGOs / CSOs, private sector and the general public. This is of particular importance after the lodging and fall-out of the AKNL complaint⁷, which was elevated to national and international leadership and which led to the follow up through UNDP’s Stakeholder Resolution Mechanism (SRM) and the Social and Environment Compliance Unit (SECU). The responses from this follow up took a very long time to materialize (official AKNL complaint was received in writing in February 2019, officially taken up by SECU in April 2019, a SECU mission followed in July 2019, and a report for public consultation was promised for the fall of 2019. Unfortunately this report for public consultation came out only on 11 July 2020, during the MTR mission). This has led to further aggravation of the issue, especially through official, private and social media in Mauritius where the delays and non-responsiveness from government and UNDP were also mentioned. During the investigations a “slow down” for project activities was put in place (with on-going activities continuing but no new activities started during this time) which hampered project activities. The media interest also led to reputational damage for the project and for UNDP. In the meantime, a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (in April 2019) and Communication and Awareness Action Plan (in March 2020) were developed by the Project, that took into account the SECU complaint and how to deal with this and reach out to aggrieved stakeholders and the general public. PMU has initiated preliminary action and prepared the TORs for the recruitment of a Communication Consultant

⁷ The Arret Kokin Nu Laplage (AKNL) network submitted a complaint in writing to the project which was later also submitted to the Ministry of Environment, UNDP and GEF Headquarters. The complaint centred around the continuing infrastructure development around the coastal zone, which affected ESAs and that did not seem to be mitigated through EIAs or other planning and permitting processes. In fact AKNL alleges that the issuing of EIA permits drastically increased during project implementation, and even some infrastructure development along takes place through “loophole” procedures. Through this complaint directed at the project AKNL wanted to put a freeze on Government issuing EIAs and permits for such coastal development.

and a workplan to operationalize the Communication and Awareness Action Plan as well as the Stakeholders Engagement Plan.

A final barrier **is the financial sustainability of biodiversity conservation and protected areas in particular**. Although over 2019 the funding for government for MPAs increased, and the financial gap for MPA management apparently decreased, the financial sustainability of MPAs looks uncertain at this moment. This is mainly because of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, especially on tourism, where most of the public and non-public budgets and financial support for environmental protection and biodiversity conservation comes from. Even the government funding looks uncertain, because of the general consequences and economic impact of COVID-19 pandemic on the country. One recommendation is to mainstream environment and ecosystem concerns into the foreseen COVID-19 recovery from Government. Such a “Green COVID Recovery” is already discussed at Government level and UNDP should support this, possibly using also results from this project.

With the SECU public report now out and comments being collected, with many valuable results in terms of products, information, knowledge and evidence prepared by the project and ready to publicize, including a revised Wetland Bill, as well as the recommendations of this MTR, it seems opportune for the Project and UNDP to grab this opportunity and following the Communications and Stakeholder Engagement Plans, to **engage and communicate with stakeholders and general public to disseminate and advertise its achievements, lay a foundation for actioning and achieving better mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation in the Coastal Zone**. To this end, PMU has already initiated actions so that activities towards the end of the project can be agreed, which will also lead to better prospects for sustainability.

3.3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

3.3.1. Management Arrangements

This project was meant to be implemented by the Mauritius Oceanography Institute (MOI) under the Ministry of Ocean Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping (MOEMRFS), following the National Implementation Modality (NIM) with the support of UNDP Country Office, and in close collaboration with other concerned Ministries as “Responsible Parties” that would sign Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs). The project document was signed on 22 June 2016, and the Deputy Director of MOI was nominated as National Project Director (NPD), tasked, inter alia, to provide Government oversight and guidance to project implementation. In December 2016 the national GEF Operational Focal Point informed UNDP CO that the MOEMRFS (henceforth called Ministry of Blue Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping - MoBEMRFS in this report) would be the designated IP, and not MOI, without any change to the position of NPD. The change in the institutional arrangement from MOI to MOEMRFS delayed the project start-up by at least six months. In November 2019 the Deputy Permanent Secretary of MoBEMRFS, Mr. J.P.D. Labonne, was nominated as NPD.

The day-to-day administration of the project implementation responsibilities rests with the **Project Management Unit (PMU)** set up within the MoBEMRFS. The PMU comprises a Project Manager, Mr. P. Ragen, and a Project Assistant, Ms. S. Hardas; both were hired by UNDP CO on 1 June 2017 and 30 May 2017 respectively. The PMU is tasked to ensure the smooth and timely implementation of all project activities, including preparation of workplans, budgets, reporting, monitoring and audit requirements, etc.

The NPD and PMU are supported by a **Chief Technical Adviser (CTA)** who provides the required technical inputs and backstopping, including but not limited to preparation and/or review of terms of reference and deliverables of the various consultants, as well as facilitation at various workshops and conduct training. The CTA, Dr. David Vousden, was hired by UNDP CO on 2 June 2018, almost two years after signature of the project document.

A **Project Steering Committee (PSC)** has been set up under the chair of Permanent Secretary of MoBEMRFS to ensure the overall coordination of the project, including the review of implementation progress, endorse work plans, provide guidance and assist in the resolution of issues experienced during implementation. The PSC includes representation from a wide range of ministries, academia, NGOs and Civil Society as follows: MoBEMRFS; MOI; MoESWMCC; MoAIFS; NPCS; MoFED; MoHJLD; RRA; MoLG; DCSMZAE; MoT; Tourism Authority; Beach Authority; National Coast Guard; Mauritius Standards Bureau; District Council of Savanne and of Black River; MACOSS; University of Mauritius; NGO (Reefs Conservation); Private sector (Rogers Ltd., Association des hotels de charmes); Private Sector (Independent Consultant, Mr. P. Baissac). The first PSC meeting was held on 17 March 2017 and it was decided that the Committee would initially meet on a monthly basis until the project implementation was smoothly launched. This was subsequently been changed to every two months, and then from 2018 the PSC met bi-annually. To-date, the project has seen its fifth PSC Chair. The planned 12th PSC meeting could not be held in March 2020, it was postponed to 11 August 2020, with also on the Agenda a presentation of the MTR. Did not take place again, because of the urgency of the oil spill that took place. One stakeholder observes that the PSC meetings included too many participants; with in some cases up to 50 participants and therefore meetings became protracted and fruitful discussions were at times limited.

Given the highly technical nature of the planned project activities, key Ministries decided to set up their own **Technical Committees (TC)**: MoESWMCC, looking at Component 1 of the Project, specifically around ESAs, Coastal Management Plans and ICZM; MoT, looking at the Tourism related activities; MoAIFS, especially the NPCS, looking at the terrestrial work outlined in Component 3; MoBEMRFS looking at Marine related activities in particular; and RRA looking at all activities on Rodrigues. These TCs are multi-sectoral in nature, comprising of technical staff from mainly government institutes and that support and guide the work of the PSC by providing technical inputs in their respective areas. This included assistance in the preparation and or review of TORs for consultancies, Request for Proposals or Bidding Document, specifications for equipment, review of outputs produced by contracted consultants and sub-contractors, act as resource persons to support technical workshops, conduct training sessions, etc.

Several other key ministries are also implementing part of the project activities. As per standard UNDP/GEF requirement, a Memorandum of Understanding (**MOU**) between the IP and the concerned Ministries/Entities (designated as “Responsible Partners”⁸) must be signed. To-date, no MOU has been signed, in spite of constant reminders by the PSC Chair; this matter should be finalized without further delay.

The MTR notes that, despite a late start, **both the PSC and the Technical Committees are functioning well** and providing effective guidance and invaluable technical inputs to the project team. During the first year of implementation, the PSC focused on catching up on lost time and set out to prepare for the recruitment of the project team, setting up the PMU, initial work-planning and budget preparation, deciding on best option for funds transfer, etc. This has solidly propelled the project and the project gained good traction during the following years of project implementation (2018, 2019).

The MTR notes that the TCs, together with the strong technical backstopping from the CTA and the Project Manager, have by and large ensured that the **correct and quality consultants were selected**. Though in certain cases the first Requests for Proposals (RFPs) were left without quality responses, and these were re-advertized, in some cases with amended TORs/ RFPs. Most consultancies resulted in ultimately (very) good quality studies, though some were delayed by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, as a “lockdown” was instated in Mauritius from mid March to mid June 2020, with staff mainly working from home and limited meetings and travel. The “go slow” instructions in place

⁸ The following Ministries / Entities are RPs: MoESWCC; MoT; MoAIFS; DCSMZAE; RRA and Reef Conservation

during the SECU investigations also affected some consultancies. See also Annex 8 for Key Project Dates, including contracts.

Under the **UNDP Country Office** through its NEX/NIM Modality and as per the signed Letter of Agreement with the IP, is responsible for provision of financial and audit services; recruitment of project staff, consultants and other service providers; procurement of goods and services; and oversight over project expenditures against approved project annual workplans and budgets. A UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, based in UK, provides technical and quality oversight, including reporting to GEF.

At the time of the MTR over 80% of the planned procurement activities included in the Procurement Plan was completed. The decision to combine activities to be undertaken in “lots” in limited number of RFPs and to spend time to draft robust and detailed TORs seemed to have helped to arrive at quality and more or less timely outputs. The recruitment/contracting took about six months on average. Procurement delays were cited, especially some major recruitments were not sufficiently responded to and subsequent TORs or “RFPs” were adjusted. Most of the contractors understood and could work with the TORs, though some criticized the very high number of deliverables included (e.g. Draft and Final Reports for all activities). All project partners and most consultants praised the quality of support received from both the PMU and the UNDP Environment Teams, including from the UNDP Regional Technical Adviser (RTA).

Since Project Inception, **140 studies / technical reports have been commissioned and 30 technical inception workshops have been organized. So far, 102 technical reports have been fully reviewed, vetted by stakeholders, finalized and ready for implementation.** The CTA has assessed 17 technical reports for quality and accuracy. CTA was supposed to conduct 10 missions to Mauritius and Rodrigues in total. So far, he has undertaken 4 missions which often included training sessions; this limited number was mainly due to the national lockdown caused by Covid-19. The MTR is of the view that the technical input and guidance by the CTA, the international consultants and the national technical experts to the project contributed to general impressive and effective implementation results so far under the project. This in spite of the follow delays experienced by the project:

- The initial delay of over 6 months due to the change in Implementing Partner.
- A delay of one year before the PMU was recruited in June 2017.
- The CTA was not recruited until June 2018, two years after the project document was signed.
- Complaint by AKNL in late 2018, and following SRM and SECU investigations during 2019-2020
- “Slow down and keep low” instructions (during the SRM, SECU investigations).
- The COVID 19 pandemic prompted a complete lockdown from 19 March 2020 to 15 June 2020, with border closure which is still in force, so no field visits by any international consultants was possible.

These delays outlined above and the risks associated with the AKNL complaint were also included in the National Audit Report 2018-19 (Feb 2020)⁹.

3.3.2. Adaptive Management

Some adaptive management measures have been introduced since project inception as described below, inter alia:

⁹ The National Audit Report 2018-19 mentions: “A review of the project revealed that: (a) The implementation of the project has been delayed, and (b) An appropriate regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity protection has not yet been developed, thus, increasing the risk of exploitation of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) for capital developments”.

1. Preparing bids in terms of lots rather than by one bid, to allow flexibility in order to attract qualified bidders. This has resulted in time-savings and overall successful bidding processes, even when there was at times initial unresponsiveness, with some of the “Lots” and TORs subsequently adjusted. Because of this, the project was able to retain very competent and experienced experts in most of the bids issued, as evidenced by the high-quality reports submitted.
2. Upland wetlands in Mauritius and native forest reserves in Rodrigues have been included in the surveys of ESA in Mauritius; this was not foreseen in the project design.
3. Cancelling two activities under the eco-labelling schemes because these were already being undertaken, in exchange for a study to determine the carrying capacity of lagoons in Mauritius and in Rodrigues, which was urgent.
4. Hosting of online E-platform at Department of Continental Shelf, Marine Zone Administration and Exploration, where servers and capacities are available, instead of the Ministry of Housing and Land Development. The geospatial data generated during the project can be uploaded and access to others provided through MoESWMCC.
5. Because of cost-saving measures the PSC decided the project itself will undertake the issuance and implementation of small scale Alternative Livelihood projects instead of the UNDP-GEF Small Grants Programme as envisaged in the Project Document. Though this resulted in extra work for the PMU, this catered for close monitoring of the concerned Projects.
6. The review of the coastal and marine plans was extended to also include production of a Coastal Atlas.
7. The survey of wetlands was carried out using the multi spectral technology which produced more precise boundaries.
8. Project is involved in the cleaning up of the oil spill from the Wakashio shipwreck on 26th July 2020. The Project Manager, as a UNDP staff, was a member of the Crisis Management Operations set up by the Ministry of Environment. He represented UNDP in the daily meetings and prepared daily situation reports. Together with MoE experts, the PM conducted daily field monitoring of oil spill in all the 17 villages impacted, and with IOM, UNDP was assigned to the Social and Economic Impact Assessment Committee and conducted surveys in 10 affected villages. The project also pledged \$200,000 to support the clean-up operation and to expand the alternative livelihood programme to benefit some of the displaced fishers and workers in the affected villages. This amount is derived from savings from the budget allocated for the Study of the Carrying Capacity in the Lagoon. The Project CTA has proposed to “develop an advisory report to Government on this issue in collaboration with IMO”

All the above adaptive management initiatives and others were well received and supported by stakeholders and will better position the project to achieve its expected outcomes and results more effectively.

3.3.3. Work planning

The PMU produced an overall Project Implementation Plan by component and activity, which was only approved by the IP and UNDP CO on 17 April 2018 after a lengthy review process. Annual Workplans are produced on time and are largely followed and delivered. The MTR recommends a project extension for 1 year, until June 2022, to cater for the late start and delays in project implementation due to COVID-19 pandemic and “go slow” instructions during the SECU investigation. Before granting such a request, a detailed workplan must be developed, prioritizing the consolidation and dissemination of results and reinforce stakeholder engagement, in order to achieve effective biodiversity mainstreaming, and enhancement and sustainability of project impact

3.3.4. Finance and co-finance

The financial management and oversight under the project have been carried out in accordance with the approved annual work plans. See the Financial status in the table below

Table - Project Financial Status (as at 31 July 2020)

PROJECT BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES, COMMITMENTS AND BALANCE AS AT 31 July 2020 (in US\$)							
Project Component	Total Budget	GEF Financing			Total	Overall mplementation Rate*	Balance
		Disbursed	Encumbrance	Pre-encumbrance			
Comp. #1	1,704,000	795,223	55,660	637,366	1,488,249	87%	215,751
COMP. #2	1,992,000	932,899	242,865	400,000	1,575,764	79%	416,236
Comp. #3	746,256	384,764	21,483	200,000	606,247	81%	140,009
PMU	222,265	132,305	27,364	10,000	169,669	76%	52,596
Project Total:	4,664,521	2,245,191 (48%)	347,372	1,247,366	3,839,929	82%	824,592

* Including encumbered and pre-encumbered budgets

The actual project delivery rate as at 30 June 2020 is 48%, however, the overall project implementation to-date, including pre-encumbrances, is 82%, with a budget balance of \$818,565 remaining, and with over 80% of its planned activities presented in its procurement plan already completed. This reflects very good project delivery and implementation performance. The MTR took note that the 2020 audit covering project expenditures during the period 1 January to 31 December 2019 was “qualified” due to unallowable expenditures totalling the equivalent of US\$7,564 related to inclusion of sales taxes in the reimbursements to the IP and RRA. PMU reported that the amounts incurred by the IP and RRA are already offset.

At the time of project preparation, a total **co-financing** of \$17,139,177 had been committed, including \$9,392,208 from the government, \$70,000 from UNDP and \$7,6786,969 from the private sector and NGOs, with most of the co-financing “in-kind”. At the time of MTR, the in-kind Government contribution amounted to a total of US\$ 14.2 million, or 151% of the total resources pledged by the Government. The following table captures the actual in-kind co-financing amount contributed by the various entities so far:

PROJECT CO-FINANCING IN MILLION US\$ (as at 31 July 2020)			
Organization	Promised	Materialized	Towards Component
MoBEMRFS	1,626,000.00	3,700,000	#1
MoESWMCC	1,326,000.00	7,500,000	#2
RRA	1,000,000.00	1,500,000	#1
Eco-Sud	444,000.00	273,000	#1
Shoals Rodrigues	150,000.00	193,200	#2
MoT	1,884,000.00	1,479,383	#1
MOI	1,832,208.00	N/A	
National Coast Guard	430,000.00	N/A	
MoAIFS	1,288,000.00	N/A	
MoGECDFW	6,000.00	N/A	
Reef Conservation Mauritius	152,969.00	N/A	
Mauritius Marine Conservation Society	120,000.00	n/A	
Mauritius Wildlife Foundation	3,900,000.00	N/A	
University of Mauritius	2,490,000.00	N/A	
AHRIM – Hotels and Restaurants Association	15,000.00	N/A	

Rogers Ltd.	405,000.00	N/A	
UNDP	70,000.00	N/A	
Total Amount Leveraged:	17,139,177.00	14,645,583 (85%)	

N/A = Not yet available at MTR

Exchange rate used: 1US\$=Rs38

MoESWMCC was able to mobilize US\$ 7.5 million of financing from the Climate Change Adaption Fund towards similar Outcomes. The Ministry's own in-kind contributions have not yet been calculated. MOT was able to mobilize funds from other donors to finance the eco-labeling activities, thereby avoiding duplication of efforts and releasing funds for a study of the carrying capacity of the lagoon and the strategic environmental assessment of the ICZM plans of Black River and Rodrigues. Other contributions not yet costed include the parallel activities being carried out by Reef Conversation which is actively promoting Voluntary Marine Conservation Areas (VMCAs): A total of about 50 ha of marine area is being protected. In Rodrigues, Shoals Rodrigues was able to mobilize local expert services from Frere Remi, the National Empowerment Foundation, Commission for Environment, Vatel School, among others, to help deliver a training programme for fisher dependent households in chicken and duck farming and pig rearing as alternative livelihoods to fishing. It proved difficult for the MTR to establish materialized co-financing during MTR and therefore **the PMU is urged to follow up on a yearly basis with all the co-financing entities to obtain the needed information and to keep the above table up-to-date.**

3.3.5. Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems

The project document contained a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget. **So far, over 150 monitoring visits by the Project Manager, CTA and UNDP CO team have been conducted**, of which 30 visits was effected to Rodrigues. The Risk Log in the project document was revised during the Inception Workshop (July 2017) and the ATLAS project risk log was updated in 2020. Normal Project Quarterly, Annual Reports and PIRs are produced on time and are of good quality. The METT and the SO1 Tracking Tools were updated by the PMU during the MTR.

3.3.6. Stakeholder engagement

During project development a **wide range of stakeholders were consulted**, including ministries, NGOs, private sector and civil society. Private Sector and few NGOs also co-financed the project, mostly through in-kind related activities in line with the project outcomes and objective. A variety of stakeholders are also presented on the PSC. However, some NGOs that were initially requested to sit on the PSC opted out when it was stated that NGOs that were PSC members could not tender for project activities. NGOs and Private Sector were usually invited to Workshops and other activities though some NGOs mentioned that they are normally not invited or opted not to participate.

The NGO network under AKNL did not agree with some of the project and Ministries' activities, and **lodged a complaint**, mentioning that the project is tantamount to "greenwashing" and a "waste of money" so long Government approves different developments along the coast, including near to or in ESAs. And although the project so far has benefitted from the close and effective collaboration with the other ministries, the little private sector and NGO involvement has led to misunderstandings and adversely impacted the project. This centres in particular around the AKNL complaint and the following SECU investigation that took a very long time, which led to accusations of a lack of urgency and transparent outcomes under this investigation. Another comment is that the project has produced potentially interesting reports and plans, but that this does not achieve better recognition for the importance and protection of biodiversity and that they want to see more action ("more teeth") and activities on the ground. This especially under the AKNL allegation that the number of EIAs granted to coastal development have increased during the project implementation period.

In order to assist the project in overcoming these constraints, the CTA drafted a **Stakeholder Engagement Plan** in 2019, although this should have been done at project start. PMU has already initiated some actions to implement both the Communication and Awareness Strategy and Action Plan. This will provide better engagement with all stakeholders and provide an adequate foundation for sustainability of project results and mainstreaming.

3.3.7. Communications

The **project needs to intensify internal and external communication with all stakeholders and better relay the project objectives and results**. This will be one of the key success factors of the remaining part of the project implementation and for project sustainability. The project document mentioned that a communication and awareness strategy would be developed in the first six months of the project. However, the consultancy to develop this did not start until September 2019 and the Communication Strategy and Action Plan was validated in March 2020. The MTR team is of the view that the Communication Strategy and Action Plan, together with the Stakeholder's Engagement Plan prepared in April 2019, should be implemented without further delay, including the actions that deal with the SECU investigation, the roll out of the project website (under development and to be hosted by MoBEMRFS), as well as the Ocean Observatory E-platform of the Department of Continental Shelf where much of the geospatial data of the project, including the maps produced, will be uploaded and that should become public.

Given the recent AKNL complaint which brought the project under spotlight and close local and international scrutiny, there is now an urgent need for the project to consolidate and disseminate the project results to-date to all stakeholders. The MTR strongly suggests that the project team consider **organizing a workshop somewhere in September / October 2020 to share the main project results and products, together with MTR findings and recommendations, and including the result of the SECU investigation** (if available), following the Communications Strategy and Action Plan, as a way to update the stakeholders on project progress, and to discuss and launch the remaining project activities, following a detailed workplan and agreed priorities towards the end of project.

3.3.8. Gender mainstreaming in project implementation.

Since early stages of the project **women have been encouraged to participate in all stages of project implementation**, including in training and capacity-building initiatives, especially through the livelihood activities in Rodrigues which included 40% women and which yielded good results. Under the agroforestry scheme in Rodrigues, 45 women benefited from the trainings offered and are actively participating in various animal and agricultural farming, including small-scale food processing activities. Another round of Call for Proposal for livelihood activities went out recently for 3 more such type of livelihood projects in 2020-2021, and where a threshold of at least 40% female beneficiaries is applied. Since the project start-up, a total of 32 various technical inception and validation workshops and training activities were held; with 31% women out of a total of 888 participants at these events. Moreover, there is some 25% participation of women in the PSC and the some 40% in the 5 Technical Committees.

3.4. Sustainability

The Project Risk Analysis (done in 2015) was revised during the Project Inception Workshop of 2017, and the main Risks for the SESP were reported on in the PIRs. This has been reviewed, see Annex 9 for an updated Risk Log. **The overall Risk RATING of the project at different times of project development and implementation is summarized below:**

RISK RATING		SESP 2015	PIR RATING			COMMENTS AT MID-TERM REVIEW
PROJECT DOCUMENT	INCEPTION WORKSHOP		2018	2019	2020	
Low	Low to Medium	Low	Substan- tial / Low	Moder- ate / High	High	Risk Analysis rating changed substantially at different times and is not always clear in PIRs. At MTR: Medium

Other features of this updated Risk Log are:

- The **regulatory risk dealing with the legislation and regulatory framework has been revised upwards to “High”**. This has also been influenced by the complaint lodged by AKNL, who advocated for better protection of ESAs through enactment of an ESA Bill. The project instead focused on developing and enacting a new Wetland Bill rather than an ESA Bill. This seemed warranted, given the fact that Wetlands are unprotected thus far and are very prone to pressures from development, especially along the coast. Other ESAs are already more or less protected through other Acts (EPA, Rivers and Canals Act, the Maritime Zones Act 2005, the Fisheries and Marine Resources Act 2007, the Beach Authority Act 2002, etc.). Given the time available for the project, attention given to the vulnerability of wetlands by NGOS and also government (e.g. through participation during the Wetlands Day in February 2020, where the new Wetlands Bill was announced) and complications in promulgating a full ESA bill with so many entities responsible for different ESAs, it seems opportune for now to push for finalizing the new Wetland Bill and subsequent enactment (though this last step is in the hands of Government and out of the Project’s control). A revised Wetland Bill has been developed by the project through the services of a consultant, with regulations accompanying this bill being developed. The Ministry of Agro – Industry & Food Security through its NCPS is scheduled to present the Wetland Bill in June 2020 and the Rodrigues Regional Assembly is working on relevant regulations pertaining to ESA in Rodrigues.
- The Risk on **“Institutional responsibilities for ICZM and MPAs” has been elevated from “Low” during Project Development, to “Low to Medium” during the Inception Workshop to “Medium” by the MTR**. The mandate for ICZM lies with MoESWMCC, but IMCZ implementation does not seem to have taken off in earnest. Responsibilities for MPAs lies with Fisheries Division of the Ministry of Blue Economy, but enforcement and financing seem not always in place.
- The Risk on **“Level of threat to Biodiversity and ecosystem services is higher than assumed” has been revised upwards to “Medium”**. It has been shown and also reported by several pressure groups (e.g. AKNL) that pressure from infrastructure development on the environment and biodiversity along the coast is high, and in fact new developments have been planned, approved and/or started recently, also during the project implementation. This risk should be mitigated through increased attention to the use of ESAs in planning and permitting (e.g. through integration in the OPS), revising and enacting of Wetland Bill, and further attention to revision of ESA Bill. Enactment of a revised ESA Bill is not expected within the time of project duration left, but review and formulation of an updated comprehensive ESA Bill forms part of a recently-approved UNDP-GEF Project on “Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and Biodiversity Conservation in the Republic of Mauritius”.
- **Climate Change will also continue to be a threat to Mauritius**, especially for the coastal areas and biodiversity in this area, including marine biodiversity. The Project is working on better conserving this coastal biodiversity through developing information and knowledge (e.g. through maps and improved management) and mainstreaming this in planning and regulatory frameworks and implementation.

3.4.1. Financial risks to sustainability

The project has performed well in reaching high delivery and utilizing the allocated funds, as detailed in chapter 3.3.1. Nevertheless, a **Project “No-cost extension” is recommended for 1 year**, in order to

make up for time lost during start up, as well as the fall-out of the AKNL complaint plus protracted SECU investigation and the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic. The remaining project budget (taking into account pre-encumbrances, and procurements and activities still to undertake) is estimated to be sufficient to cater for this extension from June 2021 to June 2022.

Financial sustainability after project closure is more uncertain, especially given the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Most future conservation activities are dependent on public, but also private spending and both are uncertain at the moment. In fact the project has investigated and recommends the increased use of private sector funds¹⁰ through different mechanism for marine park management and improved biodiversity conservation. However, instating this is very uncertain at this point in time (July 2020) because of the unclear economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on both government and private sector incomes and spending. This is especially the case for tourism, which is of major importance to the economy and employment, but is currently virtually absent in Mauritius, with the airport still closed for international flights and the future number of visitors and expenditures very doubtful. In light of this uncertain future, it is important to revisit the biodiversity financing strategy and worthwhile considering mainstreaming biodiversity into the COVID-19 Recovery and future Green Growth strategies.

3.4.2. Socio-economic risks to sustainability

As already indicated through the Project Risk Log, **a further “push” for economic development, especially through infrastructure developments along the coast, is a risk for biodiversity**. This is especially true if there continues to be a tension and trade-off between economic development vs. sustaining natural capital (which is key for “sustainable Development and attaining the SDGs). It would be important for the project to consolidate and disseminate the results of the project (e.g. on increased knowledge of and tools for biodiversity conservation, including financing), and through better communication increase awareness and advocacy with policy- and decision-makers, but also with other stakeholders, e.g. private sector, CSOs and pressure groups. This is also important in the wake of the current uncertain economic foresights and a possible COVID recovery programme, where a push for a “Green (or Blue¹¹) COVID Recovery” instead of “Business as Usual” should be advocated, possibly with assistance of UN.

3.4.3. Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability

The risk for the project to not attain all its objectives because **of insufficient legal protection and too little attention in the permitting and regulatory framework for biodiversity considerations** remains significant. The project should continue to push for completing and strengthening the knowledge and tools available for improved Biodiversity mainstreaming, especially through the country’s planning and permitting framework. The risk of diffuse and uncertain mandates for key functions for biodiversity conservation (i.e. who is responsible, monitors and enforces different aspects of biodiversity, e.g. wetlands, ICZM, MPA management) should also be addressed, with as a result that the mandates and responsibilities are further clarified. One example of this is the uncertainty over who will be the Institution mandated to implement and enforce the newly revised Wetland Bill, i.e. NPCS or Ministry of Environment¹². The project can assist in providing clarity and overcoming these challenges and risks by better communicating its results and through engaging with stakeholders,

¹⁰ See Report on: “Identification of the Financing Options for MPAs and Pros and Cons, Building on Fiscal Measures to Greening the Economy”

¹¹ “Blue Economy” is already an established paradigm in Mauritius, also reflected in the name of the “Ministry of Blue Economy, Marine Resources and Fisheries”. “Blue Economy” entails, in principle, taking into account marine and coastal ecology for sustainable marine and coastal development.

¹² Not yet decided at time of the MTR. Government has shown commitment towards enacting the Wetland Bill in different fora, including in the National Assembly.

including Ministries, entities, CSOs and Private Sector, achieve more effective mainstreaming of Biodiversity.

3.4.4. Environmental risks to sustainability

The main Risks to limited environmental sustainability are also already described in the updated Risk Log. These pertain mainly to **developmental and regulatory risks which may thwart environmental and biodiversity consideration, especially in the coastal zone**. This can be mitigated through effective biodiversity mainstreaming, where biodiversity concerns are effectively incorporated in the national and local planning and permitting conditions, through updated and clear information including delineation of ESAs, strengthened legal protection and increased awareness with policy- and decision-makers on the importance and value of biodiversity for sustainable development. At this point in time this also includes economic uncertainty and the push for economic and social support related to COVID Recovery, as these should include sufficient green elements to achieve real sustainable development, especially in Mauritius which is so dependent on its natural capital.

The risks to the project that were determined at project development and start, were intensified through the AKNL complaint and subsequent SRM and SECU investigations. This issue of lack of protection for biodiversity and “greenwashing” gained a lot of traction and attention, including in the media in Mauritius. On top of this, the investigation and the outcomes, including publication of results from SECU, took very long, which didn’t help and in fact increased the risk and caused further reputational damage to the Project and UNDP. AKNL also alleges that in fact the number of EIAs granted by government for coastal developments increased substantially during the project implementation period. This should be addressed from now on with urgency, with the help of the Communications Strategy and Action Plan, which contains very valuable guidance and action to deal with this.

The overall sustainability rating, given all the risks and concerns mentioned above, is “Moderately Likely” but can slide to “Moderately Unlikely” if the key recommendations from this MTR are not taken into account in the latter stages and final duration of project implementation.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

The following are the conclusions from the MTR team, drawn after going through all relevant documents, undertaking interviews with a wide array of stakeholders and further in-depth analysis. These conclusions are derived from the main findings from the previous chapter. These conclusions respond to the evaluative framework that was developed, and are structured around the main categories: Project Strategy; Progress Towards Results; Project Implementation and Adaptive Management; and Sustainability

4.1. Conclusions

Project Strategy

1. The Project was well designed and the project Document well written. However, no “Theory of Change” was developed and used in project preparation / development. Even though this is a new GEF-prodoc requirement and not yet in place during the project formulation, Theory of Change was already a standard project development procedure and could have helped in even better directing and targeting Project outcomes, outputs, activities and implementation, and especially better articulating and managing Risks.
2. Although the Indicators were reviewed at Inception Stage, this could have been better articulated, especially the METT Scores, and Mid Term Targets for all indicators should have been included.

3. Environmental and social risks were not sufficiently addressed at project development, and mitigation measures to address these risks may have been inadequate. The SESP “low” risk rating was because the most pertinent risks (Regulatory, Environmental) were not given due attention. This was already recognized during the Inception Workshop, where the Project’s risks were discussed and revised upwards in most cases.
4. The focus on “mainstreaming” for this project is relevant and opportune. However, the MTR questions if the concept of “mainstreaming” was well understood and followed.
5. Consultations during project preparation (PPG) seemed sufficient and inclusive. Different perspectives on sustainable development were sought, but because of a highly fragmented political landscape, not all insights, including from politically and ecology oriented pressure groups, could be included within the Project Document.
6. On the whole the Logical framework is relevant and fit for purpose, though very few Mid-Term targets were included. The MTR has reviewed and offers proposed amendments to some of the Indicators, baselines, targets, Assumptions and Risks.

Progress Towards Results:

7. The project had a late and difficult start with the Inception Workshop held 1 year after Project signing, mainly because of change of IP and Project Directors, protracted recruitment of PMU and CTA. The project suffered further delays because of: A complaint lodged by AKNL which was elevated to UNDP and GEF Headquarters and which led to a “slow down” of project activities as instructed by UNDP; Some lengthy recruitment processes for consultants (mainly because of unresponsiveness to RFPs in some cases); Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic (with Mauritius in “lockdown” from 25/03 – 15/06 with staff working mainly from home, through virtual meetings and without travel, especially for consultants).
8. A focus of the project was to provide protection for wetlands, as within the existing ESA set-up these ecosystems are not yet protected. This proved contentious, with some ecological and political pressure groups advocating for formalizing a full ESA policy and Bill, rather than concentrating on Wetlands only.
9. The main barriers for achieving the project objective in the project time remaining are: Formalization and enactment of bills and regulations; Validation and implementation of the diverse Management Plans; Engagement of stakeholders in Biodiversity Mainstreaming; Financial sustainability of biodiversity conservation.
10. Despite above challenges, the project has progressed well with high delivery and has produced quality reports, plans, maps and other outputs.

Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

11. Project has demonstrated several good practices: Wide inter-ministerial collaboration; Inclusion of private sector and NGOs during the project development and to a lesser extent during project implementation; Effective PSC and (to some extent) TCs; Timely adaptive management measures (e.g. change of activities for Tourism, consultancy procurement through “Lots”, inclusion of new and additional technical deliverables in consultancies, etc.); High Quality technical outputs, through robust recruitment process and stringent quality assurance.
12. The project was affected by the AKNL Complaint and the subsequent SRM negotiations and the SECU investigation. The SRM and other discussions and negotiations with the complainant didn’t prove successful and the SECU investigations took very long, with the report for public comments only available in July 2020 (after AKNL submitted letters in late 2018 and early 2019, and a SECU mission came in July 2019). This has so far not resolved the issue, in fact there seems to be now a wider call for conservation of ESAs and against developments in vulnerable areas, especially along the coast. On top of this, the project was instructed to “keep low and go slow” during the SECU investigation, without starting new activities This poor handling of the complaint costed the project some valuable time and caused reputational damage.

13. Despite setbacks, including the still on-going COVID pandemic with no international travel, the project has been well implemented, achieving high delivery and cost effectiveness, with the budget at the time of MTR already for 82% disbursed and (pre-)encumbered, and with 80% of the planned procurement activities completed. Available budget is sufficient to complete the planned activities, even when a no-cost extension is requested to make up for the time lost due to the mentioned delays.
14. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan (2019) and Communication and Awareness Strategy and Action Plan (2020) were developed late in the project and these are not yet properly actioned. This is a risk for the project, as a comprehensive and robust engagement and communication with stakeholders and the general public, especially on the information, tools, evidence, etc. produced, but also the results of the SECU investigation, MTR and barriers remaining is crucial for the achievement of project results and biodiversity mainstreaming in general.
15. Although women were encouraged to take part in project activities, including in the livelihood activities, workshops, training, PSC and TCs, more can be done for effective gender mainstreaming, following some good results in Rodrigues.

Sustainability

16. The Risks as reported by the project (through the Project Risk Analysis, SESP, Risks Logs and PIRs) have been reviewed. The overall Risk Analysis rating changed at different times during the project and is not always clearly reported. At MTR the overall Risk to the project is considered as “Medium”. The regulatory risk looking at the supporting legislation and regulatory framework has been revised upwards to “High”; the Strategic Risk on “Institutional responsibilities for ICZM and MPAs” has been elevated from “Low” to “Medium”; and the Risk on “Level of threat to Biodiversity and ecosystem services is higher than assumed” to “Medium”. Socio Economic Risks through development pressure on the coast are also present and can thwart biodiversity conservation. Climate Change will continue to be an existential threat to Mauritius, especially for the coastal and marine areas and its biodiversity.
17. Financial sustainability after project closure is unclear, especially given the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Most future conservation activities are dependent on public but also private spending, especially through Tourism, and this faces a very uncertain future at the moment.
18. The overall sustainability rating, given all the risks and concerns mentioned above, is “Moderately Likely” but can slide to “Moderately Unlikely” if the key recommendations from this MTR are not taken into account in the latter stages and final duration of project implementation.

4.2. Recommendations

The following are the main recommendations from the MTR team, based on the conclusions articulated above. The recommendations respond to the main evaluation categories: Project Strategy; Progress Towards Results; Project Implementation and Adaptive Management; and Sustainability

Project Strategy

1. For future projects, especially those involving sensitive, political issues, developing a Theory of Change should be mandatory, as this can help in better sharpening project Outcomes, Outputs and Activities, and articulating Risks and Risk Mitigation. The indicators should be reviewed at Inception Stage, especially the Tracking Tools, and Mid Term Targets should be included. The SESP and Risk Analysis of projects should be seriously undertaken, including by identifying and analyzing the most pressing risks for improved project implementation and for achieving results and sustainability. Implementation and oversight arrangements (IPs, RPs PSC, TCs, etc.) should be agreed and formalized at project development, including through MoUs if relevant. For this project at this stage, **the MoU with Responsible Parties that have been recommended, prepared and discussed since the start of the project should be signed with urgency.**

2. **Amend the Project Logical Framework and Risk Log as proposed by the MTR**, to be discussed and validated with stakeholders and formalized through the PSC. This does not entail the Outcomes and Outputs of the project, but some of the indicators, baselines, targets and risks & assumptions. The amendments could also be presented and discussed at a Workshop (or similar) where at the same time the strategy, barriers, results achieved and way forward for the remaining project duration can be discussed and validated with main stakeholders. The amended and formalized LogFrame and Risk Analysis should then serve as management and reporting tool for the remainder of the project.
3. **Project should build capacity and lay the foundation for Biodiversity Mainstreaming**, where biodiversity concerns are effectively incorporated in the national and local planning and permitting conditions, through updated and clear information including delineation of ESAs, strengthened legal protection and increased awareness with policy- and decision-makers on the importance and value of biodiversity for sustainable development. This could be done, inter alia, through trainings that can be organized following the “Training and Capacity Needs Assessment” that has been produced by the project.

Progress Towards Results

4. **The Project should validate, formalize and implement the revised Wetland Bill, Maps of ESAs (to assist in better delineation and revision of the ESA Policy and Bill), the diverse Management Plans (for SEMPA, RAMSAR Sites, MPAs, Fishing Reserves), ICZM plans (when ready) and biodiversity valuation tools and measures**, in order to show what has been done and how this can assist in effective biodiversity mainstreaming. This will need a targeted approach geared to policy- and decision-makers.
5. The project should emphasize **consolidating, packaging and disseminating the knowledge, tools, plans and other outputs produced by the project thus far**. This could be done through workshops, consultations, trainings, developing summaries and briefings, posts on relevant websites, etc., following the “Communication and Awareness Strategy and Action Plan” and the “Training and Capacity Needs Assessment”, to be supported by the CTA.

Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

6. In order to disseminate results and products, and to chart the way forward for the project and achieve greater sustainability, a grand **“Stock-take and awareness Workshop”** (or similar name and content) could be organized, where the project results and way forward of the project can be presented, discussed and validated, possibly also including the results of the SECU investigation, MTR recommendations (and its management comments), etc. This should take cue from the Communication and Awareness Strategy and Action Plan and Stakeholder Engagement Plan. This could especially help in re-engaging and communicating with stakeholders and the general public, and lay a foundation for action and achieving better mainstreaming of BD conservation in the Coastal Zone.
7. **Strengthen gender mainstreaming** in the project, by emphasizing the inclusion of women in livelihood activities, trainings, workshops and through recruitments.
8. **A no-cost project extension for 1 year should be requested**, in order to make up for the delays suffered during the start and implementation of the project. This could ensure proper implementation of the remaining activities (study on Carrying Capacity for Lagoons, SEA for ICZM Plans, Capacity Building following the Capacity and Training Needs Assessment, Exit strategy, End of Project Evaluation). This will need a detailed, focused and prioritized Workplan from now until the foreseen end of the Project (June 2022 if a 1-year no-cost extension is granted). At the time of the MTR there is enough budget available to warrant a 1 year extension. This extension should be conditional to: - Implementing the Communications Plan; - Validation of products, tools and plans; - Provide clarity on the institutional responsibilities for the Wetland Bill; - Public availability of Maps and other products from the project.
9. **Urgently recruit a Communication Specialist / Consultant / NGO to implement the Communication and Awareness Strategy and Action Plan**. It is proposed to have the UNDP

communications specialist already start with the detailed guidance given in this strategy to communicate around the SECU investigations. Other project related communication and awareness activities could be done by a newly recruited Communications Specialist for the project, to be placed in the Project / IP.

Sustainability

10. Due attention should be given by the project to financial sustainability. This is under threat mainly because of the COVID-19 and oil spill impact e.g. on Tourism. **Some of the proposed financing mechanisms for Biodiversity Conservation will need to be reviewed** in the face of declining revenues from tourism and possibly even public financing for biodiversity conservation.
11. **Facilitate and support the Mainstreaming of Biodiversity Conservation in the possible COVID-19 Recovery packages in Mauritius**, in order ensure a “Green (and “Blue”) CoVID-19 recovery. Such mainstreaming should use the information, knowledge, tools and practices produced by the project, and this should be facilitated by the UNDP CO at the highest policy level. Measures could include fiscal and monetary incentives, which could be based on the valuation of ecosystems and natural capital, including through the models produced by the project, as well as mainstreaming into plans, budgets and operational elements, all the time ensuring environmental and social safeguarding.
12. UNDP CO could use the results of this, earlier and future (pipelined) environmental projects, and present this as a **comprehensive, programmatic and portfolio approach to support more effective environmental governance in Mauritius**. UNDP could use this in discussions and briefings towards development of UNDP and Government Strategies (e.g. the new National Env. Strategy, CPD, UNDAF, COVID Recovery, new Projects, etc.). This should especially focus on the broader discourse in Mauritius on Economic Development Vs. Environmental Sustainability and how a more sustainable focus can help to achieve the SDGs. Such an approach should take also into account possible COVID Recovery and other economic measures, while still trying to maintain the Natural Capital and Biodiversity Hotspot status of Mauritius, even more so in the wake of the recent oil spill near Blue Bay Marine Park and Point D’Esney RAMSAR site, which laid bare the vulnerability of these sites.

5. ANNEXES

Annex 1: Detailed Terms of Reference for Independent Mid Term Review of the Project Mainstreaming Biodiversity into the Management of the Coastal Zone in The Republic of Mauritius

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a mid-term review upon three year completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a mid-term review (MTR) of the **Mainstreaming Biodiversity into the Management of the Coastal Zone in the Republic of Mauritius (PIMS # 4843.)**

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Mainstreaming Biodiversity into the Management of the Coastal Zone in the Republic of Mauritius			
GEF Project ID:	00090446		<u>at endorsement</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>at completion</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>
UNDP Project ID:	00096201	GEF financing:	\$ 4,664,521	
Country:	Mauritius	IA/EA own:	Same as Government	
Region:	Africa	Government:	\$ 9,392,208	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	\$ 7,746,969	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	\$ 17,139,177	
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Blue Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping	Total Project Cost:	\$21,803,698	
Other Partners involved:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Environment, Solid Waste Management and Climate Change Ministry of Agro Industry and Food Security Ministry of Tourism Rodrigues Regional Assembly 	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		June 2016
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 30 June 2021	Actual: 30 June 2021

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The Project Goal is to contribute to integrating biodiversity and ecosystem management into physical development planning and tourism sector activities in order to safeguard biodiversity and maintain ecosystem services that sustain human wellbeing. The objective of the project is to mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services into coastal zone management and into the operations and policies of the tourism and physical development sectors in the Republic of Mauritius through a 'land- and seascape wide' integrated management approach based on the Environmental Sensitive Areas' (ESAs) inventory and assessment. More specifically, the project will achieve this through a three-pronged approach: (1) support the incorporation of ESA recommendations into policies and enforceable regulations pertaining to integrated coastal zone management (ICZM), thereby mitigating threats to biodiversity and ecosystem functions and resilience with a special focus on tourism and physical development in the coastal zone; (2) support the effective

management of marine protected areas (MPAs) across the RM, given that they contain an important proportion of critically sensitive ESAs; and (3) demonstrate mechanisms to arrest land degradation in sensitive locations, focusing on reducing coastal erosion and sedimentation and helping to restore ecosystem functions in key wetland areas.

The outcomes of the project are as follows:

- Outcome 1. Threats to biodiversity and ecosystem function are addressed by ensuring that 27,000 ha marine and coastal Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) are an integral part of planning and implementation mechanisms relating to coastal development and the tourism sector.
- Outcome 2. Threats to marine and coastal biodiversity are mitigated and fishery resources protected in at least 20,000 ha of seascapes, through the improved management of MPAs and no-take zones.
- Outcome 3. Erosion control and ecosystem services restoration: erosion and soil loss are reduced in 200ha of erosion-prone water sheds; and ecosystem services are restored in 100 ha of coastal wetlands.

The objective of the MTR is to assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team must ensure that gender-responsive evaluation methodologies, tools and data analysis techniques are used. The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Ministry of Blue Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping, Mauritius Oceanography Institute, Rodrigues Regional Assembly, Ministry of Environment, Solid Waste Management and Climate Change, Ministry of Tourism, Ministry of Agro Industry and Food Security, Ministry of Housing and Lands, Ministry of Local Government, Mauritius Standards Bureau, Mauritius Marine Conservation Society, Reef Conservation, Shoals Rodrigues, Mauritian Wildlife Foundation, Eco-Sud, Association Terre et Mer Rodriguaise, Rodrigues Council of Social Service, Plateforme Maurice Environnement, Association des Hoteliers et Restaurateurs de l'Ile Maurice, Association of Hotels de Charme, etc; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Mauritius and Rodrigues, including the following project sites such as Black River district, Blue Bay Marine Park, Balaclava Marine Park, the six Fishing Reserves of Mauritius, the Northern wetlands and the whole island of Rodrigues most particularly SEMPAs including its watersheds etc.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹³	Baseline Level ¹⁴	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ¹⁵	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁶	Achievement Rating ¹⁷	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
	Indicator 3:							

¹³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

¹⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

¹⁵ If available

¹⁶ Colour code this column only

¹⁷ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

Outcome 2:	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved

Yellow= On target to be achieved

Red= Not on target to be achieved

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.¹⁸

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

¹⁸ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for 'Mainstreaming biodiversity into the management of the coastal zone in the Republic of Mauritius' project

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *30 working days* over a time period of *12 weeks* starting *28 February 2020*, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS
17 February 2020	Application closes	n/a
28 February 2020	Select MTR Team (Starting of contract)	n/a
02 March 2020	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)	n/a
03 March 2020 - 05 March 2020	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report	3 days
12 March 2020 - 15 March 2020	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission	4 days
16 March 2020 – 27 March 2020	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	12 days
27 March 2020	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission	1 day
30 March 2020 – 06 April 2020	Preparing draft report	8 days
13 April 2020 – 14 April 2020	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report	2 days
22 April 2020	Preparation & Issue of Management Response	n/a
30 April 2020	Expected date of full MTR completion	n/a

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: (05 March 2020)	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: (06 April 2020)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP

3	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: (22 April 2020)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit
---	----------------------	--	--	--------------------------------

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is *Mauritius UNDP Country Office*

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits. (The MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Mauritius and Rodrigues, including the following project sites such as Black River district, Blue Bay Marine Park, Balaclava Marine Park, SEMPA etc.)

TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one national expert, usually from the Mauritius. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The selection of the consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:
Technical Criteria - 70% of total evaluation – max. 70 points:

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; (10)
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (10)
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate and disaster resilience; (10)
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations; (10)
- Experience working in (*SID countries of the Indian Ocean*); (5)
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years; (15)
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and *climate and disaster resilience*; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis. (10)
- Excellent communication skills in English and French; (10)
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; (5)
- A minimum Master's degree in natural resource management, or other closely related field. (15)

Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation – max. 30 points:

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
20%	Following submission and approval of the final MTR Inception Report
30%	Following submission of the draft MTR report
50%	Following submission and approval of final MTR report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)¹⁹ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)²⁰);
- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

¹⁹<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

²⁰ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

Annex 2: Proposed Work Plan MTR

TASK	DELIVER- ABLE	RESPON- SIBLE	MONTH / WEEK															NOTES
			JUNE		JULY					AUGUST				SEPTEMBER				
			15-21	22-28	29-05	06-12	13-19	20-26	27-02	03-09	10-16	17-23	24-30	31-06	07-13	14-20	21-25	
Sign Contract		MTR Team	X															Team Leader signed 15/06
Kick-Off Meeting		MTR Team, UNDP, PMU	X															Virtual Zoom Meeting on 19/06
Prepare Inception Report	Inception Report	MTR Team	X	X	X	X												Includes comments from UNDP and PMU
Document Review	Review Notes	MTR Team	X	X	X	X	X											Documents provided by PMU and UNDP
Interviews	Interview Notes	MTR Team				X	X	X										Virtual, phone, etc.
Prepare Draft MTR	Draft MTR	MTR Team							X	X	X							
Presentation and Review Draft MTR	Feedback + Comments	Key Stakeholders / PSC							X		X							De-Brief to UNDP on 30/07. Presentation to PSC on 11/08/20
Comments UNDP / Project	Comments	UNDP CO, PMU, RTA										X	X					Provide consolidated comments
Prepare Final MTR	Final MTR	MTR Team												X				Include comments audit trail
Management Response	Management comments.	UNDP. IP													X	X		Develop Management Comments;
Validation Workshop ?	Recommendations	MTR Team, PMU															X	Virtual?

ANNEX 3: List of documents reviewed

- UNDP Biodiversity Mainstreaming PIF
- PPG mission reports (10)
- UNDP Initiation Plan Biodiversity mainstreaming project
- UNDP Biodiversity Mainstreaming Project Document
- UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
- Local Project Appraisal Committee meeting,
- UNDP-GEF Biodiversity Mainstreaming Project Inception Report
- All Project Implementation Reports (2018, 2019, 2020(Draft))
- Quarterly progress reports (12)
- Work plans
- Audit reports
- METT
- CTA Mission Reports (3)
- All consultancy reports (>150)
- Monitoring reports prepared by the project
- UNDP country programme document(s)
- Minutes of the Steering Committee Meetings (11)
- Minutes of Technical Committee meetings (21)
- Workshop Reports
- BTO and Mission Reports (e,g, to Rodrigues)
- Project site location maps
- Consultancy Reports (Inception, Technical, Final)
- Training Reports
- Other Project Reports (UNDP-GEF WIO SAP; ASCLME; Mauritius PAN Project; SLM
- Terminal Evaluation Reports (PAN)
- UNDP-GEF MTR Guidance
- IEO Guidance
- National Audit Report 2018-19
- Finance Bill 2020
- Mauritius SDG dashboard
- SECU related reports and correspondence (>50)
- Etc.

ANNEX 4: List of persons interviewed

Date	Time*	Organization	Name of Interviewee(s)	Designation
06 July	11 am -12 pm	Project Team	Mr. Parmananda Ragen	Project Manager
			Ms. Samanta Hardas	Project Assistant
06 July	12:30 – 1:30 pm	UNDP CO	Mr. Satyajeet Ramchurn	Head of Environment Unit
06 July	2-3 pm	Project Team	Dr David Voudsen	CTA (in S. Africa)
07 July	11am - 12pm	Min. of Blue Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping	Mr. J.D.P. Labonne	DPS and National Project Director
07 July	1- 2pm		Mrs. Y. Bassant-Raj	Assistant Director (Fisheries)
07 July	2:30 – 3:30pm	UNDP Regional Office	Ms. Penny Stock	RTA (in UK)
08 July	11am - 12pm	Dept. of Continental Shelf, Marines Zones Administration and Exploration	Dr A. Rawat & Dr H. Runghen	Director
08 July	1- 2pm	Mauritius Oceanography Institute	Dr D.E.P. Marie Mr. O. Sadasing	Deputy Director Associate Research Scientist
08 July	2:30 - 3:30 pm	Reef Conservation	Mrs. K. Young	Managing Director
08 July	4-5 pm	-	Claire Ward	Communication & Awareness Consultant
09 July	2:30 - 3:30 pm	Platform Moris Lanvironnman	Ms. Adi Teelock	Spokesperson
09 July	4-5 pm	MacAlister Elliott & Partners Ltd	Rebecca Klaus	Consultant
09 July	6-7 pm	MacAlister Elliott & Partners Ltd	Frances James	Focal Point
10 July	11am – 12 pm	Min. of Agro Industry and Food Security (Forestry Services)	Mrs. Cecily Cyparsade	Assistant Conservator of Forests
10 July	1 – 2 pm	Min. of Environment, Solid Waste Management, and Climate Change	Mrs. Anju Ghoorah Mr. R. Seenauth Mrs. R. Sadayen Mrs. P. Chadee	Environment Officer Divisional Environment Officer Ag Divisional Environment Officer Environment Officer
10 July	2:30 - 3:30 pm	Min. Finance and Economic Development & GEF Focal Point)	Ms. Rachna Ramsurn Ms. Nawsheen Sairally	Analyst and GEF Focal Point Analyst
10 July	5 - 6 pm	AKNL	Mr. Yan Hookoomsing Ms. Carina Gounden	Director
10 July	6-7 pm	UNDP CO	Mr. Satyajeet Ramchurn	Head of Environment Unit
13 July	11am - 12pm	Rodrigues Regional Assembly	Mr. Chang Siow Bertrice Begue Mr. G.H. Clair Mr. H. Felicite Mrs. M.L. Raphael	Acting Dept. Head, Commission for Environment, Forestry, Fisheries and Marine Parks (CEFFMP) Commissioner of Tourism Admin. Officer, CEFFMP Head, Environment Unit

			Mr. J. Lindsay Azie Mr. J.R. Pierre Louis Ms. V. Leopold Mr. A. Perrine Mr. Flore Mr. P. Lisette Mr. Jhurry	Environment Officer, Environment Unit Acting Project Manager, SEMPA Technical Officer, SEMPA Technical Officer, Forestry Services Mauritius Police Force Mauritius Police Force Procurement and Supply Officer, Commission for Tourism
13 July	1-2 pm	Min. of Housing and Lands	Mr. R. Soburun	Acting Principal Town and Country Planning Officer
13 July	2:30 - 3:30 pm	Delphinium Consulting Oceanyka	Mr. Vassen Kauppaymuthoo	National Consultant – Representative of FCG ANZDEC Director
13 July	6:15 - 7pm	MacAlister Elliott & Partners Ltd	Bertrand Rassool	Team Leader Financial Strategy
14 July	11am - 12pm	Ministry of Tourism	Mrs L. Sanspeur Mr. R. Purusram Mr. R. Kasary Ms. Priya Ramnauth	Principal Tourism Planner Senior Tourism Planner Tourism Planner Tourism Enforcement Officer
14 July	2:30 – 3:30pm	Diospyros Ltd	Mr. P. Baissac	Consultant and member of Project Steering Committee
14 July	4-5 pm	UNDP Regional Office	Penny Stock	RTA (in UK)
15 July	11am - 12pm	Shoals Rodrigues	Mr. Runolph Raffaut	Education Officer
15 July	1 - 2pm	Mauritius Wildlife Foundation	Dr. Y. Tatayah	Scientist Conservation Director
15 July	10-11am	National Parks and Conservation Services	Mr. Kevin Ruhomamum	Director
16 July	10-11am	IC Environmental Legal Consultant to finalise the Wetland Bill and its associated Regulations	Peter Wulf	Consultant
17 July	10-11am	UNDP CO	Ms. Amanda Serumaga	Resident Representative
17 July	11am – 12pm	BIOTOPE SAS	Jean-Sébastien Philippe	Consultant
17 July	1-2pm	Sustain Value	James Spurgeon	Consultant
20 July	11am-12pm	UNDP – PMU	Mr. Parmananda Ragen Ms. Samanta Hardas	Project Manager Project Assistant
20 July	1-1:30 pm	Economic Development Board	Sachin Mohabeer	Head of Department
20 July	1:30–2:30 pm	Eco Sud	Sebastien Sauvage	
21 July	3- 3:30 pm	Attorney General's Office	Zaynah Essop	Senior State Counsel

ANNEX 5: MTR evaluative matrix

The following is the evaluative matrix, specifying the main review criteria, and the indicators or benchmarks against which the criteria will be assessed. The “Evaluative Questions” are to be considered as “Guiding questions”. Not all of these questions need to be asked in every interview (some interviewees may be strategically, technically or more management oriented and hence only the relevant questions may be asked), and the wording can be adapted based on the interview circumstances.

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
Do you think the project is relevant? Why (not)?	Relevant changes to Project design	National Policy Documents, Stakeholder reports. Interviews	Interviews with stakeholders, (especially those not implementing (NGOs, etc.))
Does the project address the main relevant Biodiversity related challenges and barriers? If not: What is missing?	Biodiversity challenges better articulated in Project Activities	Project Document, National Policy and Strategy Documents; Progress Reports (PIRs); Expert and stakeholder Interviews.	Document comparison / analysis; Interviews with experts / key stakeholders
Is the project in its current form well suited to reach its objective? What could / should the project do otherwise? If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.	Improved Logframe / Theory of Change	Project Document & Inception Report, National Policy and Strategy Documents; Progress Reports (PIRs); Interviews.	Analysis of policy documents; Expert and stakeholder views and opinions
Is the Logframe well designed and “fit for purpose”? What is missing / should be changed?	Proposed revisions for Logframe	Project Document & Inception Report, National Policy and Strategy Documents; Progress Reports (PIRs); Interviews.	Analysis of policy documents; Expert and stakeholder views and opinions
Are the Logframe Indicators and targets well designed and “SMART”? Do they need updating / revision?	Proposed changes in indicators and targets	Project Document, National Policy and Strategy Documents; Progress Reports (PIRs); Interviews.	Analysis of Project Documents; Expert and stakeholder views
Are overall “developmental” and “Gender” issues well represented and articulated in the Logframe? Does this need revisions?	Proposed changes to Logframe	Project Document, Inception Report, National Policy and Strategy Documents; Progress Reports (PIRs); Interviews.	Analysis of policy documents; Expert and stakeholder views and opinions
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix	Evaluation Matrix with rating filled	Project Document & Inception Report, Progress Reports (PIRs); PSC and TC Minutes; UNDP and GEF Reports and Briefs; Interviews.	Analysis of Project Documents; PIRs; Progress Reports; PSC minutes; Expert and stakeholder views

Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.	Tracking Tool progress documented	Project Document & Inception Report, Tracking Tools, PIRs	Analysis of Tracking Tools Progress
What are remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project?	Barriers Identified	Project Document, Project Inception Report, PIRs, Interviews	Analysis of Project Documents; PIRs; Progress Reports; PSC minutes; Expert and stakeholder views
What are ways in which the project can further expand results and benefits already achieved?	Recommendations for way forward identified and reported	Project Document, Project Inception Report, PIRs, Interviews	Analysis of Project Documents; Progress Reports; Expert and stakeholder views
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost- effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Was the project logical framework, work plans and risk logs used as management tools during project implementation? Were there any changes applied to any of them?	Changes to Logframe and Risk Log documented	Project Document & Inception report, Project Workplans, Project progress reports, PIRs.	Analysis of Project Documents; PIRs; Progress Reports; PSC minutes; Expert and stakeholder views
Was adaptive management applied since project inception? What were the circumstances, and what changes were required?	Rating of Management	Project Documents, Project Workplans, Progress Reports, PIRs, Interviews	Analysis of PIRs; Progress Reports; PSC minutes; Expert and stakeholder views (especially implementers)
Were the workplanning and reporting requirements adhered to in a timely manner, and were the reports accurate?	Future Quality Workplans & Reports	Project Document, Project Workplans, Project progress reports, PIRs, Interviews	Analysis of Project Documents; PIRs; Progress Reports; PSC minutes; Expert and stakeholder views
Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?	Improved audit rating	Project progress reports, PIRs, Audits, Spot Check Reports, Interviews	Analysis of Project Documents; PIRs; Audits, Spot Checks, Progress Reports; PSC minutes; Expert and stakeholder views
How do you rate the Management Support, Monitoring and Quality Assurance from UNDP, IP and PSC.	Rating for Management support and Quality Control	Project progress reports, PIRs, PSC minutes, Interviews	Analysis of Project Documents; PIRs; Progress Reports; PSC minutes; Expert and stakeholder views
Is there an effective collaboration among the institutions and other stakeholders responsible for implementing the project? Are new partners brought in?	Better future collaboration	Progress Reports, PSC Minutes, Interviews	Analysis of PIRs; Progress Reports; PSC minutes; Expert and stakeholder views
Did the leveraging of funds / happen as planned? If not, what were the obstacles? If yes, what are some of the contributing factors? Was there any new donor since project implementation?	Amount leveraged	PIRs, Progress Reports, Audits, Spot Checks, Interviews	Analysis of Project Documents; PIRs; Progress Reports; PSC minutes; Expert and stakeholder views
Are the activities / interventions Cost Effective? Any suggestions for improvement?	Recommendations for more cost effective interventions	PIRs, Progress Reports, Consultants' technical Reports, Audits, Interviews	Analysis of Project Documents; PIRs; Progress and technical Reports; PSC minutes; Consultants' Reports, Expert and stakeholder views

Is the co-financing coming forward and used as planned, and is it cost effective?	Project results achieved	Interviews, Financial Reports, PIRs	Analysis of financial Reports, PIRs, interviews
Do all stakeholders support the objectives of the project? If not: What are the challenges / complaints?	Stakeholder understanding and cooperation increased.	Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Communication Plan, Progress Reports, Interviews	Analysis of Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Progress Reports, Monitoring Reports
Is the Stakeholder Engagement Plan being implemented? If not what are the challenges?	Stakeholder understanding and cooperation in Project increased.	Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Communication Plan, PIRs, Progress Reports, Interviews	Analysis of Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Progress Reports, Monitoring Reports
Is the new Communications Plan being implemented? If not: What actions are not implemented and what are the challenges?	Communications Plan implemented	Monitoring of Communications Plan, PIRs, Progress Reports, Interviews	Monitor Communications Plan, Progress Reports, Monitoring Reports
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Are the risks identified in the Project Document and the Risk Logframe still valid and up to date? If not: What needs to change?	Risk Log and Assumptions updated	Project Document & Inception Report, PIRs, Progress Reports, Risk Log, Interviews	Analysis and review of Risk Log, Stakeholders and Experts views
How likely is it that the necessary regulatory and policy changes will not be in place at project completion time? How can this risk be satisfactorily addressed and by whom?	Policy and regulatory risks addressed	Project Document & Inception report, Risk Log, Interviews, National Policy documents, current media reports	Analysis of Risk Log, Stakeholders and Experts views
Are there financial risks that may jeopardize (i) the successful completion of the project and achievement of project outcomes, and (ii) the project sustainability after project completion?	Financial risks addressed	Project Document, Risk Log, PIRs, Progress Reports, Audits, National Budget, Interviews	Analysis of Audits, National Budgets, Media reports, websites, Expert views
Are there ongoing activities (outside the project) that may pose an environmental threat to the successful completion of the project and the project sustainability?	Environmental risks (through the SESP) updated	Project Document, PIRs, Progress Reports, Interviews, SRM / SECU report	Analysis of Project Document, Risk Log, PIRs, SESP, National Biodiversity monitoring, Expert views
What are the risks that the level of stakeholder ownership and private landowners' participation will be insufficient to allow for successful project completion and sustainability?	Risks assessed	Project Document, PIRs, Progress Reports, Interviews	Analysis of Project Document, PIRs, SESP, National Biodiversity monitoring, Expert views
Is there sufficient public awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?	Improved awareness and buy-in of project	Project Document, PIRs, Progress Reports, Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Communications Plan, Interviews	Analysis of Project Document, PIRs, Progress Reports, Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Communications Plan, Expert and key stakeholder views

ANNEX 6: Updated logical framework

(with addition from Project Inception Workshop 2017 in Red; from CTA Mission 2018 in Green, and MTR from 2020 in Italics and Yellow Highlight)

#	Indicator	Baseline	Mid Term Target	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective: To mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services into coastal zone management and into the operations and policies of the tourism and physical development sectors in the Republic of Mauritius through a 'land- and seascape wide' integrated management approach based on the Environmental Sensitive Areas' (ESAs) inventory and assessment.						
1	Area of coastal and marine ESAs under improved management or conservation status	4,696 ha (= currently managed MPAs i.e. Blue Bay Marine Park and SEMPA)	No target	27,000 ha (i.e. approx. area of marine and coastal ESAs in ICZM plans for Black River District (4602 ha), and Rodrigues (16,290 ha); and area of ESAs in proposed and existing MPAs outside these locations (c. 8,022 ha) where management will be improved)	Spatial data and GIS (e.g. NSDI) Information on MPAs from AFRC Project Progress Reports Project Annual reports/PIR	<u>Assumptions:</u> Capacity building project interventions effectively contribute to institutional development Government commits to an incremental growth in the funding allocation, and policy support for protection and sustainable management of marine and coastal biodiversity <u>Risk:</u> Policy reform is slow and does not support the required changes needed <u>Genuine Risk</u>
2	Average METT Scores for the 5 METT sites impacted by the project	48%	No target	At least 60%	METT assessment compiled (a) during PPG (reviewed and revised by the UNDP-GEF RTA), (b) by mid-term and (c) by project end, independently vetted by evaluators for b and c.	
3	Policy effectiveness of ESA categorisation in key planning and decision making processes pertaining to coastal and marine areas Not SMART. Open to Conjecture.	ESAs are not fully integrated in the development planning process (as stated in the PRODOC barrier analysis, paragraph 0, and in related content.)	No Target	A number of barriers relating to the mainstreaming or application of coastal and marine ESAs in decision making processes have been overcome, as independently vetted by project evaluations	Mid-term Review Terminal Evaluation	

#	Indicator	Baseline	Mid Term Target	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 1: Threats to biodiversity and ecosystem function are addressed by ensuring that marine and coastal Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) are an integral part of planning and implementation mechanisms relating to coastal development and the tourism sector.						
Outputs: Information necessary for marine and coastal biodiversity mainstreaming is made available and capacity for knowledge management is developed by making the ESA study and other relevant information available ESAs are mainstreamed into physical development and ICZM planning processes, through the provision of guidance and support to the ongoing ICZM planning and physical development planning processes and by demonstrating appropriate approaches through implementation of an ICZM plan for Rodrigues and one District level plan for Mauritius Standards and a certification system developed for the tourism sector that facilitates the mainstreaming of the management of marine and coastal biodiversity into their operations						
4	Spatial and policy information for all marine and coastal ESAs openly and freely available to all planning agencies, decision makers, stakeholders and to the general public, with due consideration to the different target audiences in the terms of data use and data applications	<p>Baseline</p> <p>The ESA maps have not been distributed to all local authorities, and it is not always easy for a planning authority or developer to identify whether a proposed development site will impact on an ESA.</p> <p>ESA Mapping initially done in 2009 was rectified in 2013 because of the change in coordinate system.</p> <p>Based on existing maps from Min. of Housing, consultants will be required to field complete (ground truthing) ESA sites to confirm their exact locations. (not really a baseline?)</p> <p>ESA maps are distributed to stakeholders as per request.</p> <p>Outline Planning Scheme: Last done in 2015 for Urban Areas and 2011 (2006 without amendments for District Council). However, it does not indicate the ESAs.</p> <p>EIA and PER Mechanism for Scheduled Undertakings under the EPA 2002 at Ministry of Environment—Depending on the type of development on ESAs,</p>	Online platform installed	<p>(a) All relevant Ministries to have access to information and to be using it in planning applications and permits that affect marine and coastal ESAs</p> <p>One institution identified to host the online GIS platform which will be responsible to collect both terrestrial and marine biodiversity data amongst others. (Immediate priority, not end of project target)</p> <p>Not Relevant as Target (already done and platform installed)</p> <p>(b) All relevant planning decisions in coastal and marine areas to take account of ESAs</p> <p>(c) Open, free (See comment on assumption) and interactive access to geo-referenced ESA maps, assuming that the adequacy of terms of data use and data applications with respect to the different data users</p>	<p>Source of verification</p> <p>Availability of maps, data, documents etc. on line for government bodies but with some restrictions for the public (OPS is payable even for government bodies presently)</p> <p>Results of survey of stakeholders at beginning and end of project to assess use of the information (Not Done)</p> <p>Mid-term Review, Terminal Evaluation (end of project achievements to be independently assessed through evaluation) Online centre already set up and institution responsible identified</p>	<p>Assumptions:</p> <p>Government willing to make information and maps on ESAs publicly available (other than critical confidential information such as private ownership details). This is not currently the case. Information on ESAs is made on a case by case basis upon request and for specific regions and issues.</p> <p>Relevant government entities show willingness to implement policy measures and legislation</p> <p>Local government and stakeholders willing to develop and implement ICZM plans</p> <p>Rodrigues establishes a long-term budget for the GIS Unit and has the capacity to manage the Unit & retains the capacity</p>

#	Indicator	Baseline	Mid Term Target	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		<p>proponents will require either an EIA license or PR Approval (not really a baseline?).</p> <p>The Wetlands Bill has not been enacted yet and NPCS do not have power of entry in private wetlands. (not relevant here?).</p> <p>37 priority disaster risk areas have been identified by NDRRMC for topographic mapping at the scale of 1:5000. 20 regions have already been mapped and the remaining areas is in progress. (not really a baseline?)</p> <p>Shoals Rodrigues Carried out coastal vulnerability assessment in Baie du Nord.</p> <p>Baseline additions at Inception Phase are many. Some could be removed (see above in strikethrough)</p>				<p>Mauritius also to ear-mark a budget for the setting up of the online platform and centre</p> <p>Ministry of Housing & Lands collaborate on the ESA & OPS Integration</p> <p>Eco-labelling is of interest to tourist operators in the coastal zone and they are willing to invest for it</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Conflicts and misunderstandings between agencies involved undermine efforts .</p>
5	Number and profile of persons(M/F) and organisations accessing coastal and marine biodiversity information using the tools and products developed by and/or influenced by the project	<p>Zero</p> <p>Ministry of Tourism (Brief to be submitted):</p> <p>-Sustainable Tourism Guidelines available to the public</p> <p>-Blue Flag programme stopped</p> <p>-Dolphin watching guidelines develop in 2012 and to be implemented in 2017</p> <p>-Encourage hotels to be eco-friendly</p> <p>-The standard of tourism is benchmark for international accreditation</p> <p>Ministry of Environment:</p> <p>-ICZM framework</p>	<p>From CTA 1st Mission Report: "25 Individual Consultations")</p>	<p>"50 Individual Consultations"</p> <p>Government bodies, NGOs, Research Groups,</p> <p>100% skippers engaged in Dolphin watching and glass botton boat trained</p> <p>50% gender balance for livelihood</p> <p>Not relevant as Baseline for this indicator. Can be removed.</p>	<p>Sex, age, location disaggregated feedback forms attached to communications materials</p> <p>MOUs between institution housing the knowledge management system and institutions providing data</p> <p>Web hits</p> <p>Number, sex, age, location of subscribers to newsletters/electronic mail outs</p>	<p>Tourism operators unwilling to participate in voluntary eco-labelling schemes</p> <p>(This risk can be removed as no activities on Eco-labelling</p>

#	Indicator	Baseline	Mid Term Target	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		JICA coastal conservation plan already developed Clearing house mechanism set up by Ministry of Agro and Food Security, and Ministry of Ocean Economy No tools developed yet under the project <i>Not relevant as Baseline for this indicator. Can be removed.</i>			Visitors to visitor centres, Training courses participant records, disaggregated by sex, age location The Clearing House mechanism under the Ministry of Agro is fully operationalised and available to the public. Marine data will be available from The Department for Continental Shelf	
6	For Rodrigues, existence of marine and coastal information and GIS unit	None Information scattered over different organisation No centralised GIS unit	GIS unit installed	Unit in place with qualified staff recruited and working effectively. A full operational GIS unit at the SEMPA Interpretation Centre	Presence of unit	
7	Extent of Category 1 and, where required by the ESA Policy, Category 2 ESAs that are protected	Re-assessment of area of each marine and coastal ESA type in each existing <i>managed</i> protected area (figures exist for 2009 in the ESA study but need updating) <i>Not clear as Baseline? Better: "ESA 2009 study indicated Category 1 and 2 ESAs, but not validated"</i>	Ground truthing to be completed by midterm	All Category 1 and, where required, Category 2 ESAs to be legally protected through OPS and more effectively managed, as independently assessed and updated by project end	ESA spatial data Information from relevant Ministries Terminal Evaluation	
8	Number of tourism operators participating in eco-labelling /tourism standards schemes	Local and international standards in place. Hotels certified green labels such as Green Globe For Rodrigues (03 baselines)		To be determined during inception phase To be provided by Ministry of Tourism 'Rodrigues Naturellement' label to be confirmed by RRA	Figures from MOTE, MSB	

#	Indicator	Baseline	Mid Term Target	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	This Indicator can be removed, as Ecolabelling is no longer an activity under the Project	<p>Label “Rodrigues Naturellement” launched in 2015 for national and international certifications—MS 165 and Green Globe. (Remarks— Lack funding. There is need for the development of a scheme for the two certifications for the tourism sector under the Label Rodrigues Naturellement)</p> <p>Rodrigues Regional Assembly Tourism Regulations 2007 (Remarks— Revision of the regulation to cater for the development of a local sustainable tourism standards for small accommodations with appropriate schemes and development of new ecological activities)</p> <p>Deloitte & Touche (2001) and Sustainable Integrated Development Plan for Rodrigues (SIDPR) of 2009 (Remarks— the documents need to be updated for a new Master Plan)</p>		FROM CTA 1st Mission Report: “5 Operators for the Republic of Mauritius”		
9	Number of individuals (M/F) trained to participate in, and to manage/certify/etc the ecolabelling schemes in such a way that they address marine and coastal biodiversity This Indicator can be removed, as	<p>Tourism Authority already done sensitisation for dolphin watching; refresher courses required for dolphin watching & glass bottom watching + additional guidelines (to be submitted by TA)</p> <p>SGP: training done Skippers</p> <p>To check with MSB</p>		<p>To be provided by Ministry of Tourism</p> <p>(From CTA 1st Mission Report: “40 for the Republic of Mauritius”)</p>	Project Progress Reports Project Annual reports/PIR	

#	Indicator	Baseline	Mid Term Target	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Ecolabelling is no longer an activity under the Project					
	New proposed indicator for new Activity and Study on carrying Capacity (Ministry of Tourism): "Threshold level and management strategies for nautical activities in defined areas established".	"No threshold level for nautical activities"	As baseline level (new indicator and target	"Threshold Levels established"	Carrying Capacity Study; Progress and PIR Reports, ICZM and coastal policies and regulations	Information and data available; Technically adequate consultants; Policy makers, stakeholders and public ready to accept results and recommendations. RISKS: Government ready to use recommendations in existing and new policies / regulations and enforcement; Tourism will rebound from COVID-19 pandemic
Outcome 2: Threats to marine and coastal biodiversity are mitigated and fishery resources protected in at least 20,000 ha of seascapes, through the improved management of MPAs and no-take zones.						
Outputs: 2.1 Management effectiveness of the MPA network is improved through management planning where required, and also through the introduction of operations and business planning, and improved surveillance and enforcement. 2.2 An investment framework for MPAs is developed and contributes to improved financial sustainability of the marine protected area sub-system						
10	Protected area management effectiveness scores for each MPA as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) – see PRODOC Annex 3, Table 14	Baseline METT Scores: SEMPA = 62% Rodrigues Northern Marine Reserves = 43% BBMP = 58% BMP = 48% Fishing Reserves = 28%	For Mid Term review, the METT score for the SEMPA, BBMP and BMP can be improved.	METT Scores by project end: SEMPA = at least 75% Rodrigues Northern Marine Reserves = at least 55% BBMP = at least 70% BMP = at least 55% Fishing Reserves = at least 40% The targets set for SEMPA, BBMP and BMP will be reached by end of project.	METT assessment compiled (a) during PPG (reviewed and revised by the UNDP-GEF RTA), (b) by mid-term and (c) by project end, independently vetted by evaluators for b and c.	<u>Assumptions:</u> Government adopts fundamental policy reforms required, such as the consultative approach to MPA planning and management involving increased stakeholder participation. Institutional and policy barriers for an effective site-level revenue generation, collection

#	Indicator	Baseline	Mid Term Target	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
				<p>The target for the Fishing reserves of 40 % is feasible provided the Mgt. Plan is in place (Added to that, it is essential to increase man power in view of having the Fishing reserves effectively managed; there is need to consider the institutional set-up during Mgt. Plan write-up; there is need to have an in-depth baseline study about the six Marine reserves in Mtius.)</p> <p>As for the Rodrigues Northern Marine Reserves, there is need to endorse and then start implementation of the set Mgt. Plans in view to meet the set targets.</p> <p>Above details on targets can be removed</p>		<p>and retention into the PA system can be lifted, and government allows funding generated by MPAs to be invested in site management</p> <p>Communities and stakeholders accept responsibility for sustainable stewardship of coastal and marine resources</p> <p>The Social and Community Welfare Centres have the resources to act as information, communication and facilitation hubs</p>
11	Area (ha) of MPAs, either legally designated or established through MOUs with communities	15,913 ha	No Target	20,000 ha (expectation to include VMCA's and marine areas around northern islets)	Project Progress Reports Project Annual reports/PIR	<p>The financial reporting system of the MOEMRFSOI is adapted to provide information directly on MPA planning and management operations</p>
12	Key MPA finance indicators, as recorded by the SO1 TT, Financial Scorecard for the MPA Sub-system (see PRODOC Annex 3, Table 15)	<p>(a) Funding gap for management of MPAs: As per the rough SO1 TT baseline assessments, the funding gap (2015) is approx. 100% of current expenditure under the basic management scenario, and 430% under the optimal management scenario</p> <p>(b) Financial Sustainability Score for the MPA Sub-system = 24%</p>	No Target	<p>(a) The annual financing gap is reduced to be at least 50% of expenditure under the basic management scenario</p> <p>(b) Financial Sustainability Score for the MPA Sub-system = increases to at least 40%</p>	Financial Sustainability scorecards assessment compiled (a) during PPG (reviewed and revised by the UNDP-GEF RTA), (b) by mid-term and (c) by project end, independently vetted by evaluators for b and c.	<p>More detailed MPA finance assessments, especially with respect to needs and gaps, are carried out regularly and broken down for relevant PA/MPA managing agencies in Mauritius and Rodrigues, in close collaboration with the PAN and other related projects</p>

#	Indicator	Baseline	Mid Term Target	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
13	Total operational budget (including HR and capital budget) allocation for MPA management	c. USD300,000	No Target	USD 450,000 (based on expectation of 50% increase)	Audited financial reports of MOEMRFSOI	Risk: Adverse policy and regulatory environment prevails (e.g. Government does not support proposals for MPA revenue retention; does not change policy direction towards more decentralised socio economic and environmental planning)
14	Number of additional males and females benefitting from livelihoods strengthened through solutions for management of MPAs	Gender sensitive community baseline survey to be undertaken during inception phase of workshop	No Target	To be determined once baseline has been established Survey will need to be carried out. (From CTA 1 st Mission Report: 30 Persons)	Tracker studies, panel data On Rodrigues, information from SGP monitoring unit in the EPU	Downturn in visitor numbers reducing income to MPAs from fees and permits
15	Number of additional females benefitting from livelihoods strengthened through solutions for management of MPAs Combined with Indicator No. 14, i.e. males and females.	Gender Sensitive baseline survey to be undertaken during inception phase of workshop		To be determined once baseline has been established. Survey will need to be carried out. (From CTA 1 st Mission Report: 30 Persons)	Tracker studies, panel data On Rodrigues, information from SGP monitoring unit in the EPU	Coastal communities unwilling to adopt new practices and livelihoods Users resistance while implementing the recommendations of the Management plan; Communities and stakeholders does not accept responsibility for sustainable stewardship of coastal and marine resources User community is reluctant to use facilities being put in place (e.g. Mooring area in SEMPA)

#	Indicator	Baseline	Mid Term Target	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
						Lack of personnel to ensure proper management of the MPA (SEMPA)
Outcome 3: Erosion control and ecosystem services restoration: erosion and soil loss are reduced in 200 ha of erosion-prone water sheds; and ecosystem services are restored in 100 ha of coastal wetlands.						
Outputs: 3.1 Sustainable land management (SLM) techniques are applied to control erosion and water course sedimentation in the SEMPA watershed, with a focus on Rivière-Coco 3.2 Essential ecosystem services are restored in coastal wetlands (e.g. water filtration, storage and flood control services, habitat and recreation)						
16	Area of coastal wetlands managed effectively	<p>26 ha (based on area of Rivulet du Terre Rouge Ramsar site and assumption that this is managed effectively).</p> <p>Environment Protection Act to be included. Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) has been included in the EPA and EIA Mechanism is in place for any development on ESAs.</p> <p>Draft Management plan for Terre Rouge has been prepared but needs to be reviewed.</p> <p>ESA Study by the Ministry of Environment. Categories are classified for wetland protection and GPS points are in place for identification.</p> <p>Planning Policy Guidance by the Ministry of Housing- that is, there is already a provision for 30 m setback for any development.</p>	<p>50 ha of wetlands restored.</p> <p>Management Plan for Terre Rouge and Pointe D'Esny approved and gazetted (Not</p>	<p>100 ha (= area of two coastal wetlands Ramsar sites – 48 ha – plus an additional area that might be managed with private owners)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For State Land - An approved Management Plan to be in place for Terre Rouge and Pointe D'Esny. - The private sector has be included in the following potential wetland areas:- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bain des Dames – 10 ha 2. Pointe D'Esny – 7 ha 3. Cite La Chaux – Mahebourg - approximately 30 ha 4. La Prairie – at least 20 ha. (The hurdle is that there are two sites for sand mining. But the Ministry for Housing decided that they were going to give permit only for aeolianite dune. Consequently, the promoters decided not to invest in wetlands management and restoration, losing the opportunity for the effective management and restoration of this unique system) - Private Sector - An Approved Management Plan to be in place and endorsed by them. 	<p>Project Progress Reports</p> <p>Project Annual reports/PIR</p>	<p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <p>Government is willing to support appropriate legislative and policy reforms</p> <p>Other enabling legislation passed and/or regulations made: Environment Act updated, Development and Planning Act wholly proclaimed, and regulatory framework for ESA adopted</p> <p>Unrealistic Assumption? Rather a RISK</p> <p>Private landowners(allegedly 65% of coastal wetlands are privately owned) willing to participate in conservation interventions for coastal wetlands, and issues surrounding private ownership resolved</p>

#	Indicator	Baseline	Mid Term Target	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ongoing training for people managing wetlands following a proper structure. - Category 1 of all private wetlands found in the ESA has to be included. However, the extent of this Category 1 on private land has to be re-assessed. Management plan also has to be put in place. <p><i>Above is realistic? Project + stakeholders to review</i></p>		<p>Women and men farmers on Rodrigues are willing to adopt new practices that prevent soil erosion</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Soil erosion prevention techniques take longer than project lifetime for proven success</p>
17	<p>Legislation passed <i>Unrealistic indicator. Passing of legislation not dependent on Project. Stakeholders to discuss Indicator. Suggestion:</i></p> <p><i>"Revised Wetland Bill and Regulations and submitted to the State Law Office for enactment"</i></p> <p><i>Include: "ESA Bill revised"?</i></p>	<p>Wetland Bill is in place. There is need to review the National RAMSAR Committee in the wetlands bill. And the requirements of the application should be well defined and listed (for example site plan by sworn land surveyor, showing delimitation of the wetlands and buffer). There should be clear definition of all types of wetlands.</p> <p>ESA bill was prepared by the M/Environment.</p> <p>Capacity Building for all agencies, forming part of the NATIONAL RAMSAR COMMITTEE and to be extended to the private sector</p> <p><i>Not a Baseline?</i></p>	<p>Wetlands Act and ESA Regulations (RRA) promulgated.</p> <p><i>Not realistic. Possibly: "Wetland Bill Revised"</i></p>	<p>Wetlands Act + regulations + maps submitted to SLO and tabled for Cabinet and Parliament and ESA Regulations for RRA in place-<i>ESA Bill Revised</i></p> <p>ESA Regulations and Wetlands Act enacted and associated regulations promulgated.</p> <p><i>Not realistic within Project mandate and timing</i></p> <p>Training needs assessment (TNA) to be worked out. The TNA will be used as basis to procure training services.</p> <p>Training assessment to be finalised by the end of the second year of the project.</p> <p>Accredited training programme to be implemented during the third year.</p> <p>Capacity built within the Government to secure resources to replicate the training programme.</p>	Government gazette notice	

#	Indicator	Baseline	Mid Term Target	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
18	Area over which soil erosion techniques are successfully applied in Riviere Coco	<p><i>Baseline is "0" (No soil erosion control present at Riviere Coco)?</i></p> <p>Area of Riviere Coco that requires erosion control to be determined at start of project (PIF assessed 200 ha but this needs checking) <i>Not Baseline?</i></p> <p>The RRA proposed that the project is not to restricted to Riviere Coco but the region as a whole, starting from Grand Var to Anse Raffin. <i>Not Baseline</i></p> <p>The size of the region should be assessed. 200 hectares has been suggested but this figure may be increased. Erosion is more pronounced in that specific region. Moreover, this project addresses alternative livelihood for fishermen in terms of agro-forestry systems with plants like moringas, etc. The aim is to rehabilitate the whole southern area. <i>Not Baseline</i></p> <p>The Commission for Environment also must be consulted during the implementation <i>Not Baseline</i></p> <p>SEMPA - GEF SGP project concerning rehabilitation of 15 ha for watershed management for prevention of soil erosion at Var Brulee.</p>	<p>100 ha of the Riviere Coco region rehabilitated. A detailed project document prepared for all the watersheds from Grand Var to Anse Raffin.</p> <p>Cattle-walk regulations passed and approved <i>Realistic?</i></p>	<p>At least 200 hectares is fenced and rehabilitated in the Riviere Coco region (particularly Grand Var area).</p> <p>Schemes identified, developed and put into place for fishermen and other persons so as to sustain their livelihoods.</p> <p>Training needs identified, developed and training provided to fishermen and farmers</p> <p>A detailed project document prepared for all the watersheds from Grand Var to Anse Raffin.</p>	Project information (PIR reports etc.)	

ANNEX 7: Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self-reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
Objective: To mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services into coastal zone management and into the operations and policies of the tourism and physical development sectors in the Republic of Mauritius through a 'land- and seascape wide' integrated management approach based on the Environmental Sensitive Areas' (ESAs) inventory and assessment.	Indicator 1: Area of coastal and marine ESAs under improved management or conservation status	4,696 ha (= currently managed MPAs i.e. Blue Bay Marine Park and SEMPA)	<p>No formal increase in target for Improvements in Management and Conservation Status as yet.</p> <p>Current progress toward target is as follows: ICZM Plan for Black River will be developed through consultancy now being evaluated. Review of Management Plan Blue Bay Marine Park is ongoing and will be completed in July 2018. Institutional and governance arrangements for MPA management in the Republic of Mauritius to be developed by consultants (bids under evaluation) The management plan for the six Fishing Reserves and a lagoon rehabilitation plan to be developed by</p>	<p>The consultancy for the development of ICZM Plan for Black River and Rodrigues has been awarded to Anzdec Ltd from New Zealand in November 2018 and the consultancy is ongoing. This consultancy will be completed by December 2019 and this will concern 4,602 ha for Black River and 16,290 ha in Rodrigues of coastal and marine ESAs. The Management Plan of Blue Bay Marine Park has been reviewed and the area earmarked as ESAs in the marine park is estimated at 353 ha of protected area. The consultancy to develop Institutional and governance arrangements for MPA management in the Republic of Mauritius has been awarded to MacAllister Elliott Partners Ltd of UK in October 2018 and this consultancy is ongoing and will be completed by November 2019. The consultancy to develop the management plan for the six Fishing Reserves and</p>		<p>27,000 ha (i.e. approx. area of marine and coastal ESAs in ICZM plans for Black River District (4602 ha), and Rodrigues (16,290 ha); and area of ESAs in proposed and existing MPAs outside these locations (c. 8,022 ha) where management will be improved)</p>	<p>35,305 ha</p> <p>The consultancy for the development of ICZM Plan for Black River and Rodrigues has been considerably delayed by COVID 19 pandemic. The contract for this consultancy has been extended up to December 2020.</p> <p>The consultancy to map the coastal and marine has been completed using drone technology and 4,487 ha has been surveyed in the Black River district and 14,099 ha in Rodrigues. The Management Plan of Blue Bay Marine Park has been reviewed and the area earmarked as ESAs in the marine park is estimated at 353 ha of protected area. The management and operation plan for SEMPA has been completed for an area of 4,300 ha.</p> <p>The consultancy to develop Institutional and governance arrangements for MPA management in the Republic</p>		S	<p>No stated Mid Term targets. Indicator 1 End Target seems overachieve, though this could not be independently verified (on the ground) And it is difficult to assess "improved management".</p> <p>Indicators 2 and 3 seem well on Track, though the information, maps and management plans generate need now</p>

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
			consultants (bids under evaluation) The Implementing Partner who is legally mandated to proclaim additional MPA has been informed of the process to increase the marine area under protection. The formalization of VMCA's through Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of Ocean Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping and the NGO's responsible for the management is being proposed. The marine area around the Northern islets has been proposed as new MPA	a lagoon rehabilitation plan has been awarded to McAllister Elliott Partners Ltd and will be completed by November 2019 and 6,352 ha will be earmarked for improved management. The Implementing Partner who is legally mandated to proclaim additional MPAs has been informed of the process to increase the marine area under protection. Action will be initiated at the level of the Ministry after the consultants will finalised the Management plans of the 6 fishing reserves whereby one of the action will be to expand seaward the extent of Fishing reserves. The project will also endeavour to review and update the management plan of BalACLava marine park and this will concerned 485 ha of protected area. The formalization of VMCA's through Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of Ocean Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping and the NGO's responsible for the management has been			of Mauritius has been completed. The consultancy to develop the management plan for the six Fishing Reserves (6,352 ha) and a lagoon rehabilitation plan (24,300 ha) has been completed and these are will be under improved management. One of the recommendation of the management plan was to expand seaward the extent of Fishing reserves. The project is presently reviewing and updating the management plan of BalACLava marine park which will encompass 485 ha of protected area. The formalization of Voluntary Marine Conservation Area's through Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of Blue Economy. This is important in term of new type of governance with the community. The marine area around the Northern islets has been proposed as new MPA as they have been considered as an International Bird Area by IUCN and a Key Biodiversity			to be actioned.

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating* **	Justification for Rating
				proposed and the Ministry has initiated action. Please note that one of the VMCA at Roches Noires forms part of a Fishing Reserve and is protected as such. The marine area around the Northern islets has been proposed as new MPA as they have been considered as an International Bird Area by IUCN and a Key Biodiversity Area by the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund.			Area by the Critical Ecosystem Partnership			
	Indicator 2: Average METT Scores for the 5 METT sites impacted by the project	48%	METT scores are still as baseline level of 48% but are expected to gradually increase as management plans are reviewed and the efficiency of MPA management is increased.	METT scores are still as baseline level of 48% and are expected to gradually increase as management plans are reviewed and the efficiency of MPA management will increased subsequently. The project has procured surveillance equipment for both Blue Bay Marine Park and SEMPA. A new Visitors and Interpretation Centre has been built at SEMPA. The review of the SEMPA management plan and its operational plan has been awarded to MacAllister Elliott Partners Ltd of UK in March 2018 and the consultancy will be		At least 60%	57.4% METT was reviewed prior to the MTR and was found to be 57.4 %. With the implementation of the management plans for MPAs and the procurement of surveillance equipment and training, the target will be overachieved by end of project			

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
				completed by February 2020. All these measures will increase the METT score. The METT score will be reviewed during the Mid Term review which will be due by the end of 2019.						
	Indicator 3: Policy effectiveness of ESA categorisation in key planning and decision making processes pertaining to coastal and marine areas	ESAs are not fully integrated in the development planning process (as stated in the PRODOC barrier analysis, paragraph 143, and in related content.)	Review and update of ESA data, maps and policy and management recommendations now under development through formal consultation process. Consultancy bids currently under evaluation. The mapping of ESA's to be hosted on the online platform and made available to developers and the local authorities for planning purposes.	The consultancy to review and update of ESA data, maps and policy and management recommendations has been awarded to ANZDEC Ltd of New Zealand in March 2019. The mapping exercise of all marine and coastal ESAs has already started in April 2019 and will be completed by December 2019 depending on favourable weather conditions. As adaptive management and to ensure that all wetlands in Mauritius are mapped, the project has obtained cost sharing of about USD 100,000 to include mapping of inland wetlands as well. These wetlands boundary coordinates will be included as a schedule in the Wetland bill to ensure blanket protection of all wetlands in Mauritius. This will also increase the area of ESA under management and		A number of barriers relating to the mainstreaming or application of coastal and marine ESAs in decision making processes have been overcome, as independently vetted by project evaluations	The consultancy to review and update of ESA data, maps and policy and management recommendations has been delayed by the COVID 19 pandemic. The total confinement of 3 months from 20 February 2020 to 15 June 2020 which prevailed in Mauritius prevented the consultants to carry out the survey of coastal and marine ESAs which was almost completed. The PMU had no alternative than to extend the contract up to December 2020. However, the first batch of maps using the colour signature has been submitted and will be hosted on the online platform. This will take place after getting all the data validated by stakeholders in July 2020. The next series of maps drawn using the multi spectral imagery will be submitted by September 2020.			

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
				conservation to more than 1500 ha. Furthermore, the map of all coastal and marine ESA's will be uploaded on the online platform procured by the project and hosted by the Department of Continental Shelf, Maritime Zone Administration and Exploration. These maps will be made available and freely accessible to developers, the local authorities and the general public at large for planning purposes. These maps will be used in the legal planning process at the Ministry of Housing and Lands.			<p>The first batch of maps will be uploaded in July 2020 after its validation by the stakeholders on the online platform procured by the project and hosted by the Department of Continental Shelf, Maritime Zone Administration and Exploration. The latter has already set up an Environment Information System for sharing and managing the data developed by the project. These maps will be made available and freely accessible to developers, the local authorities and the general public at large for planning purposes.</p> <p>These maps will be used in the legal planning process at the Ministry of Housing and Lands. Furthermore, the project has installed a server in the SEMPA Interpretation Centre which will also host all the maps produced as a backup and also for use by stakeholders. As adaptive management and to ensure that all wetlands including upland uplands in Mauritius are mapped using multi spectral imagery which will give more accurate maps of wetlands.</p>			

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
							<p>The consultancy to review and finalise wetland bill has also been delayed due to COVID 19 pandemics which prevented the field mission of the consultant in March 2020 to consult with stakeholders for finalising the assignment. The Wetland Bill has already been reviewed and the consultant is presently working on the Regulation. The contract has also been extended to October 2020 to enable the completion of the consultancy..</p> <p>All these measures described are meant to consolidate the legal protection of all coastal and marine ESAs surveyed by the project.</p> <p>The area of coastal and marine ESAs surveyed for this project amounted to 32,708 hectares.</p>			
Outcome 1: Threats to biodiversity and ecosystem function are addressed by ensuring that marine and coastal	Indicator 4: Spatial and policy information for all marine and coastal ESAs openly and freely available to all planning	The ESA maps have not been distributed to all local authorities, and it is not always easy for a planning authority or developer to identify whether a proposed development site will impact on an ESA.	Installation and commissioning of the Database Application Server to be undertaken through a formal consultancy with bids currently under evaluation.	The Database Application Server has been procured and installed at the Department of Continental Shelf, Maritime Zone Administration and Exploration and is ready for the uploading of all deliverable of the project		a) All relevant Ministries to have access to information and to be using it in planning applications and permits that affect	The Server has been installed at the Department of Continental Shelf, Maritime Zone Administration and Exploration and an Environmental Information System has been set up and system is ready for the uploading of all deliverable of		MS	Servers installed and (some) information / maps, etc. uploaded, though not yet validated,

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) are an integral part of planning and implementation mechanisms relating to coastal development and the tourism sector	agencies, decision makers, stakeholders and to the general public, with due consideration to the different target audiences in the terms of data use and data applications	<p>ESA Mapping initially done in 2009 was rectified in 2013 because of the change in coordinate system. Based on existing maps from Min. of Housing, consultants will be required to field complete (ground-truthing) ESA sites to confirm their exact locations.</p> <p>ESA maps are distributed to stakeholders as per request.</p> <p>Outline Planning Scheme: Last done in 2015 for Urban Areas and 2011 (2006 without amendments for District Council). However, it does not indicate the ESAs.</p> <p>EIA and PER Mechanism for Scheduled Undertakings under the EPA 2002 at Ministry of Environment - Depending on the type of development on ESAs, proponents will require</p>	Review and update of ESA data, maps and policy and management recommendations to be undertaken through a formal consultancy with bids currently under evaluation. Mapping of ESA's will be hosted on the online platform and made available to developers and the local authorities for planning purposes.	most specifically the maps of ESAs and the coastal atlas. The consultancy to review and update of ESA data, maps and policy and management recommendations is currently ongoing and all data, maps produced during this consultancy will be uploaded on the online platform and made available to developers, the local authorities as well to the general public for planning purposes. These maps will be used in the legal planning process at the Ministry of Housing and Lands.		<p>marine and coastal ESAs</p> <p>One institution identified to host the online GIS platform which will be responsible to collect both terrestrial and marine biodiversity data amongst others. (Immediate priority, not end of project target)</p> <p>b) All relevant planning decisions in coastal and marine areas to take account of ESAs</p> <p>c) Open, free and interactive access to geo-referenced ESA maps, assuming that the adequacy of terms of</p>	<p>the project most specifically the maps of ESAs and the coastal atlas.</p> <p>The consultancy to review and update of ESA data, maps and policy and management recommendations is still ongoing having suffered delays due to COVID 19 pandemic with the resulting confinement of 3 months as from 19 March 2020 which resulted in a standstill at the level of the mapping survey. However, the maps produced using colour signatures have been submitted in shape files as well as in pdf files. These maps will be uploaded on the online platform and made available to developers, the local authorities as well to the general public for planning purposes. These maps will be used in the legal planning process at the Ministry of Housing and Lands..</p> <p>Similarly, a server has been installed at the SEMPA interpretation Centre. It will also host all these maps as a back up as well as for use in Rodrigues.</p> <p>The drone survey using multi spectral technology is ongoing</p>		<p>public and used.</p> <p>ESAs not yet formally protected, though delineation has now improved and will allegedly be used in OPS.</p> <p>Activities on “Eco-labelling through the project cancelled, as this was already pursued by the Ministry with other support. Another activity around “Sustainable Tourism was developed: A study of Carrying Capacity of Lagoons in</p>	

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
		<p>either an EIA license or PR Approval</p> <p>The Wetlands Bill has not been enacted yet and NPCS do not have power of entry in private wetlands. 37 priority disaster risk areas have been identified by NDRRMC for topographic mapping at the scale of 1:5000. 20 regions have already been mapped and the remaining areas is in progress.</p> <p>Shoals Rodrigues Carried out coastal vulnerability assessment in Baie du Nord</p>				data use and data applications with respect to the different data users	and will produce accurate maps of wetlands			Mauritius, with support of MoT and sanctioned by PSC. New Indicator proposed in revised and updated Logical Framework: "Threshold level and management strategies for nautical activities in defined areas established".
	<p>Indicator 5: Number and profile of persons(M/F) and organisations accessing coastal and marine biodiversity information using the tools and products developed by</p>	<p>Zero</p> <p>Ministry of Tourism (Brief to be submitted):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Sustainable Tourism Guidelines available to the public -Blue Flag programme stopped -Dolphin watching guidelines develop in 2012 and to be implemented in 2017 	The online platform is not yet installed.	The mapping of all ESAs will be completed by December 2019 and all these maps will be uploaded in the server where it can be accessed freely. The number of hits will be recorded as soon as all maps of ESA are uploaded in the server.	25 Individual Consultations	<p>50 Individual Consultations</p> <p>Government bodies, NGOs, Research Groups,</p> <p>100% skippers engaged in Dolphin watching and glass bottom boat trained</p>	The mapping of all ESAs was delayed due to COVID 19 pandemic. By July 2020, maps produced and already submitted will be uploaded into the online platform. The number of hits will be recorded as soon as all maps of ESA are uploaded in the server.			

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
	and/or influenced by the project	-Encourage hotels to be eco-friendly -The standard of tourism is bench-mark for international accreditation Ministry of Environment: -ICZM framework -JICA coastal conservation plan already developed Clearing house mechanism set up by Ministry of Agro and Food Security, and Ministry of Ocean Economy No tools developed yet under the project				50% gender balance for livelihood				
	Indicator 6: For Rodrigues, existence of marine and coastal information and GIS unit	None Information scattered over different organisation No centralised GIS unit	The PMU/Project is supporting the Rodrigues Regional Assembly in developing the specification for the GIS unit. This will then be used to create a ToR for tender to establish the Unit Training of staff will be a key component in this process.	The PMU/Project has supported the Rodrigues Regional Assembly in developing the specification for the GIS unit. Tender has been launched and the offers has already been evaluated. The contract to supply the GIS unit as well as the training of officers of the unit was awarded to State Informatics Ltd. This GIS unit will be operational in the last quarter of 2019.	GIS Unit installed	Unit in place with qualified staff recruited and working effectively. A full operational GIS unit at the SEMPA Interpretation Centre	Unit in place with qualified staff trained in GIS software. The unit will host the coastal and marine ESAs maps for the Republic of Mauritius. One GIS unit has already been installed at the SEMPA Interpretation Centre and 3 Officers were given training on GIS software. The unit is now operational and will also be used as to host the maps of ESAs produced by the project which will be done in July 2020			
	Indicator 7: Extent of Category 1 and,	Re-assessment of area of each marine and coastal	The Review and update of ESA data, maps, policy and	The Review and update of ESA data, maps, policy and management	Ground Truthing to be	All Category 1 and, where required,	The Review and update of ESA data, maps, policy and management			

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
	where required by the ESA Policy, Category 2 ESAs that are protected	ESA type in each existing managed protected area (figures exist for 2009 in the ESA study but need updating)	management recommendations to be undertaken through a formal consultancy with bids currently under evaluation. Draft TOR for an International Consultant drafted for the review and finalization of the Wetlands Bill and will be circulated shortly	<p>recommendations will be completed by December 2019.</p> <p>An International Environmental Legal Consultant, Peter Wulf has been recruited to review and finalise the Wetland Bill. The revised Bill will be very different from the original Bill provided to the consultant. The adaptive measure proposed will include the listing of coordinates of the boundaries of terrestrial wetlands which should, if the Bill and proposed Regulations are enacted, provide protection for all wetlands under the new legislation. The adaptive measure to include the mapping of inland wetlands will enable the insertion as a schedule in the bill thus ensuring blanket protection for all wetlands. Similarly, all the ESAs maps will be included in the legal instrument of the Ministry of Housing and Lands, thereby ensuring the protection and conservation of all coastal and marine ESAs.</p>	completed by mid-Term	Category 2 ESAs to be legally protected through OPS and more effectively managed, as independently assessed and updated by project end	<p>recommendations has been delayed at a critical stage by the COVID 19 pandemic. There have been some reports submitted and the consultants were more for blanket protection of all categories of ESAs i.e they were proposing no classification of ESAs . But this has to be validated by July with the stakeholders. All the marine and coastal ESAs maps will be included in the legal instrument of the Ministry of Housing and Lands, thereby ensuring their protection and conservation</p> <p>The Rodrigues Regional Assembly will go for an ESA Regulation for the protection of marine and coastal ESAs in Rodrigues. This regulation will be drafted by the Consultants. Moreover, the project through consultancy to finalise wetland bill which in principle when enacted geared to protect all wetlands indistinctly. The adaptive measure to include the mapping of inland wetlands will enable the insertion as a schedule in the bill thus ensuring blanket protection for all wetlands.</p> <p>.</p>			

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
				The Rodrigues Regional Assembly will later propose an ESA Regulation for the protection of marine and coastal ESAs in Rodrigues.						
	Indicator 8: Number of tourism operators participating in eco-labelling /tourism standards schemes	<p>Local and international standards in place. Hotels certified green labels such as Green Globe</p> <p>For Rodrigues (03 baselines)</p> <p>Label “Rodrigues Naturellement” launched in 2015 for national and international certifications - MS 165 and Green Globe. (Remarks – Lack funding. There is need for the development of a scheme for the two certifications for the tourism sector under the Label Rodrigues Naturellement)</p> <p>Rodrigues Regional Assembly Tourism Regulations 2007 (Remarks – Revision of the regulation to cater for the development of a</p>	PMU and the Ministry of Tourism are currently finalizing a TOR for this activity	<p>PMU and the Ministry of Tourism has finalised the TOR for two consultancies regarding sustainable tourism. One lot will be on the eco labelling project which will include training for operators and the second lot will be an adaptive measure to evaluate the carrying capacity of the lagoons regarding nautical activities. The TOR for this activity has been developed and vetted by the Technical Committee.</p> <p>PMU will launch the RFP shortly after consultation with RTA and UNDP.</p>		<p>To be provided by Ministry of tourism.</p> <p>“Rodrigues Naturellement” Label to be confirmed by RRA</p> <p>5 Operators for the Republic of Mauritius</p>	<p>The Tourism Technical Committee has requested to drop the ecolabelling project as this activity was taken up by another project which the Ministry was implementing. To avoid duplication, the PMU worked on a RFP to determine the carrying capacity of lagoons of Mauritius as well as for SEMPA in Rodrigues i.e the scope of work was increased. Again to adapt to new situation most particularly to mitigate the SECU investigation of AKNL complaint, a new task was included in the TOR which will develop a strategic environmental assessment of the ICZM plans of Black River and Rodrigues. This RFP has been launched by UNDP with deadline of submission on 30 June 2020.</p> <p>This indicator will need some modification during the MTR</p>			

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
		<p>local sustainable tourism standards for small accommodations with appropriate schemes and development of new ecological activities)</p> <p>Deloitte & Touche (2001) and Sustainable Integrated Development Plan for Rodrigues (SIDPR) of 2009 (Remarks – the documents need to be updated for a new Master Plan)</p>								
	<p>Indicator 9: Number of individuals (M/F) trained to participate in, and to manage/certify /etc the ecolabelling schemes in such a way that they address marine and coastal biodiversity</p>	<p>Numbers already trained from (information from TA)</p> <p>Tourism Authority already done sensitisation for dolphin watching, refresher courses required for dolphin watching & glass bottom watching + additional guidelines (to be submitted by TA) SGP: training done Skippers.To check with MSB</p>	<p>PMU and the Ministry of Tourism are currently developing a TOR for this activity</p>	<p>PMU and the Ministry of Tourism has finalised the TOR for two consultancies regarding sustainable tourism. One lot will be on the eco labelling project which will include training for operators and the second lot will be an adaptive measure to evaluate the carrying capacity of the lagoons regarding nautical activities. The TOR for this activity has been developed and vetted by the Technical Committee.</p> <p>PMU will launch the RFP shortly after consultation with RTA and UNDP.</p>		<p>To be provided by Ministry of Tourism</p> <p>40 for the Republic of Mauritius</p>	<p>In view of the above and that this activity has been dropped to avoid duplication and loss of resources, this indicator need to be modified. Proposed new Indicator (Ministry of Tourism): “Threshold level and management strategies for nautical activities in defined areas established”.</p>			

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
Outcome 2: Threats to marine and coastal biodiversity are mitigated and fishery resources protected in at least 20,000 ha of seascapes, through the improved management of MPAs and no-take zones	Indicator 10: Protected area management effectiveness scores for each MPA as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) – see PRODOC Annex 3, Table 14	Baseline METT Scores: SEMPA = 62% Rodrigues Northern Marine Reserves = 43% BBMP = 58% BMP = 48% Fishing Reserves = 28%	METT scores are still at baseline level. Scores are expected to increase after drafting management plans and increasing the management effectiveness of MPA	METT scores are still as baseline level and are expected to gradually increase as management plans are reviewed and the efficiency of MPA management is increased. The project has procured surveillance equipment for both Blue Bay Marine Park and SEMPA. A new Visitors and Interpretation Centre has been built at SEMPA. The review of the SEMPA management plan and its operational plan has been awarded to MacAllister Elliott Partners Ltd of UK in March 2019 and the consultancy will be completed by February 2020. All these measures will increase the METT score. The METT score will be reviewed during the Mid Term review which will be due by the end of 2019.		METT Scores by project end: SEMPA = at least 75% Rodrigues Northern Marine Reserves = at least 55% BBMP = at least 70% BMP = at least 55% Fishing Reserves = at least 40%	BBMP = 68% BMP = 52% Fishing Reserves = 43% SEMPA = 75% Rodrigues Northern Marine Reserves = 49%		S	METTs of Pas are reportedly high and almost all nearly achieved End target. MTR has not been able to verify the reported METT scores. MPA and Reserves Areas and Management reportedly increased, though MTR not able to verify on the ground.
	Indicator 11: Area (ha) of MPAs, either legally designated or established through MOUs with communities	15,913 ha	The Implementing Partner is already closely engaged with the PMU in delivering on this target.. The process of formalizing VMCA through MoU has been initiated. The area around the	The consultancy to develop the management plan for the six Fishing Reserves and a lagoon rehabilitation plan has been awarded to McAllister Elliott Partners Ltd in November 2018 and will be completed by November 2019.		20,000 ha (expectation to include VMCA's and marine areas around northern islets)	Five fishing reserves were proclaimed in Rodrigues alongside the six from Mauritius. Two of the Fishing Reserves were included in the SEMPA. So, the three Fishing Reserves left which are as follows:			Financial sustainability of MPA and Reserves questionable at the

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
			Northern Islets has been proposed as new MPA.	<p>The Implementing Partner who is legally mandated to proclaim additional MPA has been informed of the process to increase the marine area under protection. Action will be initiated at the level of the Ministry after the consultants will finalise the Management plans of the 6 fishing reserves whereby one of the action will be to expand seaward the extent of Fishing reserves.</p> <p>The formalization of VMCA's through Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of Ocean Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping and the NGO's responsible for the management has been proposed and the Ministry has initiated action..</p> <p>The marine area around the Northern islets has been proposed as new MPA as they have been considered as an International Bird Area by IUCN and a Key Biodiversity Area by the Critical Ecosystem</p>			<p>1. North East Zone Fishing Reserve</p> <p>2. North Zone Fishing Reserve and</p> <p>3. Baie Topaze Fishing Reserves must be included as MPA in the Republic of Mauritius. The total area of these three Fishing Reserves are XXXX ha.</p> <p>The Fishing Reserves management plan developed by the project has earmarked several areas adjoining these Fishing Reserves to be expanded more particularly the fore reef.</p> <p>The formalization of VMCA's through Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of Ocean Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping and the NGO's responsible for the management has been proposed and the Ministry has initiated action..</p> <p>The marine area around the Northern islets has been proposed as new MPA as they have been considered as an International Bird Area by IUCN and a Key Biodiversity Area by the Critical Ecosystem.</p>			<p>moment with tourism at standstill because of COVID Pandemic (but could pick up after re-opening?).</p> <p>Financing gap for MPA management reduced to 11%, according to SO Tracking Tool (would need to be verified). Financial Scorecards for MPAs not established at MTR.</p> <p>Government budgetary support for MPA has for now</p>

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
							The Implementing Partner who is legally mandated to proclaim additional MPA has been informed of the process to increase the marine area under protection.			increased and reached the end-target, though impact of pandemic on next budget will need to be awaited.
	Indicator 12: Key MPA finance indicators, as recorded by the SO1 TT, Financial Scorecard for the MPA Sub-system (see PRODOC Annex 3, Table 15)	(a) Funding gap for management of MPAs: As per the rough SO1 TT baseline assessments, the funding gap (2015) is approx. 100% of current expenditure under the basic management scenario, and 430% under the optimal management scenario (b) Financial Sustainability Score for the MPA Sub-system = 24%	Development of an investment framework and financing strategy and to increase financing flows to MPA is currently stalled due to a lack of bids following the Request for Proposals. The RFP will shortly be re-launched to a wider audience.	The consultancy to develop an investment framework and financing strategy and to increase financing flows to MPA has been awarded to MacAllister Elliott Partners Ltd from UK in March 2019 and the consultancy is ongoing and will be completed by February 2020. The SO1 TT and Financial Sustainability score will be reviewed during the Mid Term Review which is due at the end of 2019.		(a) The annual financing gap is reduced to be at least 50% of expenditure under the basic management scenario (b) Financial Sustainability Score for the MPA Sub-system = increases to at least 40%	The consultancy to develop an investment framework and financing strategy and to increase financing flows to MPA has been completed. Several measures were recommended to be put in place to be financially sustainable mainly the following: 1. An airport environment charge of US\$5 per passenger 2. A cruise ship environment charge of US\$20 per passenger/crew. 3. A Daily Multiple-Entrance Fee of US\$10 per commercial or recreational boat entering MPAs among others. However, with the COVID19 pandemic associated with confinement and travel restriction has completely put the tourism industry at a standstill. These measures will have to be implemented at a later stage when the Tourism Industry has take off. again			

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
	Indicator 13: Total operational budget (including HR and capital budget) allocation for MPA management	c. USD300,000	No increase in target level beyond baseline level at this stage but there is commitment of funding to the Ministry in the financial budget speech which will support the MPAs .	The PMU and the Ministry has carried out an exercise on budget monitoring and has shown that the budget allocated for MPAs management in Mauritius has reached USD 500,000 i.e exceeded the target. This will have to be confirmed during mid term review. No increase in target level beyond baseline level at this stage but there is commitment of funding to the Ministry in the financial budget speech which will support the MPAs .		USD 450,000 (based on expectation of 50% increase)	USD 500,000 The PMU and the Ministry has carried out an exercise on budget monitoring and has shown that the budget allocated for MPAs management in Mauritius has reached USD 500,000 i.e exceeded the target. Annual financing gap reduced to 10% as reported in SO1TT (to be verified)			
	Indicator 14: Number of additional males benefitting from livelihoods strengthened through solutions for management of MPAs	Gender sensitive community baseline survey to be undertaken during inception phase of workshop	NGOs to be recruited to implement alternative livelihood projects in Mauritius and Rodrigues. The call for proposals is currently being finalized through stakeholder consultation	The inclusion of at least 40% female beneficiaries is applied in the TOR for the Call For Proposal from NGOs to implement alternative livelihood projects in Mauritius and Rodrigues. This means that at least 60% of the beneficiaries will be males. Till now, only one contract has been awarded to a woman-led NGO SHOALS Rodrigues and this project is ongoing. They are proposing to recruit 50 beneficiaries for this project. A second call for proposals has been launched in February 2019 but no		To be determined once baseline has been established Survey will need to be carried out 30 persons	15 males These 15 beneficiaries of the Sustainable Alternative Livelihood project implemented by the NGO SHOALS Rodrigues. This project is ongoing and the beneficiaries were given training in chicken, duck and pig rearing as an alternative livelihood activities. It is to be noted that the spouse of beneficiaries were also trained together with their respective spouse. This will eventually increase the additional beneficiaries at the end of the project.			

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self-reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
				responsive offer was obtained. This CFP will be launched again shortly with some minor amendments.			<p>UNDP has launched another Call for proposal which was closed on 20 June 2020. We had four proposal and this is under evaluation and three NGOs will be awarded by mid July 2020 the contract to implement their alternative livelihood project.</p> <p>The inclusion of at least 40% female beneficiaries is applied in the TOR for the Call For Proposal from NGOs to implement alternative livelihood projects in Mauritius and Rodrigues</p>			
	Indicator 15: Number of additional females benefitting from livelihoods strengthened through solutions for management of MPAs	Gender Sensitive baseline survey to be undertaken during inception phase of workshop	The inclusion of at least 40% female beneficiaries is applied in the TOR for NGOs to implement alternative livelihood projects in Mauritius and Rodrigues. The call for proposals is currently being finalized through stakeholder consultation	The inclusion of at least 40% female beneficiaries is applied in the TOR for the Call For Proposal from NGOs to implement alternative livelihood projects in Mauritius and Rodrigues. Till now, only one contract has been awarded to SHOALS Rodrigues and this project is ongoing. They are proposing to recruit 50 beneficiaries for this project. A second call for proposals has been launched in February 2019 but no responsive offer was obtained. This CFP will be		<p>To be determined once baseline has been established</p> <p>Survey will need to be carried out</p> <p>30 persons</p>	<p>10 females</p> <p>These 10 beneficiaries of the Sustainable Alternative Livelihood project implemented by the NGO SHOALS Rodrigues. This project is ongoing and the beneficiaries were given training in chicken, duck and pig rearing as an alternative livelihood activities. It is to be noted that the spouse of beneficiaries were also trained together with their respective spouse. This will eventually increase the additional beneficiaries at the end of the project.</p>			

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self-reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
				launched again shortly with some minor amendments.			UNDP has launched another Call for proposal which was closed on 20 June 2020. We had four proposal and this is under evaluation and three NGOs will be awarded by mid July 2020 the contract to implement their alternative livelihood project. The inclusion of at least 40% female beneficiaries is applied in the TOR for the Call For Proposal from NGOs to implement alternative livelihood projects in Mauritius and Rodrigues.			
Outcome 3: Erosion control and ecosystem services restoration: erosion and soil loss are reduced in 200 ha of erosion-prone water sheds; and ecosystem services are restored in 100 ha of coastal wetlands	Indicator 16: Area of coastal wetlands managed effectively	26 ha (based on area of Rivulet du Terre Rouge Ramsar site and assumption that this is managed effectively) Environment Protection Act to be included. Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) has been included in the EPA and EIA Mechanism is in place for any development on ESAs. Draft Management plan for Terre Rouge has been	The development of a Management and Action Plan for Pointe D'Esny Ramsar site and the Operational Plan for Rivulet Terre Rouge Estuary Bird Sanctuary Ramsar site recommendations to be undertaken through a formal consultancy with bids currently under evaluation. This will increase management effectiveness of these two Ramsar sites representing 48 ha in	The consultancy to develop management plan as well as operational plans of 2 Ramsar sites was awarded to BIOTOPE SAS from France in October 2018. The consultancy is ongoing and will be completed by October 2019. This will involve improved management of 52 ha of wetlands. Several wetlands found in the Bras D'Eau National Park including Mare Sarcelle as will also be included in the list of well managed wetlands. Ile D'Ambre, an offshore islet	50 ha of wetlands restored. Management Plan for Terre Rouge and Pointe D'Esny approved and	100 ha (= area of two coastal wetlands Ramsar sites – 48 ha – plus an additional area that might be managed with private owners)	48 ha The consultancy to develop management plan as well as operational plans of 2 Ramsar sites i.e Rivulet Terre Rouge Estuary Bird Sanctuary and Pointe D'Esny Mangrove Forest were completed. These plans were submitted to the National Parks and Conservation Service who will have to undergo public consultation before being vetted by Cabinet. However, some actions of these plans will be implemented in the next quarter, thus improving their management.		MS	Management Plans for RAMSAR sites (Point D'Esny and Rivulet du Terre Rouge) developed, but implementation uncertain at the moment. Status of Private wetlands unknown.

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
		<p>prepared but needs to be reviewed.</p> <p>ESA Study by the Ministry of Environment. Categories are classified for wetland protection and GPS points are in place for identification.</p> <p>Planning Policy Guidance by the Ministry of Housing- that is, there is already a provision for 30 m setback for any development.</p>	<p>total which will increase the baseline area by almost 100% The same formal consultancy will define the boundaries of wetlands under private ownership and make recommendations pertinent to providing protection to these areas under the Wetlands Bill .</p>	<p>which is also an islet national park will be nominated as a Ramsar site .</p>	<p>gazetted</p>	<p>- For State Land - An approved Management Plan to be in place for Terre Rouge and Pointe D'Esny.</p> <p>- The private sector has be included in the following potential wetland areas:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bain des Dames – 10 ha 2. Pointe D'Esny – 7 ha 3.Cite La Chaux – Mahebourg <p>- approximately 30 ha</p>	<p>This will involve improved management of 52 ha of wetlands. Several wetlands found in the Bras D'Eau National Park including Mare Sarcelle as will also be included in the list of well managed wetlands. Ile D'Ambre, an offshore islet which is also an islet national park will be nominated as a Ramsar site. Thus the target will be exceeded by end of project.</p>			<p>Enactment of Bills and regulation uncertain and unrealistic as Project Indicator (not in the hands of Project). Nevertheless new revised Wetland Bill developed with Regulations being worked on. ESA Bill not worked on, but with new maps, delineation</p>

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
						4. La Prairie – at least 20 ha. (The hurdle is that there are two sites for sand mining. But the Ministry for Housing decided that they were going to give permit only for aeolianite dune. Consequently, the promoters decided not to invest in wetlands management and restoration, losing the opportunity for the effective management and restoration of this unique system)				and information produced by Project, revision of old ESA Bill (2009) could be worked on. Indicator wording is proposed to be revised (see “updated LogFrame”). Eroded land in Rodrigues is allocated to persons (ex-fishers) to be restored by Agro-Forestry. On-going but could not be verified on the ground by MTR.

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating* **	Justification for Rating
						<p>- Private Sector - An Approved Management Plan to be in place and endorsed by them.</p> <p>Ongoing training for people managing wetlands following a proper structure.</p> <p>Category 1 of all private wetlands found in the ESA has to be included. However, the extent of this Category 1 on private land has to be re-assessed. Management plan also has to be put in place.</p>				
	Indicator 17: Legislation passed	Draft Wetlands Bill	A formal consultancy ToR has been prepared and two RFP/bidding	An International Environmental Legal Consultant, Peter Wulf has	Wetlands Act	Wetlands Act and ESA	The revised Wetland Bill has been submitted by the			

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
		<p>Wetland Bill is in place. There is need to review the National RAMSAR Committee in the wetlands bill. And the requirements of the application should be well defined and listed (for example site plan by sworn land surveyor, showing delimitation of the wetlands and buffer). There should be clear definition of all types of wetlands.</p> <p>ESA bill was prepared by the M/Environment.</p> <p>PAN Project- Review Legislation & Capacity Building.</p> <p>Capacity Building for all agencies, forming part of the NATIONAL RAMSAR COMMITTEE and to be extended to the private sector</p>	exercises undertaken but no bids were received by official closing date. PMU currently re-drafting the TOR to reflect the need for a specific legal consultancy at an International Consultant level	been recruited to review and finalise the Wetland Bill. The revised Bill will be very different from the original Bill provided to the consultant. The adaptive measure proposed will include the listing of coordinates of the boundaries of terrestrial wetlands which should, if the Bill and proposed Regulations are enacted, provide protection for all wetlands under the new legislation. The adaptive measure to include the mapping of inland wetlands will enable the insertion of all these wetlands boundary coordinates as a schedule in the Wetland bill to ensure blanket protection of all wetlands in Mauritius. The consultancy is ongoing and will be completed by November 2019.	and ESA Regulations (RRA) promulgated	<p>Regulations (RRA) in place</p> <p>ESA Regulations and Wetlands Act enacted and associated regulations promulgated.</p> <p>Training needs assessment (TNA) to be worked out. The TNA will be used as basis to procure training services.</p> <p>Training assessment to be finalised by the end of the second year of the project.</p> <p>Accredited training programme to be implement-</p>	<p>International Environmental Legal Consultant, Peter Wulf.</p> <p>This consultancy has suffered delays due to COVID 19 pandemic as the consultant was unable to carry out a field mission for further consultations due to confinement and travel restriction. PMU had no alternative than to extend the contract up to end of October 2020. However, a government policy on the wetlands is being awaited.</p> <p>The adaptive measure proposed will include the listing of coordinates of the boundaries of terrestrial wetlands which should, if the Bill and proposed Regulations are enacted, provide protection for all wetlands under the new legislation. The adaptive measure to include the mapping of inland wetlands will enable the insertion of all these wetlands boundary coordinates as a schedule in the Wetland bill to ensure blanket protection of all wetlands in Mauritius. The consultancy is ongoing was</p>			

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
						ted during the third year. Capacity built within the Government to secure resources to replicate the training programme.	also delayed by the C.OVID 19 pandemic. RRA has included ESA regulations in the RRA Act for Rodrigues It should be noted that the project cannot force the government to enact the law .However, PMU will encourage the government to do so. This indicator should be reviewed.			
	Indicator 18: Area over which soil erosion techniques are successfully applied in Riviere Coco	Area of Riviere Coco that requires erosion control to be determined at start of project (PIF assessed 200 ha but this needs checking) The RRA proposed that the project is not to be restricted to Riviere Coco but the region as a whole, starting from Grand Var to Anse Raffin. The size of the region should be assessed. 200 hectares has been suggested but this figure may be increased. Erosion is more pronounced in that specific region. Moreover, this project	The RRA has produced an Agro-Forestry Scheme for Rodrigues. The project will provide funds for its implementation. Procurement of fences and water tanks etc. for this scheme will now cover a much greater catchment area. The exact new target area will be defined by the RRA through support from the project.	The RRA has produced an Agro-Forestry Scheme for Rodrigues. The project has provided funds for its implementation. Acquisition of fences and associated materials has already been done. The exact area under implementation will be calculated after the fencing has been carried out and will exceed 100 ha.	100 ha of the Riviere Coco region rehabilitated. A detailed project document prepared for all the watersheds from Grand Var to Anse Raffin.	At least 200 hectares is fenced and rehabilitated in the Riviere Coco region (particularly Grand Var area). Schemes identified, developed and put into place for fishermen and other persons so as to sustain their livelihoods. Training needs identified, developed and	140 ha The project is collaborating with The RRA to implement the Agro-Forestry Scheme in Rodrigues as a SLM to control soil erosion.. 34 beneficiaries together with their families has already been selected and were handed over about 4 ha each where they will undertake agroforestry as a source of livelihood. The beneficiaries would themselves fenced the plot of land and will be given support for the activity by RRA. They would be provided with plants produced in government nurseries. The project will also provide the beneficiaries with water tanks, irrigation facilities including			

Project Strategy	Indicator*	Baseline Level*	Level in 1 st PIR (June 2018; self- reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (June 2019; Self Reported)	Mid-term Target*	End-of-project Target*, **	Midterm Level & Assessment (Based on Draft PIR June 2020)	Mid Level Colour Code	Achievement Rating**	Justification for Rating
		<p>addresses alternative livelihood for fishermen in terms of agro-forestry systems with plants like moringas, etc. The aim is to rehabilitate the whole southern area.</p> <p>The Commission for Environment also must be consulted during the implementation</p> <p>SEMPA - GEF SGP project concerning rehabilitation of 15 ha for watershed management for prevention of soil erosion at Var Brulee</p>			Cattle-walk regulations passed and approved	<p>training provided to fishermen and farmers</p> <p>A detailed project document prepared for all the watersheds from Grand Var to Anse Raffin</p>	pumps as well as beehives for beekeeping. The area allocated to the beneficiaries amounted to 140 ha.			

* Incorporated / Adjusted at Project Inception Workshop (in red font)

** Some targets included by CTA after first Mission, 2018 (in green font)

ANNEX 8: Key Project Milestones / Dates

Key stages	Dates
PIF approval	5 Jan 2014
GEF CEO endorsement	31 March 2016
Local Project Appraisal Committee	17 August 2015
ProDoc signature	22 June 2016
1st Implementing Partner (IP) designated: Mauritius Oceanography Institute (MOI) under Ministry of Ocean Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping (MOEMRFS) . 1st National Project Director: (NPD) Mr. D. Marie, MOI	Per signed project document
2 nd IP designated: MOEMRFS 2 nd NPD designated: Mr. J.P.D Labonne, MoBEMRFS	9 Dec. 2016 Nov. 2019 (From 7th PSC meeting onwards)
1 st Project Steering Committee held:	17 March 2017
1 st disbursement	2017
Project Manager hired	1 June 2017
Project Assistant hired	30 May 2017
Project Inception Workshop (Mol& 1st NPD)	13-14 July 2017
CTA Hired (a. Advertisement: 25 Nov. – 26 Dec. 2017. b. Interview: 7 March	2 June 2018
Component 1, Lots 2 and 3 for ESA Study and ICZM planning, was awarded to ANZDEC	15 Oct 2018
Component 1, Lots 1 and 4 for update and review of coastal and marine ESA: no responsive bid at first round. Under revised RFP comprising review of coastal and marine ESA with the mapping of upland wetlands, ANZDEC was awarded the contract.	25 Feb 2019
Component 2, Los 4 for Strengthening of MPA management in Mauritius, was awarded to Mac Allister Elliott and Partners (MEP)	15 Oct 2018
Component 2, lot 1, 3 and 5 were re-advertised: . Lot 1 for economic evaluation of coastal marine system for Rodrigues and was awarded to Sustain Value. . Lot 2 for dev. of an investment framework and financing strategy for MLPAs was awarded to MEP. . Lot 3 for development of operational and business plans or SEMPA/Rodrigues was awarded to MEP.	15 March 2019
Component 3, Lot 1 for review of Wetland Bill: No responsive bid under 1 st round bidding under RFP. Re-advertised under IC and Mr. Peter Wulf was contracted.	15 Nov. 2018
Component 3, Lot 2 on development of management plans for Ramsar sites was awarded to Biotope	10 Sept 2018
Activity 1.1.4 – Consultancy for Communications and Awareness Strategy (awarded to Ms. Claire Ward)	23 September 2019
Expected Date of MTR	End 2019
Actual date of MTR	June - August 2020
Expected project end date (5 years after ProDoc signature)	June 2021

ANNEX 9 : Updated Project Document Risk log

(with new additions / edits at Project Inception Report, 2017, and additions / comments during Mid Term Review July 2020)

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND TYPE	RISK RATING	MITIGATION MEASURES	INCEPTION WORKSHOP COMMENTS	PIR COMMENTS				COMMENTS AT MID-TERM REVIEW
				SESP 2015	2018	2019	2020	
<u>Regulatory</u> 1. The supporting legislation and regulatory framework that will ensure that project interventions are sustainable in the long term is not enacted, and priorities to develop the ocean economy take precedence	Medium to High	The project will provide legal expertise and support that will help to encourage the government to enact and/or revise the necessary laws or regulations to protect and sustainably manage coastal and marine ESAs (with particular emphasis on wetlands for which legislation is notably lacking). At the same time the project will help to develop a stewardship, and where appropriate, voluntary approach to conservation and management within stakeholder groups and coastal communities, which will help to reduce the need for enforcement and the regulatory approach.	Wetlands Bill need to be enacted at the earliest To harmonise with Forest and Reserve Act which is being reviewed presently. With no legislation, the planning process will not be effective and implementable. Mitigation measure is to provide more information to the State Law Office to motivate the urgency for the Act to be passed. Political/administrative willingness to implement. A Consultant to be hired urgently.					High: This is currently a High Risk for achieving project impact, even more so with the complaint lodged by AKNL, which centred around better protection of ESAs, especially through enactment of an ESA Bill. The project focused on developing and enacting a new Wetland Bill rather than an ESA Bill. A revised Wetland Bill has been developed, through the services of a consultant. Regulations accompanying this bill are being developed. The focus on a Wetland Bill, instead of an ESA Bill seems warranted, given the fact that Wetlands are unprotected thus far and are very prone to pressures from development, especially along the coast. Other ESAs are already more or less protected through other Acts (EPA, Rivers Act, etc.). Also given the time available and attention given to Wetlands by NGOS and also government, it seems opportune to try to push for finalizing a new Wetland Bill and pushing for enactment (though this is in the hands of Government and out of the Project's control)
<u>Strategic</u> 2. Institutional responsibilities for CZM and MPAs remain diffuse with	Low to Medium	Components 1 and 2 of the project have been specifically designed to foster collaboration among responsible partners. MOI will play a lead project implementation role and will ensure coordination and collaboration among	Institutional responsibilities must include private sector involvement. With no incentives					Medium. This has been worked on by the project by coming up with improved ICZM and MPA Action Plans, outlining responsibilities of different stakeholders. Final mandates and

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND TYPE	RISK RATING	MITIGATION MEASURES	INCEPTION WORKSHOP COMMENTS	SESP 2015	PIR COMMENTS			COMMENTS AT MID-TERM REVIEW
					2018	2019	2020	
no collaboration framework.		the different entities. The role delegated to other entities by MOI will be formalised through agreements (e.g. MOUs) with clear TOR. An analysis of institutional and governance arrangements for MPA management is to be undertaken as part of Output 2 and this will help to clarify the roles and responsibilities of agencies and the support that can be provided by civil society.	and motivation for the private sector involvement their participation will be low and not effective. The Ministry of Ocean Economy, Marine Resources Fisheries and Shipping will lead the project. A steering Committee has been set up under the chair of the lead ministry					formalizing these improved Management and implementing the Action Plans will still need to be pushed
<u>Operational</u> 3. Supporting infrastructure and national arrangements for long term maintenance of a knowledge management system for marine and coastal biodiversity does not materialize during the life of the project	Medium to High	The project will liaise closely with on-going initiatives in the various responsible partners involved in collating data and information and making this available to decision-makers and the public. It will also promote understanding of the need for sharing information and ensuring that all those with interest in marine and coastal biodiversity can access the information they need. The project will also encourage the use of cost-effective, simple and easy to maintain processes and software in the development of such systems.	To date, mechanism for data sharing among the various institutions does not exist					Medium. Knowledge management structures and servers containing tools and information generated by the project are in place (at Continental Shelf and SEMPA). The project should still strive to ensure that the information will be public and accessed by stakeholders. Capacity Development and training will still be done by the project.
<u>Strategic</u> 4. Local level ICZM plans are completed (on	Low to Medium	The project will develop and explore various ways and modalities of implementing the proposed ridge-to-reef plans in line within the ICZM Framework, through Component 1	Particularly at the local communities and District Council.					Medium ICZM Plans for Black River and Rodriques have been developed. Relevance and

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND TYPE	RISK RATING	MITIGATION MEASURES	INCEPTION WORKSHOP COMMENTS	SESP 2015	PIR COMMENTS			COMMENTS AT MID-TERM REVIEW
					2018	2019	2020	
paper) but never implemented.		activities, particular Output 1.1.4 (awareness raising to ensure that all stakeholders understand the need for such plans), Output 1.2.1 (analytical review of ICZM to date), Output 1.2.2 (demonstration plans for one District on Mauritius and for Rodrigues), and Output 1.2.3 (training and capacity building which will ensure that staff and agencies have the required skills and capabilities). These activities will increase the chances of the plans being effectively implemented and of the relevant stakeholders being involved in sector-specific and location-specific actions.	Mitigation Measure – to include the ICZM plan into the Outline Planning Scheme. ICZM plans for Rodrigues is under preparation and is expected to be completed in September 2017.					implementation with mandated stakeholders and parties is still uncertain.
<u>Strategic</u> 5. Fishers and coastal communities see the no-take zones in Rodrigues and in the Marine Parks in Mauritius as damaging to their livelihoods and fail to respect rules of access.	Low (for Mauritius) to medium (for Rodrigues)	The project will mitigate the risk of no-take zones failing to produce the desired results by developing, with the affected communities, a livelihoods programme. A sound basis for this has been established by the GEF SGP, and experiences of previous projects will be used, and recommendations from recently prepared livelihood strategies will be used.	2 projects for Rodrigues and 2 projects for Mauritius (7 sites excluding BBMP) would be concerned. Are the projects being catered for within this project or can the projects be extended within this project?					Low. Projects with affected stakeholders are in place (Rodrigues) and planned (Mauritius). This will mitigate this risk, but already through the activities of this project and previous work fishers largely appreciate the No Take Zones.
<u>Strategic</u> 6. Expectations towards the engagement of the tourism sector prove ambitious.	Low to Medium	Specialised technical assistance will be contracted to ensure that the tourism industry is fully engaged; activities to be carried out under Output 1.3 have been developed in close collaboration with MOTEC, AHRIM and interested individual tourist operators. Certification has been tried with some success	There is a lack of incentives (not necessarily monetary) which cause indifferences and limited involvement of the					Low to Medium Tourism Sector is interested in support for Sustainable Tourism. The specific earlier project output and activities that centred on “eco-labelling” have been changed, as this was already supported and on-going. Instead a study on the Carrying Capacity for the Lagoons

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND TYPE	RISK RATING	MITIGATION MEASURES	INCEPTION WORKSHOP COMMENTS	SESP 2015	PIR COMMENTS			COMMENTS AT MID-TERM REVIEW
					2018	2019	2020	
		in the Seychelles and the project will ensure that experience from the Seychelles is used to replicate successful approaches. For Rodrigues: Existence of a close collaboration between the tourism operators and RRA. The project is in line with the development of ecotourism in Rodrigues	tourism industry and private sector Mitigation Measure: to provide incentives.					has been prepared and will soon start. This will help in identifying challenges and ways forward in better managing lagoons and the role of tourism in this.
<u>Strategic</u> 7. The level of threat to biodiversity and ecosystem services is higher than assumed.	Low to Medium	The project builds on the thorough analysis of threats to biodiversity and ecosystem services carried out through the ESA Study. Although threats are very serious, these are well understood and there is evidence of gradually increasing capacity to address them, including at systemic level (e.g. policies, laws and finance). Management capacity across all the responsible entities will be enhanced through the project and thus opportunities for addressing threats will be increased. Threats from climate change present a growing trend, particularly in the form of sea water warming and acidification, sea level rise, and increased frequency and intensity of storms, which will have a significant impact on marine and coastal biodiversity, but the RM is participating in a range of regional initiatives designed to build resilience in both ecosystems and coastal communities, as well as capacity in all stakeholders to undertake appropriate mitigation actions.	Climate change uncertainties					Medium to High. Development pressure, especially through infrastructure development on the coast is high, and in fact new developments have been planned and/or started during the project implementation. This should be mitigated through increased attention to the use of ESAs in planning and permitting (e.g. through integration in the OPS), revising and hopefully enacting of Wetland Bill, and further attention to revision of ESA Bill. Climate Change will continue to be a threat to Mauritius, especially the coastal areas and biodiversity in this area, including marine biodiversity. Project is working on better conserving this through developing information and knowledge (e.g. through maps and improved management) and mainstreaming this in planning and regulatory frameworks and implementation.
SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENT SCREENING REPORT (SESP, 2015)								
Risk 1: Improved enforcement of regulations	I = 2 P = 1;	Component 2 includes an Output devoted to the development of sustainable livelihoods for						Low. see also No. 5 above

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND TYPE	RISK RATING	MITIGATION MEASURES	INCEPTION WORKSHOP COMMENTS	SESP 2015	PIR COMMENTS			COMMENTS AT MID-TERM REVIEW
				2015	2018	2019	2020	
relating to access to or use of marine and coastal resources could result in some users, notably coastal communities, having reduced fishery catches, reduced ability to take tourists to attractions (Component 2), or reduced access to agricultural or grazing land (Component 3), leading to potential economic displacement	Low	coastal communities that might be affected by the implementation of MPAs on both Rodrigues and Mauritius, and by the introduction of soil erosion reduction mechanisms on Rodrigues. This Output will be delivered through the GEF SGP which has substantial experience in the RM of developing livelihood activities in parallel with interventions to protect and sustainably manage marine and coastal biodiversity						
Risk 2: Project activities are proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (marine parks & fishing reserves), and areas proposed for protection	I = 3 P = 3; Low	Project activities will not adversely affect ESAs or protected areas. Mechanisms to be used include capacity building, strengthening of standards and certification systems, demarcation, improved enforcement and potential expansion of protected areas, and erosion control. Project activities pose few adverse social and environmental risks to sensitive areas. At the same time, the project will specify certain further interventions during project implementation (e.g. reforestation, shifting agricultural patterns/practice, restricted use/access). Social and/or environmental risks to ESAs or protected areas from project activities will be reviewed as the project progresses using appropriate monitoring and evaluation methods and any potential adverse impacts identified in advance and suitable mitigation measures identified and introduced.						Low. Project instead is producing knowledge, tools and plans to safeguard and conserve ESAs

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND TYPE	RISK RATING	MITIGATION MEASURES	INCEPTION WORKSHOP COMMENTS	SESP 2015	PIR COMMENTS			COMMENTS AT MID-TERM REVIEW
				2015	2018	2019	2020	
Risk 3: The project will likely affect harvesting of fish by addressing unsustainable practices and may increase catches through better management of marine protected areas	I = 3 P = 3; Low	Project activities are designed to reduce unsustainable use of fishery resources, and in the long-term improve catches and therefore the livelihoods of fishers and coastal communities. Potential risks of heightened enforcement and increased catches (e.g. displacement of fishing activities) will be reviewed and assessed in the course of the project.						Low. See also Risk 3 above
Risk 4: The primary outcome of the Project is increased abundance and populations of marine and coastal species, which may ultimately be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change	I = 2 P = 2; Low	Climate change is having a significant impact on marine and coastal biodiversity globally, through sea water warming, ocean acidification and increased intensity and frequency of storms in particular, with coral reefs and sandy beaches notably at risk. The ESAs in the RM are already affected by such changes and this project is designed to help mitigate the threats, increase the resilience of the ESAs and complement other climate change related initiatives and projects currently under way (e.g. UNDP-GEF Climate Change Adaptation project)						Medium Climate Change remains a threat, especially around the coastal zone, despite focus and attention by Government
NEW RISK: ENVIRONMENTAL: A complaint was lodged by the CSO “Aret Kokin Nu Laplaz” (“Stop Stealing our Beaches”) [AKNL] on 25/02/2019. The broad complaint is that the UNDP GEF Biodiversity Project is harming the complainant by not stopping	This complaint has led to High Risk Rating of the Project	The UNDP GEF project is not connected to; and in no way validates the current allocation of EIA licenses. UNDP is not mandated to guide Government in the issuance of licenses for development in ESAs or any other development. In response to the complaint, HQ management forwarded to OAI for further action by SRM and SECU. The SRM process is proceeding to resolution, and the SECU final report is due in November. Based on the final						This complaint doesn’t seem to be directly linked to the project, but rather at the Government and especially the way EIAs have been issued in the recent past, affecting the conservation and protection of the coastal area. This complaint focused on the regulatory framework for Biodiversity Conservation in place, and also how the project could support in strengthening this. The project should continue focusing its attention to increasing the knowledge and

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND TYPE	RISK RATING	MITIGATION MEASURES	INCEPTION WORKSHOP COMMENTS	SESP 2015	PIR COMMENTS			COMMENTS AT MID-TERM REVIEW
					2018	2019	2020	
government from destroying environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs). The linkage being made by the complainant to the UNDP GEF Project is that the hotels are being built on coastal wetlands, some of which will be surveyed by the project for the purposes of mapping of environmentally sensitive areas. The complainant states that these are the last coastal wetlands in Mauritius, and seeks to stop any such developments; and in addition, to stop the UNDP GEF project from continuing. Conversely, he also requests that all EIA licenses are frozen pending the conclusion of the project which includes the mapping that is ongoing.	ct as reported in PIRS	SRM agreement and SECU recommendations, the project will employ adaptive management to reorient and reposition the project. Based on the final SRM agreement and SECU recommendations, the project will employ adaptive management to reorient and reposition the project.						tools to strengthen ESA conservation through improved mainstreaming, as well as to focus on revising and putting forward the Wetland Bill for Enactment. This will already go a long way in better protecting and conserving the ESAs of the Coastal Zone. Further increased protection of ESAs and revision of the ESA Bill plus support for its enactment could then be supported by follow-up projects, e.g. the recently approved UNDP-GEF SLM and BD Mainstreaming Project and a pipelined UNDP-GEF Freshwater Protection Project.
OVERALL RISK RATING	Low		Low to Medium	Low	Substantial / Low	Moderate / High	High	Risk Analysis rating changed substantially at different times and is not always clear in PIRs. At MTR: Medium

ANNEX 10: Ratings Scales

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.
Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co- finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

ANNEX 11: Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form

Evaluators/Consultants:

- Must present Information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
- Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate Individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body- Evaluators should consult with Other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty In their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results In a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
- Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
- Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent In using the resources of the evaluation.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: Jan Rijpma

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at (Place) on (Date)

Signature:

15/06/2020
The Hague, Netherlands



Name of Consultant: Laurence Reno

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at (Place) on (Date) 15 March 2020
Signature



ANNEX 12: Signed MTR final report clearance form

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name:

Signature:

Date:

UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name:

Signature:

Date:

Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report

Annexed in a separate file: Relevant midterm tracking tools