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# Executive Summary

***Background, Context and Purpose***

UNDP Mauritius commissioned an Outcome Evaluation of its Environment programme under the 2008-2011 Country Programme cycle, extended until 2012. At the national level, there is strong political commitment to advance sustainable development through the adoption of the new long-term vision of Maurice Ile Durable (MID), whose main objective is to make Mauritius a model of sustainable development, particularly in the context of SIDS. The UNDP Country Programme is anchored in the ten-year national economic reform Programme, focusing on capacity development in strategic initiatives and aiming to create more growth opportunities to restore the economy on a higher plane of development. The current results-oriented country programme in environment is focused on strengthening institutional capacities and features identified as growing threats to current and future environmental parameters such as climate change mitigating and adaptive strategies, removal of persistent organic pollutants, expansion of marine and terrestrial protected areas and removing barriers to energy conservation.

The scope of this programme evaluation has two intended outcomes involving the following eight projects at various stages of implementation:

Local Projects

* GEF Funded Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency
* GEF Funded Sustainable Land Management
* GEF/Go Funded Marine Protected Areas
* JICA funded Climate Change Adaptation
* GEF Funded Sustainable Management of POPs
* Maurice Ile Durable(MID) Support Project

Regional Projects

* CDM Regional project
* Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystems

The Evaluation, which was conducted in October 2011, focuses on the programme rather than the project level and considers the scope, relevance, efficiency and sustainability of UNDP support in achieving the two outcomes. The objective of the evaluation is to assess the progress toward the two outcomes and the extent to which UNDP has contributed to these outcomes through its activities. The evaluators conducted a desk review of project and policy documentation; and interviewed UNDP senior management and programme staff, project coordinators and national partners from the government and NGO community. Based on this assessment, the evaluation makes recommendations on how UNDP could improve its efficiency through adjusting its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods or management structures. The results of the outcome evaluation can be used for re-adjusting the interventions during the remaining period of the current CP and for guiding the next CP (2013-2015).

***Main Findings***

* The thematic portfolio is strategic, demonstrating a good focus on energy efficiency, climate adaptation and sustainable land management. UNDP´s main contributions are in capacity building, policy development and partnership building and learning by doing in the context of promoting an integrated vertical and horizontal planning and management approach to environment and energy issues facing the island. The portfolio and management has been very responsive to the enabling environment and to expected CP outcomes. UNDP has positioned itself strategically around very relevant environment and energy themes to support National Development Planning and the MID project in the future. The team feels this is also where the UNDP must act swiftly and strategically to respond to a request from the MID focal point during the evaluation for technical assistance.
* The evaluation determined it is timely to move beyond capacity strengthening outcome and include a focus on support to enforcement and implementation. Examples include a greater focus on integrated resources management (such as water and solid waste), land use planning and sustainable design at the local level (such as eco-villages) and promoting energy efficiency in the entire economy. The programme design process should be more participatory in the future and the project ideas locally based on sound planning and design using architectural principles, such as scale, zoning and planning, along with Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), sustainability and inclusiveness to balance regional and international project interests with national priorities in order to be effective and sustainable.
* Project recruitment delays and slow start-ups are the main threats to performance and impact. In-house procurement support will help in delivery and in capacity building of ministries. There is a need for consolidation of the programme portfolio into a larger programmatic intervention and more strategic use of UNDP staff time.
* In terms of individual project results and contributing towards the outcomes, the evaluation concurs that an important exercise for delivering results related to the Climate Change Adaptation (AAP) project will be the execution of the mid-term evaluation. The AAP Project is suffering from strategic design, ownership, HR and management issues. Cross-sectoral work is important, and there is a need for base capacity and leadership and communication skills in the Ministry of Environment in order to coordinate and strengthen capacity in other ministries. The operationalization of the Energy Efficiency Management Office is critical for the sustainability of the Energy Efficiency project and the overall outcomes around cross-sector energy coordination and management. For Rodrigues, the work that UNDP is currently engaged with regarding MPA is the opportunity for long-term engagement and capacity strengthening on sustainable development issues. An advisor from MPA might be engaged further to support the overall capacity strengthening of RRA on environmental management and energy issues and reinforce the sustainability of the project outputs.
* The limited availability of qualified environmental expertise affects the region, and COs are competing for candidates to form project teams. This is an issue that needs to be considered at a regional organizational level, and alternatives must be explored that improve access or broaden the range of environmental expertise available for national projects such as the AAP project.
* Adaptation to climate change provides an overarching conceptual framework that can be used to better align UNDP’s support for the next CP.
* Joint monitoring of environmental programmes with the Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Public Utilities and MID project is needed to avoid duplication of activities and ensure a systematic overarching capacity strengthening outcome. Relative to this, the ministers of both agencies must be regularly briefed in order to understand the cost benefit and utility of the outcomes.
* UNDP must give important consideration to the imminent transition to NCC status. The PMU must undertake advocacy with the Government of Mauritius on GLOC payments and on the NCC status, including discussion regarding financial as well as all other implications.
* The present project portfolio is overly dependent on GEF funding focused on the global environmental benefits through various national and regional inputs (the project’s costs vary from 900K to 9 M USD with a total GEF envelope of 19 M USD total). This might be countered by developing very good partnerships with government and AFD and other donor sources.

***Conclusions and Lessons Learned***

* The evaluation team has rated the Environment Programme as **satisfactory overall** with potential for a higher level of achievement by the end of 2012. A summary of the parameters rated and their ratings is provided in the Table below. The main body of the report contains a more elaborated analysis justifying each rating.
* Government stakeholders value working with UNDP, and there is demand for UNDP in Mauritius. Resource mobilization needs to be enhanced through expanding cost-sharing with MOE and MPU significantly in the next CP through better advocacy at the highest level.

***General Recommendations – Specific Recommendations are provided in Annex 1***

* Programme Design -Use SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Realistic and Time-bound) indicators for the next country programme. A good indicator of a “mature” partnership strategy for UNDP will be the extent of joint monitoring and evaluation that it carries out with its partners. Also, coordination and joint monitoring with MOE at the programme level will facilitate smooth implementation and enable valuable staff time to be used for strategic work.
* Programme Implementation
  + At the level of projects, project management trainings should be built into them in order to strengthen PSC coordination and planning knowledge. Better coordination, monitoring and communication among project managers will facilitate cross-project linkages.
  + As national capacity strengthening is a core objective, the programme manager and project managers must consider developing creative incentives for government staff to work over and above on the projects and to reinforce learning.
  + Develop an institutional capacity strengthening strategy for environment and energy programme work with government, CSOs and local institutions including universities. Future GEF projects should try to include the SGP for innovative pilot approaches on the ground.
  + Develop programme knowledge management and communication strategy for outreach to all stakeholders, including upgrading the website for more effective dissemination of outputs and even developing a newsletter to share information about progress on programme outcomes.
* Programme Impact
  + UNDP managers must devote the remainder of this programme cycle consolidating the current portfolio by improving efficiency, especially in the evaluation, procurement and recruitment processes.
  + The future programme focus on capacity strengthening for cross sect oral management and planning, enforcement and sub national implementation
  + The programme must instill the use of knowledge management approaches for cross sectoral coordination, economic and integrated land and water resource management arguments in future projects to influence policy making and UNDP would do well to consider training staff (including from MOE) in these issues.

**Table: Summary of Outcome Evaluation ratings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Aspect Rated** | **Rating1** |
| Appropriateness of the two Outcomes for the development situation in Mauritius | Highly Satisfactory |
| Appropriateness of Outcome Indicators | Unsatisfactory for Outcome 1 but satisfactory for Outcome 2 |
| Overall rating on progress towards achieving the outcomes | Satisfactory |
| Appropriateness of UNDP Contributions to achieve the Outcomes | Satisfactory |
| Sustainability of the Outcomes and of UNDP contribution to it | Moderately Likely |
| Effectiveness and Efficiency of UNDP contributions to achieve the Outcomes | Satisfactory |
| Appropriateness of monitoring indicators to measure Outcomes achievement | Need for improvement |
| Resource Mobilization and Partnership Strategies | Satisfactory |

1 HS=Highly Satisfactory; S-Satisfactory; MS-Moderately Satisfactory; U: Unsatisfactory. Likely (L): There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

# Introduction (Rationale /Purpose /Methodology)

In order to enable the preparation of the next country programme document, the UNDP Mauritius Country office has decided to carry out the Outcome Evaluation for the Environment protection component of the Country Programme 2009-2012 ahead of schedule. The evaluation results will be used by the UNDP Country Office Management and by the Government Implementing Partners while formulating the next Country Programme 2013-2015

The 2009-2011 programme and the intended results of the annexed Country Programme for the Republic of Mauritius 2009-2011, outlines the objectives, baseline, indicators for the environment programme, which is split into two focus areas and constitutes the baseline for the carrying out of the outcome evaluation. The Results and Resources Framework for the 2009-2011 mentioned that the country programme outcomes and indicators are as described below.

*Country Programme Outcomes:*

National capacities of key institutions to implement global environmental commitments at national and regional levels through integration of environmental concerns in national policies and programmes improved.

Baseline: Limited capacity and tools to integrate global and regional environmental obligations into national development policies and programmes and lack of framework for accessing carbon finance.

Target: Capacities of institutions and appropriate tools developed, facilitating the integration of international and regional environmental obligations into national policies, strategies and programmes.

Indicators: 10% improvement reflected in the environmental indicators for Mauritius by 2010 in the various states of environment reports prepared as part of the Conventions Obligations and framework for CDM to be developed and operational by end 2010.

Objective: Capacities for management of persistent organic pollutants, mainstreaming climate change adaptation strategies and integrating energy conservation into policy and programme development enhanced at country level.

Baseline: Climate change adaptation measures and energy efficiency concerns are not integrated and national development strategies.

Target: Build local capacity to mainstream climate change issues into national development programmes.

**Indicators:** National Adaptation Plan implemented. Energy efficiency regulations implemented by end 2011.

Annex 2: Country Programme for the Republic of Mauritius (2009-2011)

Annex 3: UNDP strategic Plan 2008-2011

UNDP Corporate has a system of RBMS (Results-Based Management System) which requires linking individual projects to outcomes in a programme, based on the above-mentioned strategic plan.

*Evaluation Purpose*

This evaluation is an **end of programme cycle evaluation** for the following purpose and with the following objectives in mind:

1. To evaluate the impact of the implementation of the environment programme as per the original country programme outcome and related country programme output, with particular focus on the sustainability and cost effectiveness of the key interventions to date;
2. To provide useful lessons learned for follow-up interventions during the current programme’s extension year until 31 December 2012 and for formulation of the next country programme 2013-2015, in particular to generate knowledge about good practices, lesson learned and weaknesses of the programme/project;
3. To examine how well needs of different groups supported were met by the programme/projects;
4. Examine how institutional and operational arrangements supported the implementation of the programme.

*Evaluation Methods - Objectives and Scope*

The Environment Programme consists of a number of projects at various stages of implementation. The local and regional projects listed below are those which have been running for the past 3 to 1.5 years and therefore expected to result in some initial outcomes.

Local Projects

* GEF Funded Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency
* GEF Funded Sustainable Land Management
* GEF/GoM Funded Marine Protected Areas
* JICA funded Climate Change Adaptation
* GEF Funded Sustainable Management of POPs
* Maurice Ile Durable Support Project

Regional Projects

* CDM Regional project
* Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystems

Four GEF funded projects (POPS, Energy Efficiency, SLM, MPA and ASCLME) will come to an end in 2012 after almost 4-5 years of implementation. In addition, some projects are midway and expect to be evaluated, e.g. JICA funded Climate Change Adaptation project. Some new projects are also starting, such as the Regional Integrated Water Management Resources project and the Removal of Barriers to Solar PV Power Generation projects. Follow-on projects are planned starting in 2013 under the mandate of a newly formulated Country Programme 2013-2015 for the Republic of Mauritius.

*Methodology*

The evaluation methodology was developed and implemented based on the UNDP guidance for external programme outcome evaluations. The methods included a unique mixture of participatory methods including: desk study of relevant programme documents, consultations with key programme stakeholders including: programme and project managers, government counterparts, NGOs and other relevant stakeholders. (Annex 13 –List of consultations). The key areas considered within the scope of the evaluation are outlined in the TOR (Evaluation TOR- Annex 2) and within these, the evaluators were specifically requested to consider the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the programme concept / design, management and implementation and of the outcomes and respective activities as it related to programme level outcomes:

The following questions were thus, addressed:

* Have the right things been done? Were the outcome and associated programme/projects relevant, appropriate and strategic to national goals and the UNDP mandate?
* Were impacts and outcomes achieved as planned?
* Are the results sustainable? Will the outputs and outcomes lead to benefits beyond the life of the existing programme/project?
* How might we do things better in the future? Which findings may have relevance for future programming or for other similar initiatives elsewhere?

According to the previously mentioned purpose and objectives of the outcome evaluation and based upon the established indicators, baseline information and specific targets, the methodology describe:

* Review of all major documents including project document, revisions, monitoring and progress reports (see attached list and web link);
* Interviews with key informants;
* Stakeholder consultations/interviews;
* Whether and how the evaluation was considered in programme/project design;
* Details of the outcome and outputs indicators that have been proposed/used to measure performance, with associated baseline and target data;
* Information on whether monitoring has actually taken place and whether it has produced critical data for management purposes;
* Strengths and weaknesses of the original M & E design and the quality of data that have been generated;
* Availability of relevant global, regional, national data;
* Availability of complementary data (from similar programmes/projects).

# Background and Context

*Physical and socio-economic environment*

The Republic of Mauritius (ROM) is a Small Island Developing State (SIDS) located in the southwest of the Indian Ocean. After attaining independence on 12 March 1968, it became a Republic within the Commonwealth in 1992. In addition to the main island of Mauritius, the ROM includes the islands of Rodriguez, the Agleam Islands and St. Brandon, comprising 2,045 km2 in total, with an EEZ of 1.9 million km2. Mauritius encompasses approximately 1,865 km2 and Rodrigues, approximately 720 km northeast of Mauritius, covers an area of 109 km2. The population of the ROM was estimated at 1,283,415 as of 31 December 2010. There is an annual population growth rate of about .5% (CSO, 2010). Rodrigues is now a dependency, having obtained limited autonomy in 2001 under the Rodrigues Regional Assembly Act.

In spite of its small economic size, low endowment of natural resources and remoteness from world markets, Mauritius has transformed itself from a poor sugar economy into one of the most successful economies in Africa, largely through reliance on trade-led development. Real gross domestic product (GDP) growth averaged more than 5% between 1970 and 2009, while GDP per capita has increased more than tenfold over the same period. Today, Mauritius has a per capita income of more than $7,500, the second highest in Africa, as compared with $260 at the time of its independence. The share of agriculture in GDP fell from 6.1% in 1999 to 3.6 % in 2010; that of manufacturing decreased from 23.9% to 18.3%, while that of tourism and of financial and business services increased from 5 to 11% and 8.4% to 11.7% respectively. Real GDP grew by 4.1% in 2010, with the growth projected to remain around 4% in 2011. In parallel to its economic growth, Mauritius has achieved significant improvements in key human development indicators, well-ranked at the 72nd position on the Human Development Index. The country is well on track to reach the Millennium Development Goals before 2015. The incidence of absolute poverty is relatively low.

In 2006, the country reached the end of an economic cycle based on trade preferences which had to a large extent contributed to its past success. The country faced other external shocks, such as falling sugar prices and soaring oil prices. The challenge is to boost economic growth through higher productivity, to develop human capital through education reform to raise skill levels and promote new emerging sectors and to move Mauritius to a more knowledge-based economy while preserving its longstanding commitment to social welfare. In order to secure the country’s survival in a highly competitive, open and globalized economy, the government has embarked since 2005 on a 10-year economic reform Programme structured around four main pillars, namely, (1) fiscal consolidation and public sector efficiency; (2) improvement of trade competitiveness; (3) improvement of the investment climate and (4) democratization of the economy through participation, social inclusion and sustainability.

*Environmental challenges*

Mauritius faces the inherent environmental vulnerabilities associated with SIDS, which include a small land area, susceptibility to natural disasters, geographical isolation, limited natural resources and sensitive ecosystems and limited human and institutional capacity. As a result of its economic success, the standard of living on Mauritius has increased with significant changes in consumption patterns. The new demands placed on an already limited natural resource base are resulting in increased environmental problems, such as road congestion, water scarcity, land and coastal degradation, inadequate waste disposal and pollution. Population density is already high (644 people/km2). The environment in Mauritius will be under increasing pressure with growth of the population and of the economy.

Rapid economic development has placed increasing pressures on land resources, with rising demand for urban and infrastructural expansion and for support of the agricultural, industrial, manufacturing and tourism sectors. Sustainable land management through integrated land planning and strengthening enforcement of planning guidelines and legislation are critically needed. Environmental degradation, mainly the result of deforestation, unsustainable agricultural practices and coastal development, is receiving growing recognition as a threat to biodiversity and sustainable economic practices. Mauritius has the third most endangered terrestrial flora in the world. It is also a water-stressed country, and achieving significant water conservation in industry, domestic and agricultural sectors, as well as sustainable watershed management, are now a national priority. Climate change impacts on the coastal zone, water resources, agriculture, fisheries, food security, human health and adaptation are essential to consolidate the hard-earned gains over the long term for the wellbeing and security of livelihoods of the population and to strengthen resilience. Implementation of climate change adaptation has so far been fragmented and uncoordinated due to a lack of technical, human and institutional capacity (MOESD (2011). The expansion in the share of renewable energy and energy efficiency is high on the government’s agenda, given the high importation costs of fossil fuels.

*Environmental Policies, Strategies and Governance*

Given the importance of the environment for its economy, the government of the ROM has shown commitment to implement international recommendations on sustainable development (SD) which recognize the specific vulnerabilities of SIDS, such as the 1992 Agenda 21, the 1994 Barbados Programme of Action for SIDS, the 2002 Johannesburg Plan of implementation (JPOI) and the 2005 Mauritius Strategy (MSI) for SIDS. It has signed about 30 environmental conventions and protocols (MOENDU, 2010) and those most relevant to the current UNDP country Programme are the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD, 1992), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC, 1992) and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs, 2001).

The first National Environmental Strategies, its National Environment Action Plan and Environment Investment Programme for the decade from 2000-2010 were developed in 1999. The National Environmental Policy of 2007 outlines a series of thematic policy objectives and strategies to address environmental challenges. The second National Environmental Strategies plan was updated in 2008, aimed at carrying forward and extending the achievements of the second National Environment Action Plan while recommending corrective measures to overcome the constraints experienced. Sectoral policies have also been developed across various thematic areas such as land, biodiversity, forests, water and wastewater, solid waste, coastal zone management, tourism and energy, among others (MOENDU, 2008).

The National Development Strategy (NDS) provides the basis for land use planning in the ROM, setting out broad objectives, strategies and principles to promote an orderly, organized development of the overall land resources. It lays down the criteria for an efficient allocation of land for different uses. The Outline Planning Schemes, which are regional plans for a Municipal Council or District Council area, provide the framework for local authorities to plan, shape and control the use of land within their area. Outline Schemes set out broad proposals for the physical development of a planning area and translate the national strategy to the local level. National Planning Policy Guidelines (NPPGs) are written statements that guide on particular planning issues and assist developers, local authorities and the general public to comply with principles of good design, appropriate sites and location of activities. There is a generally recognized fragmentation of power and a lack of implementation and enforcement of the existing legislation. Local authorities, as the enforcing agency for development control, lack capacity and resources. Government has embarked on the Land Administration, Valuation and Information Management System (LAVIMS) project, providing an instrument for the effective use and development of land resources to achieve economic prosperity and social equity and to preserve the natural beauty of the island. A national digital cadastre, integrating a valuation roll for all residential and commercial properties, will be created.

Although Mauritius is heavily dependent on fossil fuels, energy efficiency and energy conservation measures are limited. The National Long Term Energy Strategy (2009-2025) is currently being implemented to reduce the country’s dependence on fossil fuels, increase the share of renewable energy to 35% by 2025 and democratize energy supply. To increase the availability of water, the government has launched various initiatives through a reformed institutional framework for the assessment, development, management and conservation of water resources. The institutional framework for climate change is in place with a National Climate Change Committee at the Prime Minister's level, a Climate Change Division at the Ministry of Environment & Sustainable Development and a series of national and sectoral policies and Programmes to mitigate and adapt to climate change.

Although there is no national sustainable development strategy, national and sectoral policies, strategies and action-plans for environmental protection, economic and social development and poverty reduction have adopted sustainable development principles. Recently, the National Budget has put emphasis on the greening of the economy, making substantial provision for sustainable development projects, including energy efficiency, renewable energy, poverty alleviation and other social development projects. Mauritius has therefore been actively pursuing a sustainable development strategy, despite inherent vulnerabilities, such as capacity and financial constraints. To effectively manage and implement sustainable development, there must be well-designed institutions. The Ministry of Environment is the key organization for environmental protection and management. The Department of Environment (DOE), established in 1989 as an institutional response to emerging environmental challenges, maintains the primary responsibility of ensuring environmental protection, planning, monitoring, coordination, enforcement and awareness-raising. Following the general elections in May 2010, an additional mandate, namely Sustainable Development, was appended to that of the MOE.

The process of developing a national sustainable development strategy is now occurring in the form of the Maurice Ile Durable (MID) strategy. At the national level, there is strong political commitment to advance sustainable development through the adoption of the new long-term vision of MID, whose main objective is to make Mauritius a model of sustainable development, particularly in the context of SIDS. While the initial thrust was to minimize dependency on fossil fuels through increased utilization of renewable energy and a more efficient use of energy in general, the concept widened to include all aspects of the economic model, society and the environment that are considered to be pivotal in the attainment of a sustainable Mauritius. In order to give greater impetus to the MID quest, a National MID Commission has been set up within the Prime Minister’s Office to coordinate projects funded by donor agencies under the MID Programme. It will harmonize efforts, ensure timely implementation of relevant projects and look into all aspects of sustainability. The Commission also aims at supporting cross-sectoral activities requiring complex coordination among stakeholders and monitoring and ensuring consistency of numerous activities to help prioritize such activities, measure their impacts and ensure cross-experience exchanges. The government has engaged in a national consultation process to formulate a policy and strategy and action plan for MID. A consolidated MID Policy, 10-year strategy and 3-year action plan will be elaborated by the mid-year 2012, with each ministry having its own MID priority projects.

The Presidential address in June 2010 announced policies and objectives for the new government’s Programme during the period 2010-2015 that take into account the above-mentioned issues. A National Development Plan is also under preparation at the level of the Ministry of Finance.

Since 1990, the policy landscape for environmental management has expanded considerably with a plethora of national and sectoral policies and strategies. To meet sustainable development goals, it is imperative to devote resources to implement existing policies and strategies. One of the major barriers to implementation is the inadequate coordination between ministries. The challenge is to identify institutional elements that can facilitate integration on a continued basis. Achieving expected benefits depends on more effective linkages between policies and their implementation, as well as better coordination between government departments, local authorities, the private sector, civil society organizations and the community at large. Improved knowledge is essential for effective implementation of policies. As a result, continuous capacity development and institutional strengthening are necessary to reinforce human resources for environmental protection. Moreover, improvement in environmental management, through enforcement, monitoring, reporting and further research is also required.

*The UNDP Country Programme on Environment*

Donor support and technical assistance from international organizations will boost national initiatives. The UNDP Country Programme (2008-2012) is anchored in the ten-year national economic reform Programme, focusing on capacity development in four strategic initiatives and aiming to create more growth opportunities to restore the economy on a higher plane of development: (a) the Empowerment Programme (EP), (b) the “Zone d’ Education Prioritaire” (ZEP), (c) Programme-Based Budgeting (PBB) and sector strategies and (d) environment protection, energy and management of natural resources. The current results-oriented country ME in environment is focused on strengthening institutional capacities and features identified as growing threats to current and future environmental parameters such as climate change mitigating and adaptive strategies, removal of persistent organic pollutants, expansion of marine and terrestrial protected areas and removing barriers to energy conservation.

# Evaluation Findings (and Analysis)

# Programme Design

The evaluation team learned that the Environmental Programme outcomes (listed above) were designed based on several underlying assumptions including: a conducive enabling environment for national capacity strengthening for environment and energy mainstreaming, baseline knowledge of ecosystem services and adaptation to climate change, the relevance to national development priorities, NEX modality and the capacity building approach and stakeholder involvement. At the project level, there were assumptions regarding the functioning of PSCs and the IP Project Manager role. The evaluation considered all these elements, including the logical framework and the relevance of the CP outcome area in relation to the new Country Programme.

Any environmental outcome is affected by the political situation, the attitude of the government system towards environment, the governance of the environment sector and the interest of the donor community. An enabling environment is conducive for national capacity strengthening around sustainability goals including sound environment and energy management. The MID initiative started in 2008 and UNDP was requested to provide assistance to the overall development of the MID concept. The team learned that the UNDP has responded effectively to initiate the MID support project. The MID initiative is helped in shaping positively the attitude of the government system towards environment and energy management as well as the need for integrated vertical and horizontal planning in general. A special advisor on MID was appointed in the Prime Minister’s office and a MID steering committee set up to oversee coordination of activities. After the general elections of 2010 the Ministry of Environment received the additional mandate of sustainable development so as to look into the implementation of the MID concept. This represents an opportunity for UNDP to better influence the national planning agenda on sustainable development. The AFD moved to Mauritius in 2006 and has become increasingly involved on sustainable development issues during the programme period. It is playing an active role in support to the MID initiative and is co-funding an output under the project “Removal of Barriers for Energy Efficiency.”

*Logical Framework*

The CP logical results framework needs to be improved. A well-structured stakeholder and problem and objectives analyses have not been an integrated part of the planning process, and vertical and horizontal logic therefore are not well represented. In addition, the indicator for outcome 1, 10% change in environmental conditions is overambitious for a limited programme period (3 years). The target indicator, behavior change, would be difficult to measure quantitatively in a short period without smarter indicators (Interviews with PMU Oct 9-14). The result is that outcomes and outputs are not formulated and time-bound achievements but rather are gradual and unspecific contributions to higher level objectives, with difficult-to-measure progress (compounded by lack of benchmarks). In general, indicators at the output activity (project) level hardly provide coordinated information on impact at outcome level. They serve the internal monitoring of activity planning.

*Relevance of Outcomes*

Considering the updated situation analysis (section above), both outcomes remain relevant with the exception of the focus on POPs, an area that might best be merged with the first outcome. Capacity strengthening needs were reported around the environment conventions (UNCCD, UNFCCC, CBD) climate change adaptation and energy efficiency by all ministries the team visited. They reported need for continued assistance for capacity strengthening and technology transfer (MOE, MOHL, MPU and MOA ministries during interviews). In relation to this, the PMU has been stretched very thin in terms of its ability to manage separate capacity strengthening exercises in several ministries (also see programme management section). However, giving consideration to the development situation and the capacity of the office to deliver its services to the ministries, the team felt that next country programme might focus on fewer strategic sectors to remain relevant and effective.

*Capacity Building Approach -NEX*

Although the team finds the portfolio externally driven with five GEF projects, the PMU has worked creatively to ensure a strategic approach to the environmental mainstreaming and multi-sector capacity strengthening targets. Capacity strengthening is factored into each new project design and is working. The team also thought that the approach can be even more effective with better programme-level monitoring (see section below on monitoring). An important lesson emerging is that two principles are needed to guide all projects implementation: (1) capacity assessment exercises should be conducted on all projects against the outcome targets, and (2) local experts or ministerial staff is employed into learning positions when possible.

The designers made assumptions around the overall capacity and interests within the ministries for cross-sectoral planning. In this regard, the team felt that tying the entire capacity building approach together concerns creating a function for ongoing learning and coordination at the ministry level for supporting environmental and energy issues across sectors. The natural counterpart for environmental coordination and management is the Ministry of Environment and for energy coordination and management, the Ministry of Public Utilities (MPU); therefore, more thought is required concerning strengthening their pivotal role.

In furtherance of its capacity building role, the programme might provide training and capacity building to the broader government system, raising the knowledge of environmental principles and procedures and helping them in performing their jobs as mandated and obliged by government policy and the expectations of all citizens, as well as in recognition of international obligations arising from conventions acceded to by Mauritius.

*Stakeholder involvement*

Government counterparts reportedly have been involved to the extent that they are primary beneficiaries of environmental programme outputs, but the general consensus was that they could have been more involved in designing and monitoring the programme and its intended outcomes. This would reduce redundancies and enable better coordination of all activities in the thematic area (Interview, MID focal point, Thursday, Oct. 13). Government stakeholders interviewed at MPU, MOE and MID agree that partnership with UNDP has been important not only because “they get things done” (Oct 13, 2011, MID interview, Mr. Osman Mohamed) but that there might be “improvements in coordination to avoid redundancies.”

The team feels there must be more interaction with UNDP when consulting with stakeholders during programme and projects design to ensure that resources are allocated in a focused and effective manner.

More work should be done to increase the visibility of the achievements toward results to partners and to enable joint monitoring of outcomes.

# Programme Governance

*Programme Level*

Programme Management Unit (PMU)

The PMU is comprised of a team of five professionals: a programme manager responsible for management/delivery of the entire portfolio, a programme analyst overseeing the MPA project, a programme assistant, a technical national coordinator overseeing the Climate Change and Adaptation funds and a programme analyst overseeing the Energy Efficiency and POPs projects. Their combined role is strategic-level programming, resource mobilization and oversight/monitoring. On a day-to-day basis, they are responsible for identifying opportunities for strategic level soft policy assistance when possible.

In June 2011, a decision was taken by the Ministry of Finance that implementing ministries have to undertake national procurement, which was expected to alleviate the problem of the PMU being an only operational “support to NEX implementation unit.” The team found during the interviews held with government officials- (see annex list of evaluation interviews ), that there are tensions due to the slow learning curve and poor capacity related to public procurement, which in turn adversely affected delivery and is a contributing factor on the poor performance of the portfolio this year. Delivery in 2011 was 49%, in 2010, 62 %, in 2009, 102% (Annex 10).

The capabilities of the implementing partner’s project managers and the project steering committees are currently exerting pressure on the PMU’s ability to undertake a technical support and strategic role. PMU staff are spending a high percentage of their time backstopping PMs and undertaking procurement and recruitments on behalf of ministries. As per the Programme Manager (interview of 27th October 2011), 40 to 50 % of the time of PMU staff could be freed up from the procurement hassle, enabling them to focus on oversight, project designs and implementation. The team felt that a solution is needed to alleviate the bottleneck before the next country programme.

*Project Level*

Project Steering Committee (PSC) (Annex 12)

The Project Steering Committees (PSCs) is the backbone of the capacity strengthening/integrated planning and inter-sectoral approach. Project governance, management and implementation are expected to benefit from effective Project Steering Committees. The appointed National Project Director (usually a ministerial focal point) chairs PSC meetings; however, the participants are not consistent nor are they the same people. Based on conversations with the PM and ministry stakeholders, participants’ roles and responsibilities are not well defined. There is also a high turnover reported. This is unfortunate because, ideally, the PSC members would find utility in the coordination born from the project, find a positive capacity strengthening effect and perhaps even develop champions for environmental issues in the responsive ministries.

Project Managers (PM)

Project managers (PMs) are attached to the ministries and report to UNDP. This is a critical oversight and reporting link between UNDP and the ministries/beneficiaries. The PM serves as the bridge between the donor (UNDP) and the beneficiaries. He/she needs to judge the right extent that he/she should identify with the beneficiaries, as one of the community, while at the same time not losing sight of his/her accountability to UNDP.

The programme aims to support the understanding of the opportunity costs of the environment and development decisions. In this regard, project managers are in a good position to deliver the investment case regarding project deliverables to ministries on a daily, weekly, monthly, ongoing basis. At every level, an economic mindset of the environmental management work of the projects needs to be built into daily work. The PMs can receive orientation on UNDP reporting procedures and approaches and be included in ongoing trainings, coordination and knowledge sharing activities. These can be much more systematic.

# Programme Implementation/Management

Since Mauritius is likely to be a net contributor of NCC to UNDP in 2014, it is currently in a transition period and, therefore, programme implementation/delivery and management are even more than ever important. The PMU will eventually rely on resource mobilization of non-core resources, which will impact on management and administration costs. Because there will be no more core funds for optimal staffing, a streamlined management arrangement will be an absolute necessity

UNDP Mauritius is currently moving to employ the African Adaptation Fund and has already secured two new projects–one under a million and one for 9 million–allowing time to focus on other sources for resource mobilization. In addition, SIDS Doc and CC Adaptation (current project with JICA) resources are available. Resource management is not too difficult if the office and the government develop good projects (according to the UNDP Environment Programme Manager, interview Oct 10, 2011). The question arises whether the UNDP office (PMU) is efficient and effective at absorbing those new funds in this rapidly emerging small island state.

*Procurement and cash transfers issues*

NEX related assumptions included the overall ability of the ministries to undertake effective and efficient procurements, finance and reporting procedures. The team found that many government stakeholders reported procurement and GEF requirements around project reporting as an issue (MOE, MOHL and partner agencies and AF; (see annex - delivery). The office is currently transferring all responsibility for procurement and recruitment to ministries, and this is impacting on delivery (slower) as mentioned above (Programme Delivery reports, Interviews-MOE).

*Relevance–HR Staffing*

The office is in transition, and focus has been on opening an office in the Seychelles, an NCC since 1997 (with GLOC payments). . A new analyst and an assistant were recruited for that office. The Environment Manager (telephone interview, Oct 10, 2011) suggests that when the Seychelles office is up and running, Mauritius will focus on only one cross-sector programming area, i.e. sustainable human development, which will ease current tensions. The programme manager suggested GEF’s funds may be employed to mobilize additional personnel, including a one-year slot for a JPO.

The team feels that in order provide oversight and technical and statistical assistance, more staff will be required for the office to remain relevant and provide value added services. The UNDP leadership in-country requires focusing on the environment and social NEX issues. To remain relevant and implement a relevant UNDP strategic portfolio, a reduction in scope is necessary. The UNDP TRAC resources have served to support procurement and reporting support requests. However, the capacity of UNDP to deliver is an important consideration.

UNDP Mauritius is relevant (because of its close proximity in working with the government on a daily basis and its ability to mobilize funds, provide cutting edge technical support and give support to recruitment and procurement). At the moment, regional technical advisors and other donors ask for 3% cost recovery when they provide services.

*NEX Modality*

Overall, these management structures and working methods place much of the responsibility of implementing the project on the shoulders of the respective government partner. This appears to be a very productive and useful approach overall and likely helps to achieve improved environmental management through a learning-while- doing process. It is not without its drawbacks in the minds of many government stakeholders, who several times complained of the difficulty of implementing a UNDP project within a government ministry when the project has difficulty hiring or paying government staff.

Knowledge sharing and coordination between programme managers, technical staff, counterparts and donors/partners need to be strengthened. They need to initiate systematized meetings for knowledge sharing and learning around projects activities and for initiating synergies. This can be approached through sector–Ministry of Environment Coordination functions or UNDP support.

The evaluation team observed that there is low visibility about the environmental programme outside of the direct beneficiaries (mostly government working on the projects). In order for PMU to remain a relevant programme, a communication and public awareness strategy around programme outcome goals is required. Currently, there is none.

# Programme Monitoring and Evaluation

The environment programme is monitored by a very capable team; however, the system is not systematized and therefore, the benefits are being compromised. For example, at the project level, team learned that in one instance the GEF project did not factor into planning the necessary funds for a final evaluation. This was found to be unacceptable by the SLM RCA advisor who provided the technical review in 2011 (SLM project–GEF PIR report 2011). Evidence of PMU staff and PMs employing the CP programme results framework as a management/monitoring tool was also weak.

There is a need to develop an environment outcome monitoring and evaluation strategy at the programme level to augment the existing project level monitoring systems. These might also be linked to the knowledge management and communication aspects of the programme. The programme monitoring strategy should link project level outcomes to programme level outcomes and have smart indicators. In addition, to achieve best capacity strengthening objectives, the programme monitoring responsibilities would be shared jointly with the ministries in order to increase partnership and ownership (already discussed in section on governance and implementation).

# Programme Impact –Outcomes

#### Programme Outcome 1: Capacities for sustainable land management are built in the appropriate government and civil society institutions/user groups and mainstreamed into government planning.

***Baseline:*** *Forest Land Information System completed and National Action Programme and National Forestry Action Plan initiated.*

***Target****: SLM best practices and guidelines are broadly disseminated and used in development planning, zoning and agricultural extension.*

*Observations and Recommendations (Annex 8)*

All project activities within the context of this outcome have been achieved with the exception of mainstreaming SLM in local and national planning. The evaluation team agreed with the RTA final (PIR report: PIR September 2011) that the failure to ensure that SLM principles are mainstreamed in central and local government planning poses the biggest threat to the sustainability and replication of the SLM and the project objectives. More policy advocacy work is needed to successfully mainstream SLM in national and local government. This will require leadership and facilitation that enable cross-sector learning, planning and initiatives to emerge. In addition, it will be important to follow-up SLM with the Protected Areas Net (PAN) work (Interview PAN PM manager, Oct 12) and reinforce a cross-sector learning mechanism in order to yield more understanding of payment for ecosystem services (PES) and the ecosystem and natural resources management approaches and strategies.

*Outcome 1:–Mainstreaming of SLM*

Although the project was successful to deliver results (project status review in annex), the evaluation team finds that overall sustainability is an issue. Towards the overall programme outcome, it was important that the project’s goal to contribute to institute a SLM mentality within all government sectors, programmes and services and promote effective facilitation of knowledge and learning, regular coordination, technical support across ministry is a very important aspect. Establishing a working mechanism for cross-sector collaboration on SLM, initiating focus on a multi-use information management system for SLM, i.e. building upon existing Lavin’s and instituting cost benefits analysis as a methodology for all NRM issues across sectors, are key elements.

The sustainable land management (SLM) is not being sufficiently mainstreamed into policies, regulations, strategies, plans, educational systems, etc. There was no evidence of general recognition on the part of politicians and decision makers that SLM (beyond Forestry) is a significant barrier to sustained economic development. Environment/natural resource economics still need to be developed as tools for land use planning and policy development includes requisite cost/benefit analyses of present land use systems–the cost of doing nothing–in comparison with similar analyses of SLM option.

*Outcome 2: Training/Human Resource Capacity Building*

*Land Use Planning*

The insight arising was about enforcement and coordination and also rural/urban differences. The Planning and Development Act was legalized in 2004. However, the lack of a cross-sector planning culture is still reported as the key barrier (interview with the outgoing SLM PM- Oct 13, 2011). There are two planners in each local authority; however, it is possible to just do zoning in rural areas, without planning. In addition, the urban areas have a special zoning type which is different from rural areas, where zoning is more flexible. The lesson, based on interviews with the outgoing PM, is that when politics gets involved, planning is imposed. A positive movement, however, is that strategic implementation units have been proposed for upgrading the National Development Strategy (NDS). According to the PM, the upgrades to the NDS will be handled within the context of the MID process. Policies are in place to link area-based planning action, but this is still not coordinated and laws are not enforced. Improved planning that takes into consideration the livelihood function and principles of architecture is essential. The integrated financing strategy was a successful SLM output.

*Outcome 3: Capacities for knowledge management for SLM are developed*

While SLM conducted more than sufficient trainings and related activities, the challenge is to identify qualified people in positions for cross-sector planning and collaboration roles. Management and decision makers are not necessarily coming to meetings. The project instituted a training**–**the-trainers approach**–**which the team found commendable.

The project and national capacity strengthening element focused on the forestry sector although SML is a larger conceptual framework for change. In this case, the evaluation team believes that the Ministry of Environment plays an important knowledge management, learning and technical support role for SLM, and the linkages and ownership of the SLM concept could have been better integrated into the work of the MOE.

Such a knowledge management system should include economic and financial analyses of the present land use systems and the use of these tools for identifying/developing new systems that are viable as needed. Best practices and lessons learned also need to be continually synthesized and diffused. A status report of land degradation/SLM should be developed for both islands. Land owners/natural resource users need to be made aware of these results. Key policy options need to be identified and presented in a suitable form to authorities and decision-makers.

*Outcome 4: The National Action Plan is completed*

This important benchmark activity has been delivered; however, the evaluation team felt that the implementation of the NAP will depend on the mechanisms in place to facilitate ongoing cross-sector collaboration and an environmental or natural resource information management system.

*Management Feedback and Observations*

With regard to training and capacity strengthening opportunities, the project manager participated in a 2009 technical workshop in Pretoria. The outgoing project manager believes that since the same people do not attend PSC meetings, more technical support and oversight might be required from UNDP. The meeting with the PM (Oct 13, 2011) also disclosed that a need also exists for local technical capacity assessments as part of each project design process.

The lesson arising from this project (aimed at instituting SLM as an approach, development of tools and capacity strengthening) is that information about cost benefits of NRM should be dynamically shared upwards with policy makers and mainstreamed in the budgeting process. Key learning highlights the need for cross-sector coordination and collaboration beyond ad hoc inputs for immediate capacity strengthening. SLM is a long term process, and moreover it is an “approach.” The key instrument for this is multi-use information management systems providing key information to decision makers about cost benefits, i.e. what exactly is forsaken if this is development-enacted. How this information is packaged and shared is very important for influencing land use planning and policy. The work of natural resource management goes beyond forestry and, therefore, considerations of future linkages between the outcome of this project with MOE and MPU are very important.

In general, the evaluation team rated this set of activities as having a good contribution to the indicators and give the outcome a satisfactory rating.

***Programme Outcome 2: Enabling policy and institutional framework for sustainably co-managed marine and terrestrial protected areas through public-private partnership to be developed.***

***Baseline:*** *Limited protection to globally significant terrestrial, coastal and marine biodiversity*

***Target:*** *Reduce threats to biodiversity through participatory stakeholder process to effectively conserve biodiversity through innovative co management of protected areas.*

*Observations and Recommendations (Annex 10)*

The project was redesigned at Mid-term Evaluation (August 2008) after several years of implementation since January 12, 2004). Reasoning cited in MTE report was “*Slow implementation rate and, in some areas, lack of strategic planning, e.g. failure to prepare training needs assessment and strategies for tourism development and management*” (MPA Mid-term Report, p. 6). Project baselines and indicators were reconstructed at that juncture. Based on interviews with the current project analyst and others directly involved in project implementation, quick action was taken after the mid-term evaluation to address the gaps identified. A process of strengthening capacity and institutionalizing of the MPA within the RRA planning and budgeting process was fast tracked.

In general, the project delivered its upstream (policies, legal frameworks) and downstream (park boundaries and capacity strengthening) inputs, but the evaluation team finds the sustainably of the project’s outputs at serious risk with no written and negotiated exit strategy. Sustainability is an issue, and there is a high risk to MPA management that trained staff will leave without reinforcements. The project gains are also at a physical risk of increasing frequency of cyclones. The capacities strengthened (staff trained and the local politicians influenced with the technical content and support) by the activities and the park concept as a cost effective alternative livelihood need to be reinforced. The team felt that UNDP should stay engaged with RRA due to the strategic and political nature of the sustainable development work.

The MPA project has provided excellent innovations that should be documented, strengthened and scaled, for example, through the employment of Community Resource Observers (CROs) as park stewards. The innovations can be documented and preserved, shared internally and internationally. The park is a good practice for SIDs globally. National and international communication visibility is thus very important. The team feels that more can be done to involve members of the RRA in monitoring of the global environmental conventions-related activities, which can a powerful means to impart ownership of them. The RRA members might be asked to showcase the park at international events as a means to strengthen by, i.e. CBD, UNFCCC-COP.

Based on conversations with stakeholders, the concepts underpinning SLM, which go beyond marine, need reinforcement with the RRA. For example, the watersheds in SEMPA areas should also be studied (PM Interview, Oct 10). Land use plans should incorporate watersheds. The evaluation team felt synergies can be made between SEMPA and SIDPA projects that consider Artsol soils and main group species and corral plants.

It will be important for UNDP to remain engaged with the RRA through MPA project. The follow-up activities are important due to the strategic and political nature and the linkages to the MID concept of development planning. Sustainable development planning that incorporates natural resource management and sustainable livelihoods approach is the ideal. Natural Resource Management and Protected Areas development as a livelihood strategy is a matter of sustainable development on the island.

*Management Feedback and Observations*

UNDP’s reported role in the project’s extension and support to a new team made all the difference in having the successful outcome. The project staff reported that UNDP oversight was good on a demand basis, but it was a challenge to receive technical and political support visits at the right time due to scheduling conflicts, i.e. the UNDP project managers visited when it was timely for them and not necessarily for the project. The project outcome needs to make a business case to hotel operators and local government; alternative livelihood work is just starting.

The project outcomes are very important toward the overall capacity development outcome goal. The project demonstrated sound cost benefit analysis process at the level of island development. The alternative as a tourism site is testimony that the case as a cost effective land/sea use has been made. For the income generating potential of the MPA, however, it will be important (towards outcome) to retain the attention of the RRA .therefore a strong marketing element is needed to follow up and help the project generate revenue. It will also be important that the MPA advisor be retained in order to work with the RRA as advisor on sustainable development. This will also link and support RRA strategically to the MID process. The evaluation team determined that the set of activities has a good contribution to the indicator and give ether project a satisfactory rating.

.…………………………………………………………………………………………………..

***Programme Outcome 3: Long-term sustainability of living resources of two Large Marine Ecosystems ensured through ecosystem-based approach to management of the Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystem (ASCLME)***

***Baseline:*** *Lack of a holistic multi-sectoral regional ecosystem management approach to LME for the Agulhas and Somali Current*

***Target:*** *Research and understanding of the coastal and marine ecosystems within the ASCLME.*

*Observations and Recommendations (Annex 9)*

A mid-term evaluation was completed on ASCLME, highlighting the positive developments in the project (MTE January 2010). The MTE suggested rephrasing its important and telling indicator 3’ to represent the actual project outcome, rather than the development of the technical basis, institutional mechanisms and political support for a sustainable ecosystem-based management in WIO because it was recognized to be a long-term trans-boundary consensus building process. The evaluation team supports the proposed indicator, which is more appropriate (in timing and scope) but might also be strengthened by undertaking activities that contribute to national capacity strengthening (see further analysis on this point below).

Although the project is on track towards securing trans-boundary cooperation for management of the ecosystem, the evaluation team believes that the national capacity strengthening objective, the understanding of ecosystem services related to trans-boundary ecosystem management and visibility of the initiatives can be improved.

Currently, there is no mechanism considering what the project is achieving in terms of national capacity strengthening. The regional coordinators meet regularly to discuss issues regarding the development of the project. A solution that emerged during the evaluation is to institute a national committee involving national stakeholders and decision makers at the local, regional and national levels. In addition, it is necessary to ensure that learning and technology developed is shared between project stakeholders so that it can more effectively influence the national decision-making processes at the local and national levels. Capacity strengthening to local CSO stakeholders is also very important for outcomes in this regard.

*Project Impacts*

The project impacts on the ecosystem (changes in levels of degradation) are reported by the project manager. The outcome of the MTR is that these will materialize later, after the endorsement of the Strategic Action Plan (SAP), which will summarize the joint actions needed to be undertaken at regional level to better manage the ecosystem. The team felt that although the project had built in a regional and national capacity building process, the national process can be strengthened by more focus on internal visibility and communication for development.

*Management Feedback and Observations*

A mid-term evaluation was completed January 2010. This project is on track securing trans-boundary cooperation for the management of the ecosystem. However, the national capacity strengthening objective and also visibility of the initiatives can be improved by ensuring that all the learning and technology developed and shared between project stakeholders can effectively include the wider decision making processes in Mauritius. This problem might be alleviated by setting up a national communication and public awareness strategy and coordination mechanism. The evaluation team determined that this set of activities has provided an ok contribution to the indicator. The project can better reinforce national capacity strengthening objectives, additional national level monitoring mechanism, visibility and linkages with MOE for cross-sector learning as a dynamic process. The team gave it a satisfactory rating.

*……………………………………………………………………………………………………….*

***Outcome 4:- Enabling policy, institutional framework and adaptive strategies and instruments in place for sustainable and environmentally sound economic growth; involvement of civil society in above strengthened.***

***Baseline:*** There exists no overarching framework or policy for the *Maurice Ile Durable* (MID) concept.

***Target:*** A new trajectory toward a sustainable Mauritius defined, agreed upon by key parties, and embarked upon by the country at large.

*Observations and Recommendations (Annex 7)*

*Output 1: National Policy for MID*

Under the project, a plan has been prepared to arrive at the white paper and policy for MID. Following National Consultations in 2010, the Green Paper was prepared and circulated nationally for comments in 2011. In addition, the Prime Minister’s Office has now organized working groups and six thematic reports. The MoESD is expected to continue with work started, with funding now from the AFD to prepare the policy (Interviews with Project managers, Oct 2011).

*Output 2: Support to the MID Fund*

UNDP provided financial support for a four-person Technical Support Unit (TSU) attached to MREPU to help streamline operations of the MID Fund during the period July 2011. Key contributions included the development of formats for project submission, criteria for project evaluation, suggestions for a framework for allocation of resources, evaluations of projects received and the organization of national consultations for the definition of an MID policy. The TSU was operational from July 10 as no provision of funds had been made by MREPU.

*Output 3: Provision of Essential Technical Expertise*

Under the project, experts in solar water heaters were provided to the ministry to review the solar water heater scheme operated by the Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities. Following the report, some of the expert recommendations were incorporated into the new scheme, e.g. assurance that after-sales service would be available and quality standards would be developed for solar water heaters. (Given the limited budget for this aspect, this was the only technical expertise provided).

As UNDP does not have the necessary financial resources (no core available and so must be in the context of funds mobilized) for the policy preparation and AFD has always been keen to finance the process, the MoESD and the PMO are in the process of appointing a consultant to prepare the white paper in accordance with a revised plan due by March 2012 (Interview with MID PM-Oct 13, 2011). UNDP does intend to follow up with work on the implementation of projects that are born in the MID action plan and strategy, also to be prepared by the consultants by March 2012.

*Management Feedback and Observations*

Although this is a good approach given the resource constraints, the team felt that the PMU was successful to engage in an extraordinary window of opportunity by becoming involved in the MID process. Its responsiveness and soft assistance was very strategic and timely and has influenced the new development agenda. The challenge is that if UNDP is not involved in the development of the strategic action plan development process an important opportunity to provide strategic technical advice will be missed. In this regard, the MID process needs a mechanism built in to withstand power shifts. This means quickly enacting a strategic action plan that commits government activities and organizations to move beyond the rhetoric. The green paper was the first step but not the most strategic step. The most strategic step is happening now. The evaluation team learned that the process is in transition and has already set up a Steering Committee. It will be important for UNDP to re-engage as quickly as possible. During the evaluation team interview with the MID focal point, UNDP was requested to give support along with the Sustainable Human Development Advisor. The team feel that UNDP should not miss this opportunity as MID is likely to be a process that defines the development agenda for years to come.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

***Outcome 5: Operational CDM and voluntary carbon market framework developed.***

**Baseline:** Lack of National CDM strategy.

**Target:** Promotion of access to the carbon market, financing and technology.

**Indicator**: 3 Carbon Credit projects prepared for submission to the MDG Carbon Finance by end 2010.

*Observations and Recommendations (Annex 3)*

The design of the Capacity Development Project on CDM envisaged a two-phase approach to CDM capacity building in the participating countries: Phase I was to focus on awareness raising and institutional capacity development so as to create the enabling conditions for CDM; and Phase II was to focus on harnessing this newly-created condition, enabling Environment to catalyze pipelines of in-country CDM projects, focusing in particular on those projects offering high sustainable development impacts for the host countries. The ultimate objective of the CDM capacity development project is to catalyze CDM project activity.

Unfortunately, the project has not materialized and has not been successful in harnessing the enabling conditions newly created in Phase 1 of the project to promote actual CDM projects due to the following internal and external reasons:

* There were delays in getting the funding in place and in struggling with management of the project at the regional level in trying to get a coordinator and a CDM technical specialist. EEG management has also asked for a reformulation of the project and reduces the overall budget and reevaluates the originally agreed set of activities and the geographic scope.
* The first major intended output of this project was the formulation of a coherent CDM National Strategy, which unfortunately did not materialize due to non-delivery by the consultant appointed. The implementation of this strategy would have created other mechanisms to support existing or potential future carbon market mechanisms.
* There are limitations to CDM development in Mauritius, such as the following:

1. Methodology: Though the potential of garnering carbon credits from the use of bagasse in power generation seems quite considerable, such initiatives from the local sugar industry have failed sofar. A bagasse-coal co-firing project has recently been rejected at the CDM Executive Board level for reasons of non-compliance with accepted CDM methodologies, in view of the fact that local conditions and crop season allow the use of bagasse for only half-year periods, with boilers being fired using coal as a fuel for the remaining six months. The wrong methodology was used in the proposal.
2. Economies of scale: With CDM transaction costs generally fixed, there are substantial diseconomies of scale that make it difficult for small projects to prove their financial viability. The impact of such hefty cost warrants careful assessment of risks from potential buyers. Many investors, as well as administrators of carbon funds, would thus consider engaging into small-scale CDM ventures only if the estimated potential credits exceed a minimum quota, depending upon their financial assessments.
3. Government of Mauritius has also signed a Memorandum of Understanding with UNDP Country Office with respect to the UNDP Millennium Development Goals Carbon Facility. The UNDP MDG Carbon Facility provides a “one-stop-shop” package of services to benefit from the CDM. UNDP provides project development services, such as Project Idea Note (PIN) and Project Design Document (PDD) writing, arranging and paying for validation, monitoring and verification, as well as assistance in developing quantification, monitoring and a reporting plan. An international financial services institution provides Carbon Banking Services, such as purchasing, managing and marketing of carbon credits. Costs incurred by UNDP are due to be reimbursed as a flat fee on a cost recovery basis, with an international financial services institution advancing anticipated proceeds from the sale of Certified Emission Rights (CERs). The facility comes at a cost and projects need to have a minimum of 30 to 40000 tons of carbon credits to be viable.
4. Further limitations: On top of those restrictions highlighted above, most of which are inherent to Small Island developing states, there are barriers which stem from legislative, societal, governmental, financial and technical conditions. A large proportion of these barriers are to be addressed through capacity building and education measures. The financial and technical barriers will require creative solutions and will need to be addressed to further facilitate investment, while overcoming regulatory and institutional barriers is critical in the development of further small-scale CDM activities.

The Kyoto Protocol will most probably end next year and the relevance of doing capacity building on CDM is pertinent. Moreover, there is a need to investigate other carbon financing mechanisms and a strategy needs to be put in place. As a SIDS, Mauritius has limited CDM project development potential and as such, cannot expect a lot of projects to process every year. However, there is a stated long-term energy strategy of achieving 35% of energy self-sufficiency in terms of electricity supply through the use of renewable sources of energy by 2025.Therefore, there should be potential for carbon financing in the future.

**………………………………………………………………………………….**

#### 

**Programme Outcome 2: Capacities for management of persistent organic pollutants, mainstreaming climate change adaptation strategies and integrating energy conservation into policy and programme development enhanced at country level.**

There are three outcomes that are linked to the UNDP CP goal concerning climate change, emergency efficiency and persistent organic pollutants. A summary of progress against target and indicators as well as a critic of the targets and indicators against the overarching programme outcome are summarized below.

***Outcome 1: Revised national legislation alignment with Stockholm Convention***

**Baseline:** Stockholm Convention is not fully incorporated into national legislation.

**Target**: Compliance with Stockholm Convention by end 2009 and strengthen institutional capacities.

**Indicator**: Use of POPs chemical phased out by 2010

*Observations and Recommendations* ***(****Annex 3*)

The evaluation team has the following major observations:

The project is on track. It has progressed very well with regard to the disposal of obsolete POPs from the island, thus helping implement the provisions of the Stockholm Convention on minimizing POPs releases as well as with locating suitable non-DDT solutions towards malaria preventive measures in Mauritius. Two outputs still need to be met to ensure the sustainability of the outcome:

* Development of an effective “responsible care programme”
* Development of an effective non-DDT based vector control programme.

The project has achieved bringing together Ministries of Health and Environment in close cooperation on POPs management in the country, a cooperation which will provide a good basis for tackling future POPs as well as other hazardous chemicals and waste priorities in Mauritius. Successful partnering with local communities in implementing IVM strategy to reduce DDT use is another important element that improves the inter-sectoral (central to decentralized authorities and civil society) cooperation. Positive synergy has been developed between the stakeholders.

The project has facilitated an interest from the government side to cover all three POPs contaminated sites in one contract for the soil clean-up which has increased the level of co-finance by approximately USD 600,000 from government resources.

The contractor responsible for the disposal of the POPS faced a lot of difficulties for the issuing of the trans-boundary transportation licenses, with consequent delays in project completion. The lesson is to initiate trans-boundary shipment processes as early in the project as possible as the required permitting takes time.

Regarding the institution of a “Responsible Care” programme, the current practice of spraying DDT is not sustainable as it leads to contamination of water resources during cleanup (interview of APEXHOM on 11th October 2011). APEXHOM has requested for the participation of resource persons from the Ministry of Health (“train the trainers”) for the training sessions and a reply is still being awaited. The Ministry of Health is of the view that to date no health problems related to DDT has been detected. However, as APEXHOM has rightly pointed out, it was more of an environmental problem as DDT could contaminate the environment through bad practices (for preparation and for cleanup). APEXHOM is looking into the possibility to do a video clip on the proper way of preparing DDT before use.

*Programme Management Feedback*

This project is executed by the Ministry of Environment with the support of UNDP Country Office under Country Office Support to NEX modality. The project is monitored by a Steering Committee (SC) chaired by the National Project Director of the Ministry of Environment. The Project Manager is recruited by UNDP for the entire implementation period of the task. The main partners are the UNDP CO, Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, the Ministry of Health, APEXHOM and the private sector (waste disposal contractors and importers of chemicals).

Overall there has been up to now a successful partnership strategy. The National Project Director, who is also the Director of the Department of Environment, is satisfied with the progress of the project (interview of 12 October 2011). UNDP support to the project manager has been highly satisfactory (interview of PM on 12 October 2011). The project has ensured regular coordination of stakeholders. The NEX modality arrangements appear to have been satisfactory.

Disposal of obsolete POPs from the island will be done by the end of the year, thus helping implement the provisions of the Stockholm Convention. Suitable non-DDT solution towards malaria preventive measures in Mauritius has been identified. Development of an effective non-DDT based vector control programme is on-going. Overall there has been up to now a successful partnership strategy.

The various concepts developed under the project regarding Integrated Vector Management (IVM) where emphasis is placed on community participation, once introduced effectively in villages will prevent the resurgence of epidemic-prone vector-borne diseases namely Chikungunya, Dengue and Malaria. The approaches advocated through this project can be used in developing a successful partnership strategy among relevant stakeholders to address these public health issues. The outcome from this project is also an important contribution in adaptation of the island to climate change.

Sustainability relates specifically to the ability of the government to sustain the capacity developed under the project to address enforcement related to possible importation of illegal chemicals and a meaningful sustainable care Programme and continuing capacity building for vector control. The legislative framework is in place and the project has assisted the government in eliminating the barriers that prevent the implementation of the current legislative and regulatory instruments. However the “responsible care Programme” and hazardous waste disposal and treatment on the island are major issues. The results of the responsible care Programme component are important to serve to lay the groundwork in identifying capacity needs with respect to sound management of chemicals on the island.

The evaluation team determined that this set of activities has contributed to the outcome and provided a good contribution to the indicator. The team gave it a rating of satisfactory.

***Outcome 2: Energy Efficiency market developed***

**Baseline**: Limited investment in energy efficiency in buildings and no proper regulation and codes.

**Target**: GHG emissions reduced substantially through transformation of the energy efficiency market for existing and new building.

**Indicator**: Five verified investment projects in energy efficiency measures in buildings being implemented by end 2011. Building regulations enacted and codes drafted and necessary legislation enacted by end 2010.

*Observations and Recommendations (Annex 5)*

The evaluation team has the following major observations:

Most deliverables are either completed or well underway. Good progress has been achieved up to now in the policy, market, business management skills and financial barriers components (outcomes 1, 2 and 3). Activities have advanced less in the awareness creation components (outcome 4). The project completion date of April 2012 will have to be further extended for the completion of the remaining project activities. The allocated GEF funds will be insufficient for implementing additional project activities and additional funding from SIDS DOCK has already been secured.

Strong policy presence was achieved through the enactment of the Energy Efficiency Bill and the final drafting of the Building Control Bill. The passage of the EE bill is a firm demonstration that the GEF funded project can play a key role in assisting government draft state of the art EE legislation. It is a proof of the positive link between capacity building in government and policy formulation support via a well-designed project.

Support for the SIPP SSDG FIT scheme was highly valuable. This was an unintended outcome of the project and has been instrumental in developing the grid code and piloting a FIT scheme for small-scale RE-distributed generation in the country.

The standard designs project is an example of a deficiency in the project design which should have selected an international consultant having a local project partner expert in the field of architecture and knowing well the local context.

Stakeholders of the private sector were not much involved in NSC meetings, but they have participated actively in consultative workshops.

There has been a high rate of turnover of project managers for this 4-year project. Selection criteria for the recruitment of project managers have to be reviewed and need to have binding signed agreements. There is a need to have quicker selection procedures for urgent recruitments.

As per the PM (interview of 11 October 2011), a few NSC members are only silent spectators; it is only a few of the NSC members who provide expert advice and guidance to the PMU and project manager. The right representative, having the required technical expertise and knowhow, must be delegated by a ministry/institution for attending to the NSC meetings. The NPD also reported a lack of capacity in institutions and getting the right people on the NSC (interview of 13 October 2011).

*Programme Management Feedback*

The National Project Director and the Director of Technical services from the Executing agency reported that the project was being implemented satisfactorily and that they were personally satisfied with the project (interview of 12 and 13 October 2011). The NPD was of the opinion that the CO is effective in general, and he is agreeable to routing government funds through UNDP to help them implement projects.

Project activities have proceeded quite well albeit slowly due to the high staff turnover of the various PMs. There has been a high sense of ownership of the project by local stakeholders who have been actively participating in the 15 NSC meetings that have been held up to now. The Executing Agency (MPU) is also committed to the effective monitoring of the progress of the project. The PM reported that the only disappointment is that the local stakeholders from the private sector have not been fully participating in the NSC meetings despite the fact that they had shown their interests to do so, at the inception of the project.

***Outcome 3: Capacity strengthened and adaptation measures integrated into tourism development and coastal zone management***

**Baseline**: Climate Change risk adaptation measures not incorporated into current approaches to coastal zone management.

**Target:** Capacity developed to address future climate change-related risks through adaptive measures in tourism sector development and ICZM.

**Indicator:** National Adaptation Plan developed by Ministry of Tourism by end 2011.

*Observations and Recommendations (Annex 5)*

The intended outcome in the CP was “Capacity strengthened and adaptation measures integrated into tourism development and coastal zone management.” However, the scope was rightly broadened to integrate and mainstream climate change adaptation into the institutional framework and into core development policy, strategies and plans of ROM. The Africa Adaptation Programme (AAP) is designed to assist 20 countries across Africa to incorporate climate change risks (and opportunities) into their national development processes in order to protect development gains in an environment of changing climate.

It is not a traditional adaptation programme: it has a more strategic focus, aimed at creating an environment in which more informed and appropriate adaptation decisions and practices are made in the participating countries.The clear intention is to build capacity to address the complex and multidisciplinary problem climate change poses.

The evaluation team has the following **major observations**:

* The project is currently not on track. The delivery rate is low (only 10% delivery). The only output which is currently ongoing is the capacity building for climate resilient policies. After a slow start owing to challenges in setting up the project team and staff turnover at UNDP, 2011 could be considered as the first full year of implementation. In this context, the delivery rate is not so alarming, but the challenge would be to maximize output next year.
* A number of operational issues have been identified that are impacting on delivery. These include perceived slow procurement process, lack of local expertise, weak coordination mechanisms among multiple sectors and lack of PMUs’ technical and management capacities.
* There has been criticism on the quality of the project design (interview of PM and MOE on 10 and 12 October 2011). An overall framework seems to be missing in the project design. Also, the design might not have been participatory enough, judging from the interview with the MOE.
* Outcome 4(Innovative Financing Options) is an important one for the sustainability of this project and is a challenge for implementation. The project has not been very fortunate with the recruitment of climate change economists. In addition to delays in the procurement process, there is a lack of national expertise on climate finance and an overall lack of knowledge on climate funding.
* As per the interview with the MOE, local people can do some of the job in the ministry and appropriate mechanisms need to be developed to get their involvement.

*Programme Management Feedback*

The creation and operationalization of the Climate Change Division and Adaptation Unit at the MOE in March 2010 provided a boost to the implementation of the project. However, project staffing for the PMU was completed only by late 2010, and a UNDP Climate Change National Coordinator was appointed only in early 2011. There was thus a delay in setting up the project team.

The procurements, as per advice of the Ministry of Finance, were made compliant to the Public Procurement Act as required by the NEX execution modality. The project design has been made for a high number of consultancies (about 13), and in all interviews it was mentioned that procurement and recruitment is a hurdle. The PMU needs to be strengthened to accelerate internal issues, such as services provided for procurement and disbursement purposes. The PM was satisfied with the oversight from UNDP (interview of 10 October 2011). However, the MOE noted a number of limitations in the oversight (unavailability of people at the right time, lack of continuity due to staff turnover at UNDP) (interview of 12 October 2011). The AAP team has requested a mid-term evaluation, which is scheduled by the end of the year.

# Sustainability

Sustainability is viewed in terms of financial, policy, institutional and human resource capacity and management arrangements put in place so that the positive changes in the development situation initiated by the different projects endure/continue in the future. The political context is also important.

***Financial***

Financial sustainability will depend on resource mobilization, portfolio delivery and partnership strategy. Although a resource mobilization strategy for the environmental field is clearly evident in the work under the two outcomes, the evaluators have not seen any written document on it. This strategy can be described as being built around a solid core of GEF funding, using that funding to leverage additional funds from government co-funding or from other donor programmes. Overall, the evaluation team finds the strategy to be appropriate, straightforward and effective in helping to achieve the outcomes. It is about as sustainable as is possible in the Mauritian context.

GEF has demonstrated long-term staying power as funder of global environmental projects worldwide. The government cost-sharing mechanism, however, has to be enhanced so that it contributes to ensuring the ongoing flow of benefits from development assistance in the longer term. It would help enable UNDP to maintain a long-term presence in Mauritius and may even influence how UNDP tailors the design of its next country programme. Increasing government co-funding through increased cost sharing holds potential for enhancing sustainability, but UNDP must develop a better communication strategy on this issue.

Economic arguments are the most effective in influencing policy making. Thus, environment programmes must be able to convey the economics and explain the value of a healthy and productive ecosystem services. Projects should capture market values of ecosystem services. UNDP would do well to consider training a staff member in these issues or hiring a consultant well-versed in them to help UNDP/ MOE develop project concepts to be pursued for funding by GOM and GEF.

***Policy & institutional capacity dimensions of sustainability****.*

Institutional capacity, in the form of systems, structures, staff and expertise, is also critical to sustainability of benefits from UNDP’s contributions. UNDP’s work under the Environment Programme has emphasized strengthening policy and regulatory frameworks as well as institutional capacity to support the continuation of benefits–all key elements of sustainability. In the Energy Efficiency portfolio example, sustainability perspectives are good due to the combination of good design, relevance to national priorities and clear policy linkages. These will help energy consumers reduce their energy costs, and they are likely to continue their efforts beyond the project’s end. The legal and policy framework has been developed, but institutional gaps may affect sustainability if the Energy Efficiency Management Office is not fully operational. Although the main emphasis of the current CP was on capacity building, the evaluators found it difficult to assess the level of capacity built during the Programme due to the absence of good indicators and monitoring plan.

***Management arrangements***

UNDP’s management structures and working methods are also appropriate and likely to be effective in achieving the outcomes. Each of the projects under the Environmental Programme contains elements seeking to strengthen institutional capacity. In nearly all projects, UNDP is applying the national execution (NEX) modality. Most projects are nationally executed because government is responsible for the implementation of the project and gains experience in managing and overseeing projects at the international standard. NEX maximizes this learning; it is an excellent approach that builds capacity in environmental protection and natural resource management. How specifically it does this is an interesting question to pursue more deeply in the future.

As already mentioned in the section on programme design, the approach to capacity strengthening and management structures places responsibility of implementing projects with the respective government partner. UNDP’s methods are sufficiently flexible with risk management as the guiding principle as opposed to risk adverse. It is important that in a country context such as Mauritius, where there is a limited number of professionals with the relevant environmental expertise and experience, some projects will be staffed by people from outside of government; others are staffed by people on leave from government. This approach has been very productive, positively contributing to achievements of outcome around improved environmental management through a “learning while doing” process, increasing project ownership and ultimately sustainability. UNDP’s national execution approach is thus well suited for Mauritius’s development situation. Nonetheless, it needs to ensure quality control of management and working methods under the different outcomes.

Just as with resource mobilization, UNDP’s partnership strategy for the environmental field is not a written document. Rather it is evident in the portfolio of projects and partners leading those and co-funding projects. With respect to government, the partnership strategy focuses mainly on the Ministry of Environment and, to a lesser extent, on the Ministry of Public Utilities. Partnering with ministries outside the traditional environment field would enhance sustainability of the outcome, particularly when the partner has a demonstrated commitment to the relevant sector. Improving environmental management in Mauritius over the long term will require work with different ministries in various sectors not traditionally considered “environmental.” MOE currently has limited capacity to convert the results of the projects into structural long-term effects which affect institutions beyond their own ministry. As the ministry has limited capacities to coordinate environmental affairs on an inter-ministerial level and to mainstream environmental concerns into other ministries’ work, UNDP may take a decision to diversify the circle of beneficiaries to increase sustainability.

***Political***

The political commitment at national level for MID creates a good enabling environment for the projects initiated under this CP. UNDP is positioned to strategically support national planning concerning the MID concept and must continue its activities and be present through this critical period.

# Partnerships

Given the results-based approach UNDP has adopted towards programming, monitoring and evaluation, the importance of involving a diversity of actors in the development progress is recognized. The aim of a partnership strategy is to attempt to achieve the outcomes together and ensure efficiency and sustainability.

*Government Partnerships*

UNDP’s relations with government are focused on projects, and in general the team observed that the partnerships with government are strong (interviews with NPDs and Chairman of MID Commission). UNDP has successfully partnered with the key relevant ministries for the different projects, such as Environment and Public Utilities. The existing environment directly involves six different ministries/national institutions, including the MOE, MPU, MOA, MOI, MOH and RRA. The partnership strategy is important for improving environmental protection in Mauritius over the long-term and. has influenced the efficiency of UNDP initiatives through cost-sharing measures and complementary activities. Respondents generally perceive UNDP as a responsive and accessible partner. One respondent described UNDP as the most accessible of donor agencies (interview with NPD Mr. Soonarane). Providing access to GEF funds is a recognized strength, as is UNDP’s overall flexibility. UNDP enjoys a sound reputation among the national institutional stakeholders which facilitates project design and implementation. Among other things, this fact stems from the perception of UNDP as a neutral body with an exclusive goal of and interest in supporting the national agenda. The project on Sustainable Management of POPs in Mauritius, for example, has been an opportunity from government to decontaminate other sites. An additional co-finance leveraged from the government’s sources is USD $600,000. The national implementation mechanism is also favorable to most national stakeholders.

Partnership building and inter-sectoral planning is an important valued added of UNDP support, and in several cases ministries have expanded their partner networks and working modalities through the projects. At the national level, UNDP has brought in different partners through project steering committees and others, according to the needs of the various projects. In addition, UNDP plays a role in coordinating development activities through its membership in different projects' steering committees. Communication gaps have occurred, however, during project design, such as the AAP and the standard designs of buildings (Evaluation interviews with project stakeholders). Therefore, it is recommended that the participatory planning and inter-sectoral approach be strengthened during project design.

*Donor Partnerships*

The UNDP Environment has successfully established constructive linkages to donors. In the project on Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation in Buildings, it obtained co-funding of USD $100,000 from AgenceFrançaise de Dévéloppement (AFD). AFD can be a strategic alliance as they have very similar interests and relations in government. Altogether, this significant partnership with other donors needs to be strengthened and coordinated.

*Local Partnerships*

Partnerships with private sector and CSOs are happening through consultative workshops and steering committee meetings, but it would be better for the PMU team to develop a strategy for engagement. In the project on sustainable management of POPs, an NGO (APEXHOM) has been given the responsibility of instituting a “Responsible Care” programme, while under the AAP Climate adaptation project, four demonstration activities (sea cucumber culture, coral farming, provisions of sea sensors and staff and support to GEF/UNDP SGP) are due to start by early next year with the collaboration of CSOs. Private sector involvement is mainly through consultative workshops and training; there could be more active involvement, especially through the Energy Efficiency Project. Project designs in the future need to further encourage and facilitate the active and meaningful involvement of civil society in project activities. The SEMPA has been working with the International Organization for Migration (IOM) for the development of alternative income generating activities for the fisher community. The IOM has provided human resources through interns for the conducting of the survey within the SEMPA community with a view to identify key issues and review of the socio economic conditions that prevail in this community.

*Internal Partnerships*

Within UNDP there are few incentives for programmes to work together on common initiatives. Internal collaboration is ad hoc and influenced more by personal initiative than office practice. Each thematic programme within UNDP has its own budget and performance targets, according to staff. There are missed opportunities for knowledge management and joint programming and implementation. The Small Grants Programme (SGP) and UN coordination are willing to play a partnership role in enhancing civil society linkages and local governance work and involving other UN agencies. All this above can be considered at the programme/project design stage.

*Conclusions*

As noted above, UNDP is held in high regard by partners, who feel that there is a common appreciation of problems and needs, as well as an atmosphere of mutual support. In some cases the partnerships have been manifested in joint funding and in the implementation of joint project activities. However, the team is not aware of any joint monitoring or joint evaluations of projects apart from those carried out by UNDP and government agencies through the respective national steering committees. A good indicator of a “mature” partnership strategy for UNDP will be the extent of joint monitoring and evaluation that it carries out with its partners.

# Conclusions and Lessons Learned

The evaluation team has rated the Environment Programme as **satisfactory overall** with potential for a higher level of achievement by the end of 2012. The thematic portfolio is strategic, demonstrating a good focus on energy efficiency, climate adaptation and sustainable land management. UNDP´s main contributions are in capacity building, policy development and partnership building. The portfolio and management has been very responsive to the enabling environment and to expected CP outcomes. UNDP has positioned itself strategically around very relevant environment and energy themes to support National Development Planning and the MID project in the future. UNDP´s main contributions are in capacity building and policy development, partnership building, and innovative pilot initiatives that are relevant, inform policy and are replicable on a wider scale.

Government stakeholders value working with UNDP, and there is still demand for UNDP in Mauritius. Lobbying, however, is urgently needed at the highest level concerning the added value of UNDP services.

Project management training should be built into the projects in order to strengthen PSC coordination and planning knowledge so that the members learn both their role and simple overlooked management principles such as how to run good meetings, have improved communication skills and procure what is necessary.

Within the programme there are cross-project linkages that can be exploited to raise the scale and depth of impact*.* Better coordination, monitoring and communication among Project Managers and Project Steering Committee as well as government staff responsible for the functions related to the outcomes will facilitate these linkages. Recurrent delays in project start-up undermine linkages and lower programme delivery; this could lead to missed opportunities for influencing policy levels.

The limited availability of qualified environmental expertise affects the region and COs are competing over candidates to form project teams. This is an issue that needs to be considered at a regional organizational level, and alternatives should be explored that improve access or broaden the range of environmental expertise available for national projects.

# Recommendations

The overarching recommendations below arise directly from the analysis described above and seek to provide directions concerning how the Environment Programme can effectively continue to support government and civil society in improving national and sub-national environmental and energy management efforts. The specific recommendation arising from each level of analysis is provided (Annex 1). The specific recommendations provided can be addressed (or not) in a management response to the evaluation based on what is feasible.

**UNDP CO should devote the remainder of the programme cycle to consolidating its current environment project portfolio.**

Recurrent problems that affect project implementation, such as extended contracting delays caused by the limited availability of qualified environmental expertise and procurement processes, need to be analyzed and alternatives considered in collaboration with government. Some of these constraints are systemic and outside the control of Country Office; others reflect externalities that affect UNDP projects across the region and need to be addressed at a higher organizational level. For example, GEF or JICA could consider options such as consultant rosters and referrals and the rotation and cost sharing of specialized expertise among regional projects addressing common issues. Internally, due to workloads and staffing constraints, there is limited capacity within the Country Office to provide in-depth monitoring or implement knowledge management processes.

The combination of factors raises the workload and transactional costs needed to build the environment portfolio on a project-by-project basis. The focus should be on catalytic, high-return interventions that build on current support initiatives in energy efficiency, sustainable land management and climate change adaptation. Selective follow-up support may be needed to maximize the impact, demonstration value and policy effect of current initiatives. UNDP can make a difference by earmarking “soft support” to document/disseminate case studies and inform and upstream successful pilot experiences, etc. For example, the inclusion of energy audits and efficiency improvements for government buildings/schools/universities and brokering public/private partnerships that raise energy efficiency and cost savings will help in the dissemination of best practices.

**Cross-project linkages and synergies should be nurtured to raise cumulative programme impact.** Once the project is underway, the programme should provide better coordination between the projects in its portfolio, create synergies and achieve economies of scale. For example, there are synergies that could be developed between the climate change adaptation project and the integrated vector control output under the sustainable management of POPs project**.** Better coordination and communication among Project Managers will enable this.

**Adaptation to climate change provides an overarching conceptual framework that can be used to better align UNDP’s support for energy efficiency, environmental management and advocacy/public awareness.**

Projects that support sustainable land use, energy efficiency and renewable energy share a common link (explicitly or implicitly) to climate change adaptation. This offers a substantive entry point for aligning future environment efforts that could expand partnership and funding opportunities.

**There is a real need for SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Realistic and Time-bound) programme-level indicators** to “indicate” success in UNDP’s and government’s capacity-building efforts. Indicators play an important role in defining the objective or outcome so it is more tangible/measurable. This makes measuring progress towards achieving the outcome much easier and more objective. It is useful to have a CP outcome statement through a bottom-up approach and which does not necessarily have to fit in the corporate strategy of UNDP. There should be more flexibility in designing the next CP outcomes.

**CP programme monitoring must be strengthened.** The absence of a dedicated M&E specialist in the CO is found to be a major weakness. UNDP must engage an officer as soon as possible to support this critical function and begin to demonstrate the value added of relevant, effective and efficient delivery across CP outcomes.

**Use economic arguments to influence policy making.** It is critical for the programme to institute the economics of natural respice management and decision making. Environmental programmes must highlight the economic value of healthy ecosystems and their services and the heavy economic costs of degraded ecosystems and polluted air and water in Mauritius in order to marshal the necessary resources from government to address the problems. Project designs need to better capture market values of ecosystem services. UNDP would do well to consider training a staff member in these issues together with one or more staff members from the MOE.

**Project designs need to be more participatory in the ne**x**t CP** and involve core stakeholders including besides key ministries, the private sector, CSOs and other donors**.** SGP is willing to play a partnership role in enhancing civil society linkages and local governance work, and future GEF projects should include the SGP for innovative pilot approaches on the ground.

**Develop an Institutional capacity strengthening strategy** for programme work with government, CSOs and local institutions including universities. There should be focused capacity interventions, especially at the level of project steering committees. Link with universities and other organizations of higher learning for a long term capacity building approach. To help focus and strengthen these efforts, there is a need for good indicators to “indicate” success in UNDP’s and governments capacity-building efforts.

**Joint UNDP/MOE Programme level Monitoring.** Develop a monitoring system with MOE and other counterparts at programme level. Project managers should brief their counterpart Ministers on progress on a regular basis.

**Develop an EP Knowledge Management and Communication strategy.** This will support outreach and learning amongst to all stakeholders. The programme should consider how to more actively and proactively engage stakeholders and build partnerships using web-based tools, newsletters, etc**.** The website of the UNDP Environment Programme needs to be upgraded to better disseminate progress on the different projects.

**Provide strategic support to the MID process.** The Chairman of the MID Commission has requested support of UNDP to have a technical advisor on sustainable human development in the PMO. In the CO, the evaluation team felt that Natural Resources Management expertise would bring additional benefit to the next CP.

**Resource mobilization: F**ocus on expanding cost sharing with MOE significantly in the next CP**.** The benefits of working with UNDP be communicated to MOE, both from UNDP and from other government ministry staff based upon their own experiences with UNDP (testimonials). High level UNDP support is needed to make the case for UNDP value added.

**For the next CP**, move beyond to include a focus on enforcement and implementation. Examples include a focus on integrated resources management (such as water and solid waste), land use planning and sustainable design at the local level (such as eco-villages) and promoting energy efficiency in the entire economy.

………………………………………………………………………………………………………

# Annex 1–Specific Evaluation Recommendations –Efficiency, Effectiveness and Relevance

**Programme Design**

* *Engage experienced log frame facilitator to develop a smart resulted oriented programme design for next phase. Broaden the overarching outcome to be inclusive of capacity strengthening around sustainable development goals beyond the environemntal conventions. The specific indicators, must be well formulated and smarter;*
* *Institute principles based on lesson learned from the current phase in order to guide the next programme design: include capacity assessment exercises in all new project and sectors; use local level consultants such as environment and energy technicians and architects for planning.*
* *Engage the counterpart ministries into new country programme planning exercises and consider activities and modalities for strengthening their respective role for inter- sector coordination and knowledge management of enevreionmnal and energy outcome goals;*
* *Focus the next country programme outcomes on fewer sectors (more strategic and relevant).*

**Programme Governance /Management / Implementation**

*Programme Level*

*Training – (Programme Management Unit (PMU) initiates)*

* *Initiate a series of programme level learning exercises to strengthen the capacities and abilities of the project managers, government counterparts and PSCs members to undertake environmental and or energy oversight and training functions including; results based management, enterprise risk management, projects proposal writing, persuasive memos and case studies writing, time management, gender analysis, capacity assessment and risk management.’*
* *Undertake training on public procurement;*
* *Develop capacity strengthening, communications and knowledge management strategies;*
* *Develop several options for solving the procurement issue and discuss with government and core stakeholders in planning meetings for the next CP;*

*Strategy Development and Knowledge Sharing*

* *Develop strategies for monitoring and evaluation, knowledge management and communications linked to programme and project level monitoring.*
* *Facilitate greater cross project and sector learning and knowledge sharing between stakeholders on environment, energy and climate related issues.*

*Staffing*

* *If feasible, hire a monitoring and evaluation officer at programme level to address the gaps identified in monitoring, evaluation, communications and knowledge management;*
* *Engage short term procurement support with the intention to strengthen capacity within sectors/ ministries/councils;*

*Project level*

* *Individual Project Managers begin meeting regularly with their respective sector counterparts and /or with relevant decision makers to raise awareness of their work strengthen capacity and instill ownership regarding the project deliverables.*

**Recommendations for improving Outcomes**

**Outcome 1: Capacities for sustainable land management are built in the appropriate government and civil society institutions/user groups and mainstreamed into government planning**.

*Sub-Outcome 1 – Capacities for sustainable land management are built in the appropriate government and civil society institutions/user groups and mainstreamed into government planning*

* *Undertake exercises building on integrated land and water management approaches , knowledge management and coordination around Sustainable Land Management goals; include key stakeholder ministries beyond Forestry, i.e the Ministries of Environment MOE and the Rodriguez Regional council ;*
* *Consider activities building on lessons from this project for institutionalizing Strategic Environmental Assessment SEA in national development planning.*
* *Consider activities and trainings for instituting cost benefit analysis (PES), as a modality in all projects (like EIS).*
* *Conduct the outstanding final evaluation of this project as an opportunity to build in synergies with other project s and address the sustainability issues; initiate a cross-sector debriefing discussion on SLM outcomes among all stakeholders, including MOE;*

*Sub-outcome 2- Enabling policy and institutional framework for sustainably co-managed marine and terrestrial protected areas through public-private partnership to be developed.*

* *Continue programme work on MPA in RRA; the current work with the regional council is strategic. The advisor already on board is credible and if possible can be extended for a period.*
* *Consider activities to develop concrete linkages to the SIDPA project*
* *Promote local innovation and alternative livelihoods as this aspect must be further strengthened, scaled and documented: Documentation of the project innovations must occur in a way that can be preserved and shared.*
* *Engage local hotel operators and local government in project activities and learning’s in order to reinforce the alternative livelihoods activities.*
* *Apply cost benefit analysis as a tool for natural resource management NRM at RRA.*
* *Extend focus of project – marine to land – water shed and forests for integrated planning- sustainable land management concept*
* *Strategic Environmental Assessment SEA goes beyond environmental impact assessment. Institute SEA within the business of planning and development of RRA.*

*Sub-outcome 3 – Long-term sustainability of living resources of two Large Marine Ecosystems ensured through ecosystem-based approach to management of the Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystem (ASCLME)*

* *Develop a mechanism to strengthen national capacity building and provide greater visibility of the projects achievements nationally, strengthen cross-sector linkages and knowledge sharing and improve national public awareness about project activities and results;*
* *Improve the national capacity strengthening objective: the understanding of ecosystem services as it is related to trans-boundary ecosystem management and visibility of the initiatives by ensuring that all the learning and technology developed is shared between project stakeholders and can influence the wider decision-making processes in Mauritius;*
* *Set up a national inter-sectoral committee involving national stakeholders and decision makers to follow up on project developments and achievement.*

*Sub-outcome -MID*

* *Finance a sustainable human development advisor to engage with the MID process ASAP.*

*Sub-outcome – CDM*

* *The Kyoto Protocol will most probably end next year and the relevance of doing capacity building on CDM is pertinent. Moreover, there is a need to investigate other carbon financing mechanisms and a strategy needs to be put in place. As a SIDS, Mauritius has limited CDM project development potential and as such, cannot expect a lot of projects to process every year. However, there is a stated long-term energy strategy of achieving 35% of energy self-sufficiency in terms of electricity supply through the use of renewable sources of energy by 2025.Therefore, there should be potential for carbon financing in the future*.

**Outcome 2 - Capacities for management of persistent organic pollutants, mainstreaming climate change adaptation strategies and integrating energy conservation into policy and programme development enhanced at country level.**

*Sub-outcome 1: Revised national legislation alignment with Stockholm Convention*

* *Piloting the IVM strategy should be properly documented with evidence and recommendations on decentralization approaches, and submitted to the Government..*
* *The results of the responsible care Programme component are important to serve to lay the groundwork in identifying capacity needs with respect to sound management of chemicals on the island. This should be shared with government and followed up.*

*Sub-Outcome 2: Energy Efficiency market developed*

* *Funding allocated to EEMO for its sustainability and for capacity building of the core technical staffs. The recruitment of a highly competent person to head the EEMO and support staff for the prompt implementation of this project is needed and critical.*
* *The project still lacks a communication plan. Employing the services of a communication consultant at the UNDP office will help showcase the lessons learned/ achievements met under the project. Special emphasis should be taken in targeted campaign for the project results.*
* *More awareness on energy efficiency is linked to real business cases. Awareness-raising for design of residential buildings is important through well-prepared communication campaigns and guidelines.*
* *Improve Training methods. Although theoretical training was delivered to stakeholders, the training methodology needs improving. Given the busy schedules of the stakeholders, half day sessions spread over a longer period given the technical nature of the subject instead of a 5 day workshop setting would be more appropriate. Exploration of comprehensive support from the twinning partners should be also explored, so that audits or designing can be carried out on a government building or another building for the purpose of providing members with very practical hands-on training at all stages of the process.*
* *There is room for improvement in the monitoring and evaluation of especially the outcomes and outputs. The project should put in place a mechanism for measuring the CO2 emission reductions resulting from energy savings as a result of the interventions of the project. This needs to start with having quantifiable baseline data for all the indicators.*

*Sub-outcome 3 - Capacity strengthened and adaptation measures integrated into tourism development and coastal zone management*

* *There is an urgent need to accelerate internal issues surrounding procurement and recruitment and prioritise activities in the coming months. The midterm outcome evaluation should be done urgently to review the design and maximize impact next year; Quick wins should be identified that can benefit the project over the last year of the Programme*
* *Emphasis should be put in the last year of implementation on a professional development Programme to create champions within the leaders of the technical working groups who represent different sectors thereby ensuring the overall long-term sustainability of the AAP once the Programme has ended. There is a clear need to define the exit strategy once the Programme has ended. This could include documentation of best practices, and fully develop the capacity of the climate champions.*
* *Knowledge management need to be strengthened in the last year of implementation. The focus should be given to the dissemination of policy-oriented research. And knowledge products on mainstreaming climate change into development such as: guidance documents for the integration of climate change in the school curricula, a tertiary education Programmes, communication strategies, sharing of experiences on climate change adaptation among the 20 AAP countries.*
* *As a regional project , all countries are facing the same issues. Coordination at the regional level is needed. One of the implementers of the AAP is the Inter-Regional Technical Support Component (IRTSC) that provides Inter-regional technical expertise and capacity development support to the 20 countries. The IRTSC responds to national project needs but is not responsible for their implementation. Due to the high number of consultancy services required, the Project Team could access to a roaster of experts prepared by the IRTSC.*
* *UNDP COs Management’s proactive leadership and M&E will be an essential factor for AAP success in the coming year.*
* *Such a complex and multidisciplinary project requiring inter-sectoral collaboration necessitates a PMU team with good project management, communication and negotiation skills.*

# 

# Annex 2–Terms of Reference (TOR)

**Terms of Reference**

**Outcome Evaluation Mission**

**Outcome Evaluation Title**: Evaluation of the environment component in the UNDP Country Programme 2009 – 2011 with extension 2012.

**Duty Station:** UNDP Mauritius

**Duration of Appointment**: 24 working days

**Expected Starting Date**: end of July 2011

1. **Purpose of the Evaluation**.

The annexed Evaluation Plan for Mauritius outlines what is to be evaluated during the current UNDP Country Programme which runs from 2009-2011 with extension to December 2012.

In order to enable the preparation of the next country programme document, the Country office has decided to carry out the Outcome Evaluation for the Environment Unit ahead of schedule. Therefore, UNDP Mauritius will commission an outcome evaluation with regard to Evaluation of the Environmental protection component of the Country Programme 2009-2012, as it is in its third year, with a view to putting into practice the lessons learned for the next Country Programme formulation and to provide adequate programme coverage to help UNDP Mauritius better manage for results.

The evaluation results will be used by the UNDP Country Office Management and by the Government Implementing Partners while formulating the next Country Programme 2013-2015

Annex 1: Evaluation Plan for Mauritius

1. **Description of the environmental, social, economic and political context.**

Mauritius is party to the United Nations Small Island Developing States (SIDS) programme and the Barbados Programme of Action on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States. These nations share common socio-economic and environmental issues and concerns that are unique to small islands. The concerns of SIDS were recognised by the international community when it agreed to Chapter 17 of Agenda 21 during the Earth Summit in 1992, which notes that SIDS face special challenges in planning for sustainable development and agreed to a Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States. The conference took place in Barbados in 1994 and adopted the Barbados Programme of Action, the principal international framework for addressing the special challenges and constraints faced by SIDS in their implementation of sustainable development. In the Plan of Implementation adopted at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) (Johannesburg, August/September 2002), a recommendation was made that "a full and comprehensive review of the implementation of the Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States takes place in 2004.

The IM took place in Mauritius in January 2005 and undertook a full and comprehensive review of the implementation of the Programme of Action. The review sought a renewed political commitment by all countries to the Programme of Action and focused on practical and pragmatic actions for its further implementation, inter alia, through the mobilization of resources and assistance for SIDS. (See: SIDS International Meeting)

In line with its consistent commitment to sustainable development, the Government of Mauritius has pledged to undertake various sustainable reforms in all its spheres, from environment, health, education and economy to socio-cultural uplifting. Prime Minister Ramgoolam’s vision for achieving this was given effect through allocations in the 2008/2009 budget. The Honourable. Ramakrishna Sithanen, Vice-Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Economic Empowerment, stated in his budget speech, “We will build a green future for Mauritius through the Maurice Ile Durable vision of the Prime Minister, and shift to local renewable sources of energy away from imported fossil fuel.”

The aim of the Maurice Ile Durable (MID) programme is to move Mauritius along a sustainable trajectory and into a green future. This embraces concepts of becoming self-sustaining. Towards this end, the government has set up the Rs 1.3 billion (approximately US$ 39 million) Maurice Ile Durable Fund to be utilized over the period 2008-2011, representing about 0.2% of the GDP of Mauritius. The fund will mobilize resources from taxes, government subsidies, development partners, carbon credits and the private sector, including the introduction of carbon footprint offsets in the aviation sector.

Mauritius is unique in sub-Saharan Africa, and unlike most other West Indian Ocean SIDSs, in that it has a low poverty ratio and a robust economy rooted in manufacturing, trade and business activity. It enjoys high rainfall even in the driest areas. The greatest threats to economic and environmental sustainability lay in its dependence on oil and petroleum-based energy, the extensive transformation of natural habitats and the degradation of 43% of its land resource due to extensive monoculture practice, primarily sugar. These threats are large-scale, multi-sectoral and pervasive in their reach and tenacity, and they cannot be addressed in a piecemeal fashion.

75 to 80 percent of the island’s energy requirements are serviced by imported fossil fuel products. Mauritius’ island status means that it has no potential for interconnection with neighbouring electricity grids. This has encouraged the government to look to local and renewable energy sources. Privately owned co-generation coal and bagasse (the pulp residue from cane sugar extraction) power plants were set up under the Bagasse Energy Development Programme. Hydro-electric generation is used to supplement the grid, and research is being conducted on power generation using wind and sea energy and an extension of the programme that supports solar power generation for households.

Statistics on land use from 2005 show that only 25% of Mauritius’ land asset remains untransformed in the form of forests, scrubs and grazing lands. Initial deforestation and the later conversion to wide-scale and intensive agriculture has resulted in 43% of the island’s surface area being used for cultivation, of which almost 99% is sugar cane, the balance being tea and tobacco. Abandoned cane fields make up a further additional 3% of land cover. Built-up areas and infrastructure account for 27% of land use, and much of this is focused on the coast, with discharges impacting on water quality of coastal wetlands and marine waters. Shoreline structures have impeded long shore sedimentation processes resulting in erosion of beaches, which is impacting on the tourism industry. Total land under protection (including private reserves) in 2007 was just less than 15,000 hectares (8% of surface area).

Despite its robust economy, the nation’s HDI is on a par with a country that has a much lower per capita GDP. The HDI, as an aggregate index, masks disparities within countries. It is therefore possible that a country may perform well in the aggregate HDI even if its people experience large disparities in opportunities, as in the case of Mauritius. Over the past four decades, Mauritius has achieved remarkable progress with sustained economic growth and significant improvement in the standard of living. Annual rates of growth have averaged over 5% and per capita income is now almost US$7,000. Mauritius has successfully diversified its economic activities, particularly in agriculture, manufacturing, tourism and financial and business services. Life expectancy at birth, adult literacy and income distribution have improved significantly to surpass average levels for upper middle-income countries. It ranks among the top performing economies on many fronts.

In 2009, Mauritius was ranked:

* 1st in Mo Ibrahim classification of good governance among 57 African countries;
* 17th out of 183 countries (Previous ranking: 2008-29th, 2007-49th ), and to 1st position among sub-Saharan African countries, in the World Bank Doing Business Index;
* 57th out of 132 countries “In Achieving Global Competitiveness” (World Economic Forum);
* 72nd out of 169 countries in the UNDP Human Development Index (HDI).

In September 2008, GDP growth forecast for the fiscal year 2008/09 was 6.2 percent. However, during the budget speech last May, the Ministry of Finance and Economic Empowerment (MOFEE) predicted growth in the range of 2 to 2.2 percent. This estimate has remained stable and credible since then. The fast pace in which expected growth performance for 2009 deteriorated in Mauritius is commensurate with developments across the globe. Between October 2008 and May 2009, real GDP growth forecasts plunged as a reflection of the severe synchronized economic downturn all countries are now facing.

In 2010, government expected the deficit to remain at about 5%. However, given the low level of total fiscal revenues in Mauritius (22.9% in 2008), high levels of current expenditure (23.6% in 2008) and ambitious public investment programme, there are clear downside risks to the fiscal deficit.

**Reform Framework**

Despite being a small remote island, Mauritius was able to escape grim development prospects over the last 40 years. Between 1968 and 2009, Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita grew from US$260 to almost US$7,000.

**I**n the mid-1990s, a new vision began taking shape in Mauritius of a higher value added, more diversified, skill- and knowledge-intensive economy. To realize this, planners recognized they would need to invest massively in human capital and infrastructure, make better use of advanced technologies and reform the regulatory environment to harness the creativity of the private sector. Yet, little was achieved in these areas during the decade which followed. Instead, trend growth slowed as new sectors failed to generate hoped for levels of output and employment while traditional ones lost ground to increasing competition in their export markets. The miracle years of the 1980s receded into history.

In July 2005, Mauritians went to the polls. With the “triple trade shock”–eroding textiles and sugar preferences and rising energy prices–exacerbating the longer term decline, they were in an uncharacteristically pessimistic mood. The outcome of the election was a new government with a strong reformist platform that touched on virtually every facet of economic and social policy. In the economic sphere, the Finance Minister urged the need to halt the slide in performance by raising competitiveness, promoting higher value added exports, investing in infrastructure and education and reforming industrial relations. These were well rehearsed themes, but it soon became apparent they did not portend business as usual. The new government immediately set to work on an ambitious and comprehensive structural reform program intended to raise the efficiency of the private sector and modernize the public sector for a post-regulatory world.

Since 2006, government has been implementing a comprehensive 10-year economic reform programme based on four pillars, namely: 1) fiscal consolidation and improving public sector efficiency; 2) enhancing trade competitiveness; 3) improving the investment climate; and 4)widening the circle of opportunities. These reforms are embodied in a 3-year Performance-Based Budget (PBB) introduced in the 2008/09 budget and have helped in reversing the declining trend in economic performance and strengthened the resilience of the economy.

1. **Description of the subject of the evaluation**

The 2009-2011 programme and the intended results of the annexed Country Programme for the Republic of Mauritius 2009-2011, outlines the objectives, baseline, indicators for the environment programme, which is split into two focus areas and constitutes the baseline for the carrying out of the outcome evaluation. The Results and Resources Framework for the 2009-2011 mentioned that the country programme outcomes and indicators are as described below.

**Country Programme Outcomes:**

National capacities of key institutions to implement global environmental commitments at national and regional levels through integration of environmental concerns in national policies and programmes improved.

Baseline: Limited capacity and tools to integrate global and regional environmental obligations into national development policies and programmes and lack of framework for accessing carbon finance.

Target: Capacities of institutions and appropriate tools developed, facilitating the integration of international and regional environmental obligations into national policies, strategies and programmes.

Indicators: 10% improvement reflected in the environmental indicators for Mauritius by 2010 in the various states of environment reports prepared as part of the Conventions Obligations and framework for CDM to be developed and operational by end 2010.

Objective: Capacities for management of persistent organic pollutants, mainstreaming climate change adaptation strategies and integrating energy conservation into policy and programme development enhanced at country level.

Baseline: Climate change adaptation measures and energy efficiency concerns are not integrated and national development strategies.

Target: Build local capacity to mainstream climate change issues into national development programmes.

**Indicators:** National Adaptation Plan implemented. Energy efficiency regulations implemented by end 2011.

Annex 2: Country Programme for the Republic of Mauritius (2009-2011)

Annex 3: UNDP strategic Plan 2008-2011

UNDP Corporate has a system of RBMS (Results-Based Management System) which requires linking individual projects to outcomes in a programme, based on the above-mentioned strategic plan.

1. **Evaluation objectives and scope.**

The Environment Programme consists of a number of projects at various stages of implementation. The local and regional projects listed below are those which have been running for the past 3 to 1.5 years and therefore expected to result in some initial outcomes.

Local Projects

* GEF Funded Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency
* GEF Funded Sustainable Land Management
* GEF/GoM Funded Marine Protected Areas
* JICA funded Climate Change Adaptation
* GEF Funded Sustainable Management of POPs
* Maurice Ile Durable Support Project

Regional Projects

* CDM Regional project
* Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystems

Four GEF funded projects (POPS, Energy Efficiency, SLM, MPA and ASCLME) will come to an end in 2012 after almost 4-5 years of implementation. In addition, some projects are midway and expect to be evaluated, e.g. JICA funded Climate Change Adaptation project. Some new projects are also starting, such as the Regional Integrated Water Management Resources project and the Removal of Barriers to Solar PV Power Generation projects. Follow-on projects are planned starting in 2013 under the mandate of a newly formulated Country Programme 2013-2015 for the Republic of Mauritius.

This evaluation is an **end of programme cycle evaluation** for the following purpose and with the following objectives in mind:

1. To evaluate the impact of the implementation of the environment programme as per the original country programme outcome and related country programme output, with particular focus on the sustainability and cost effectiveness of the key interventions to date;
2. To provide useful lessons learned for follow-up interventions during the current programme’s extension year until 31 December 2012 and for formulation of the next country programme 2013-2015, in particular to generate knowledge about good practices, lesson learned and weaknesses of the programme/project;
3. To examine how well needs of different groups supported were met by the programme/projects;
4. Examine how institutional and operational arrangements supported the implementation of the programme.

Key areas of the evaluation are as follows:

1. Projects design/assumptions made on the onset and realities faced over the projects’ timeframe;
2. Relationship with other UNDP projects and contribution towards the Country Programme Outcomes concerned with the environment sector;
3. Areas of best potential success for further support;
4. Coordination of stakeholders;
5. Assess impact of the projects.

Key areas of the evaluation are as follows:

1. **Evaluation questions**

The following questions need to be addressed:

* Have the right things been done? Were the outcome and associated programme/projects relevant, appropriate and strategic to national goals and the UNDP mandate?
* Were impacts and outcomes achieved as planned?
* Are the results sustainable? Will the outputs and outcomes lead to benefits beyond the life of the existing programme/project?
* How might we do things better in the future? Which findings may have relevance for future programming or for other similar initiatives elsewhere?

1. **Methodology (elements of an approach)**

According to the previously mentioned purpose and objectives of the outcome evaluation and based upon the established indicators, baseline information and specific targets, the methodology should describe:

* Review of all major documents including project document, revisions, monitoring and progress reports (see attached list and web link);
* Interviews with key informants;
* Stakeholder consultations/interviews;
* Whether and how the evaluation was considered in programme/project design;
* Details of the outcome and outputs indicators that have been proposed/used to measure performance, with associated baseline and target data;
* Information on whether monitoring has actually taken place and whether it has produced critical data for management purposes;
* Strengths and weaknesses of the original M & E design and the quality of data that have been generated;
* Availability of relevant global, regional, national data;
* Availability of complementary data (from similar programmes/projects).

1. **Management of the Outcome Evaluation and Expected Deliverables.**

The overall responsibility for managing the outcome evaluation will be with the UNDP Country Office Outcome Evaluation Team, in particular the Senior Programme Manager and the other officers/associate/assistant of the project, under the guidance of the UNDP Resident Representative.

The Country Office Evaluation Team will provide assistance in identifying consultants, participate in briefing and debriefing processes for the evaluation team, provide comments on the draft report and clear the final report before evaluation is completed. The CO Evaluation Team will also facilitate contact to key partners in the country, such as other in-country partners as required.

A presentation of the key findings of the evaluation will be made at a meeting at the UNDP premises, including stakeholders, some selected implementing partners and government.

The detailed time line and key outputs, i.e. draft report, the final report and presentations that are expected from the evaluators, are spelt out under the Chapter 9 “Plan for Evaluation Implementation.”

Guidance on the structure of a UNDP evaluation report (expected format) and a quality control checklist for its content have been developed by UNDP Headquarters and are herewith annexed.

Annex 4: Evaluation Report Format

Annex 5: Quality criteria

Annex 6: Guidelines for Outcome Evaluations

1. **Composition, Skills and Experience of the evaluation team.**

It is anticipated that the outcome evaluation team will comprise the following:

**One International consultant (team leader)**

The team leader is responsible for the quality of the final evaluation. (S) He will author the final evaluation report and lead the evaluation team through the implementation of the evaluation methodology.

The development of the evaluation tools and strategies will be of primary importance. The team leader will develop the evaluation questions in consultation with the UNDP Outcome Evaluation Team.

**One national consultant**

The national consultant will give specific insights of the Mauritius Public Service and the interaction between government, private sector and other partners. (S) He will be key in interpreting Mauritian culture to ensure that findings are clear and sound. (S)he will take lead in facilitating organizational capacity reflection focus group among the project partners in order to understand progress that has been made since programme/project inception.

The UNDP Outcome Evaluation Team and the Project Staff, the Project Management Units (PMUs) attached to the related project will facilitate administrative and logistical support to the consultants’ evaluation team and make sure that project partners and staff (PMUs) are available and participate in different meetings. It includes arranging meetings and transportation support as needed. Project staff and PMU teams could eventually collect project data in advance of the team’s arrival to facilitate time-effective analysis.

**The international consultant s**hould have a postgraduate degree in Environmental Sciences, Management or other related qualifications.

Work Experience:

* Five (5) years progressively responsible professional work experience at international levels in qualitative evaluations, particularly in the area of sustainable interventions;
* Proven working knowledge and experience in the environment field;
* Proven work experience in use of evaluation methods for identifying measurable target indicators;
* Strong conceptual, understanding and analytical skills on social, sector issues, as they link with poverty, gender, human rights and human development;
* Previous experience with UN agencies is an asset.

Skills:

* Strong leadership and planning skills;
* Excellent written and presentation skills (English);
* Strong communication skills;
* Ability to work in the multi-cultural team environment and to deliver under pressure/meet deadlines;
* Ability to network with partners on various levels;
* The necessary computer skills with competence in MS office package.

Language

Fluency in English language required;

Knowledge of French an asset.

**The national consultant** should have a postgraduate degree in Environment, Management or other related qualifications.

Work experience:

* Experience in conducting evaluation at a national level;
* Proven working knowledge and experience in the environment field;
* Previous experience with UN agencies an asset.

Skills:

* Strong leadership and planning skills;
* Excellent written and presentation skills (English);
* Strong communication skills;
* Ability to work in the multi-cultural team environment and to deliver under pressure/meet deadlines;
* Ability to network with partners at various levels;
* The necessary computer skills with competence in MS Word.

Language:

Fluency in English language required;

Knowledge of French and Creole languages.

1. Plan for Evaluation implementation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Activity | Estimated time | Key outputs |
| 1 | Preparation by consultants   * Review CP 20092011, project documents and progress reports * Other relevant literature   Preparation (by consultants)   * Briefing from UNDP Office * Prepare inception report * Agreement on activities and timeframes * Preparation of meetings/programme | 2 days  1 day  1 day | Familiarization with the projects (re. intended outcomes)  Agreement on timeframes and programme |
| 2 | Meetings and discussions with stakeholders   * Discussions with project teams (PMUs) * Field visits. This will include interviews and focus group discussions with various stakeholders. * Meetings with development partners including eventually project steering committees and other partners | 7 days | Document records of interviews and observations with stakeholders  Evaluate findings |
| 3 | Presentation of findings to stakeholders   * Hold a meeting with stakeholders including project steering committees, development partners, government and UN agencies to present preliminary findings and recommendations to collect feedback that will help finalize the report, give suggestions and get feedback * Incorporate feedback into findings | 3 days | Present findings to key stakeholders and create forum for participatory feedback |
| 4 | Writing Report   * Draft report and final report   Report should be:   * Analytical in nature (both quantitative and qualitative) * Structured around issues and related findings/lessons learned * Conclusions * Recommendations   Present draft form for review by UNDP CO | 5 days | * Draft report delivered to UNDP CO for consideration * Consideration should be given to producing a final report for public information and donors |
| 5 | Submission of Final Report | 3 days after presentation to UNDP CO | A report of maximum 25 pages in word document format with tables where appropriate will be submitted within four working days after the completion of the mission, incorporating comments made on the draft submitted to UNDP CO |
|  | Time allocated to the assignment | 24 days |  |

# Annex 3–Outcome: Operational CDM and voluntary carbon market framework developed

**Baseline:** Lack of National CDM strategy.

**Target:** Promotion of access to the carbon market, financing and technology.

**Indicator**: Three Carbon Credit projects prepared for submission to the MDG Carbon Finance by end 2010.

**1. Project Brief**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title** | CDM capacity building project for sub-Saharan Africa–Phase II |
| **Project Period** | July 2009-July 2012 |
| **Sources of Funding** | EEG TTF and the participating Country Offices. Additional funds will be sought from donors on an ongoing basis and will be incorporated into the project budget through budget revisions. |
| **Funding Volume** | Total resources required for the six participating countries: US$4 million |
| **Executing Agency** | Ministry of Environment, UNEP and UNDP |
| **Project Objectives** | Phase I of the UNDP-UNEP CDM capacity development project for sub-Saharan Africa ended in June 2009 and has successfully established the basic pre-conditions necessary for carbon finance to develop in the participating countries; Phase II will build on these pre-conditions to (a) permit the participating countries to focus on particular sectors or stakeholders considered to be strategic priorities by the host governments; and (b) to place greater emphasis on translating capacity building efforts into the development of CDM project pipelines in the host countries. Phase II will involve the same six participating countries as Phase I. There are three expected outputs:  **Output 1**: Development of early-stage Phase II National Work Plans  **Output 2**: Commencement of targeted Public Sector Capacity Development activities  **Output 3:** Commencement of targeted Private Sector Capacity Development activities |

# 

# Annex 4–Outcome: Revised national legislation alignment with Stockholm Convention (POPs)

**Baseline:** Stockholm Convention is not fully incorporated into national legislation.

**Target**: Compliance with Stockholm Convention by end 2009 and strengthen institutional capacities.

**Indicator**: Use of POPs chemical phased out by 2010.

**1. Project Brief**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title** | Sustainable Management of POPs in Mauritius |
| **Project Period** | January 2009-June 2012 |
| **Sources of Funding** | GEF  Government of Mauritius |
| **Funding Volume** | GEF USD 902,250  Allocated resources:  Govt of Mauritius USD 900,000  Other (co-financing) USD 30,000 |
| **Executing Agency** | Ministry of Environment. Ministry of Health and Quality of Life is also an important partner in this project. |
| **Project Objectives** | The overall objective of the projects is to provide assistance to Mauritius in the management of obsolete POPs chemicals and sites that are significantly contaminated by POPs. There are two main themes:  **Theme 1: Removal of POPs from the environment of Mauritius(disposal and decontamination);**  **Theme 2: Development of alternatives and integrated vector control strategies for malaria (preventing re-occurrence in the future).**  The specific outcomes of the project are: i)A suitable legal and enforcement structure to sustain the outcomes of the project in the future; ii)A comprehensive awareness and responsible care programme to make importers, distributors, users and the general public aware of the risks involved in the use of chemicals in general and POPs specifically; iii)An effective non-DDT based vector control programme that will limit the chance of importing malaria and outbreaks of malaria; iv)Removal and disposal of all obsolete POPs chemicals; v)Removal and disposal of the few remaining transformers that have PCB-containing oils that exceed international standards; vi)Remediation of all POPs contaminated sites that exceed internationally acceptable standards; vii) Enhancement of the ability to develop and implement alternative strategies for malaria vector management with the ultimate aim to eliminate future use of DDT. |

**2. Analysis of Outputs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 1: Removal of POPs from the environment of Mauritius(disposal and decontaminates)** | | |
| **Intended Outputs** | **Progress to Date** | **Comments** |
| **Output 1.1**  **Evaluation and Safeguarding** | All POPs contamination of soil and sludge has been properly identified across the country. The relevant disposal methods have been evaluated by assigned international and national consultants. The disposal sites and related transportation have been identified. The POPs stockpiles have been safeguarded. | Output has been achieved. The consultancies of international and national experts have been successful. |
| **Output 1.2**  **Disposal of obsolete POPs Inventories** | The disposal specifications have been developed and a hazardous waste management company has been contracted following UNDP bidding guidelines. In the bidding document that was issued, the international contractor was requested to team with a local contractor to carry out the POPs disposal activities in view of building local capacity. Disposal works are expected to be complete by end of year 2011. Around 100 tons of POPs wastes (DDT, other POPs pesticides in smaller quantities and PCB materials/equipment) would be disposed of under the contract. | Output will be achieved by early 2012. |
| **Output 1.3**  **Clean-up of POPs-contaminated Areas** | Clean-up specifications have been developed and the selection of a contractor finalized. The project will cater for the decontamination of one pilot site, namely Fort Georges. The Ministry of Health and Quality of Life (MoHQL) informed that they wish to proceed with decontaminating the additional sites under the same contract as that for the Fort George pilot site. The cost-sharing agreement has been signed by both the MoHQL and the UNDP and the additional co-finance leveraged from the government’s sources is USD 600,593.nDecontamination works are expected to be complete by early 2012. | Output will be achieved by early 2012. The project has also been an opportunity from government to decontaminate other sites. |
| **Output 1.4**  **Institution of a “Responsible Care” Programme** | APEXHOM has submitted a draft report on the training needs analysis and the proposed training syllabus. The number of participants for the MoHQL would be around 200. These would include insecticide sprayer men and general workers. The main objective is to raise awareness to all the staff that might come into contact with POPs, in case of an emergency. The training would be mainly on the safe use of DDT and other chemical insecticides, and in particular on the potential health hazards of exposure to POPs chemicals. APEXHOM has requested for the participation of resource persons for the training sessions. MoHQL have informed that all sprayer men had regular medical checkups and that to date no health problems related to DDT has been detected. The representative of APEXHOM has indicated that contamination was not by spraying but mainly through the food chain. She added that it was more of an environmental problem as DDT could contaminate the environment through bad practices (for preparation and clean up). | The collaboration of the Ministry of Health is crucial for the successful completion of this output |
| **Outcome 2: Develop alternatives and integrated vector control strategies for malaria (prevent re-occurrence in the future).** | | |
| **Intended Outputs** | **Progress to Date** | **Comments** |
| **Output 2.1**  **Continued need for DDT evaluated** | The “risk analysis of the re-emergence of vector-borne diseases in Mauritius” has been completed.Decision-making on the selection of insecticide for indoor residual spraying has been facilitated. The laboratory and small scale field trials on the efficacy of DDT and alternative insecticides have been completed. | The identification–through trials–of viable alternatives to DDT and substantial reduction in the annual consumption of DDT for preventive treatment can be seen as a breakthrough in IVM strategy application at the national level. It also helped identify a suitable DDT alternative to further strengthen the integrated vector management. |
| **Output 2.2**  **Decentralized capacity for surveillance** | A workshop was conducted on vector surveillance in the context of Integrated Vector Management (IVM) and representatives from the pilot villages (Triolet, Morc. St. André, St. Julien Village, and Bon Accueil) were present during the workshop. The report on the design of on-the-job training to establish mosquito surveillance in project districts was finalized and disseminated among project stakeholders. | Capacity building activities for vector control need to be sustained. |
| **Output 2. 3**  **Decentralized IVM strategy established** | A Vector Surveillance Committee has been established and meets regularly in the pilot villages | Activities will have to be sustained. |
| **Output 2.4**  **IVM demonstrated in pilot districts** | The VBCD conducted baseline studies on vector populations in all four pilot villages. The contract for the longitudinal impact study has been finalized and signed between the Ministry of Health & QL and the University of Mauritius. This study will help to assess the impact of the IVM strategy on vector incidence | Project is ongoing. |

# 

# Annex 5 - Outcome: Energy Efficiency market developed

**Baseline**: Limited investment in energy efficiency in buildings and no proper regulation and codes.

**Target**: GHG emissions reduced substantially through transformation of the energy efficiency market for existing and new building.

**Indicator**: 5 verified investment projects in energy efficiency measures in buildings being implemented by end 2011. Building regulations enacted and codes drafted and necessary legislation enacted by end 2010

**1. Project Brief**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title** | Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation in Buildings |
| **Project Period** | July 2008 – April 2012 |
| **Sources of Funding** | 1. Global Environment Facility (GEF)   2. Co-Funding by Agence Française de Dévéloppement (AFD) |
| **Funding Volume** | 1. GEF: USD 912,411 2. AFD: USD 100,000 |
| **Executing Agency** | Ministry of Energy & Public Utilities |
| **Project Objectives** | The project is intended to overcome barriers to energy efficiency in buildings in Mauritius and to reinforce the development of a market approach to improving residential and non-residential building energy efficiency in both existing stock and future buildings. The project tackles market barriers in all three areas of a building’s energy use: building fabric, equipment and people (behaviour).    The project comprises 5 main outcomes, focusing on :   * Policy (Outcome 1): Building regulations and codes for energy saving are developed, enacted and sustainably enforced * Functioning Markets (Outcome 2) : Demand and supply for energy saving services and technology stimulated * Awareness (Outcome 3 ): Building engineers, architects, compliance officers, policy makers, financial sector, suppliers and public are convinced of the importance and market opportunities for building energy saving * Monitoring & Evaluation (Outcome 4 ): Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation * Project Management (Outcome 5). |

**2. Analysis of Outputs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 1: Building regulations and codes for energy saving are developed, enacted and sustainably enforced.** | | | | |
| **Intended Outputs** | | **Progress to Date** | | **Comments** |
| **Output 1.1**  *Energy Efficiency Unit (EEU) established and functioning* | | •An Energy Efficiency Bill has been enacted in March 2011  •An Energy Efficiency Management Office (EEMO) has been set up within the legal framework of the new Energy Efficiency Act  •EEMO is partly functional with only one technical and two non-technical staffs. | | •Funding has to be allocated to EEMO for its sustainability and for capacity building of the core technical staffs.  •Recruitment of a highly competent person to head the EEMO and support staff for the prompt implementation of this project is critical. |
| **Output 1.2**  *Building regulations and codes developed and enacted* | | •Final drafts of a building control bill, energy efficiency building regulations, energy efficiency building code and compliance mechanisms have been submitted by the consultant. | | •The final draft of the Building Control Bill is being reviewed by the Ministry of Public Infrastructure before being sent to the cabinet and state law office for its eventual enactment in the Parliament.  •The final drafts of Energy Efficiency Building Regulations and Codes have to be refined by a technical committee to be set up at EEMO. These codes and regulations will be enforced upon enactment of the Building Control Bill. |
| **Output 1.3**  *Compliance enforcement capabilities of municipal building code enforcement*  *agencies reinforced* | | •Approximately 80 technical staff attended a training workshop conducted by the international consultant. | | As per the PM remarks, proper targeting of trainees to build their capabilities related to the new energy efficiency building regulations, code and compliance mechanisms is needed. |
| **Outcome 2: Demand and supply for energy saving services and technology stimulated.** | | | | |
| **Intended Outputs** | **Progress to Date** | | | **Comments** |
| **Output 2.1**  *National standard for energy audits and programme of certification of energy*  *auditors established* | •A Mauritius Building Energy Audit Tool (MBEAT) for non-residential buildings has been developed by the appointed consultant.  •52 Trainee Energy Auditors were shortlisted to follow a 5-day training course in energy auditing of non-residential buildings. 45 Energy Auditors (including 5 future trainers) have successfully completed the training course.  Report on the review of existing international standards for energy audits has been submitted by the consultant. | | | •The development and availability of the MBEAT software as a tool for practitioners is a commendable effort.  •To ensure a critical mass and have in-country ownership of the project, the capacity building of the certification body and accreditation body for the audit scheme will require additional funds.  •The challenge still remains that none of those trained has been certified later orwasable to carry out any verifiable audit on the ground. |
| **Output 2.2**  *Number of investment grade energy audits and feasibility studies through audit*  *scheme increased* | •The document for the Energy Audit Management Scheme and the report on contingent support mechanism are being drafted by the appointed consultant. | | | •Additional funds will be needed for the setting up and implementation of the energy audit scheme and for the interim certification of the initial batch of 45 trained auditors  •The envisaged delay in the implementation of the audit scheme as well as being able to get results would necessitate extension of the project period. |
| **Output 2. 3**  *Standard designs developed for low- and middle-income housing, schools and*  *other buildings needs to be developed and in use* | •The consultant has submitted final draft of design guidebooks for low- and middle-income dwellings, and for other targeted residential and non-residential buildings of <500 m.2 | | | •There is a challenge of making stakeholders agree with the draft design guidebooks. Involvement of a local architect may be necessary before eventual dissemination to the public.  •Since the energy efficiency guidelines, designs and plans specified in the guidebooks will not be mandatory, an effective awareness campaign and communication strategy need to be defined so that the general public will know about these standards. |
| **Output 2.4**  *Appliance selection and installation guidelines for key products available at points of sale* | The consultant has submitted the final draft report on the review of international energy performance standards and energy labeling of household electric appliances.10 priority household electric appliances have been identified for which voluntary or mandatory energy labeling will have to be done. Draft regulations have been prepared for the minimum energy performance standard (MEPS) and energy labeling of household room air conditioners. | | | * It’s commendable that 6 out of the 10 targeted appliances have Mauritian Standards (MS) already drafted. * The regulations being drafted by the Ministry of Energy & Public Utilities for the mandatory energy labeling and control of imports on air conditioners and refrigerators, based on the minimum energy performance standards of these two appliances is a move in the right direction. |
| **Outcome 3: Building engineers, architects, compliance officers, policymakers, financial sector, suppliers and public are convinced of importance and market opportunities for building energy savings.** | | | | |
| **Intended Outputs** | **Progress to Date** | | | **Comments** |
| **Output 3.1**  *Costs and benefits of building energy efficiency measures well known by service suppliers and policy makers* | * Service suppliers and policy makers have been participating in workshops and are now already aware (to some extent) of most of the building energy efficiency measures. | | | * There is still a gap in recruiting a consultant that who will conduct surveys of the number of available commercial actors in building energy saving sector at the end of the project. |
| **Output 3.2**  *Awareness of building energy saving opportunities improved* | * Awareness on building energy saving may be considered to have been doubled since the inception of the project with about 20 workshops (including Inception, Harmonization and Consultative Workshops) that have been organized up to now. | | | * Wide range of local stakeholders has participated actively in the workshops, and they have provided their views and comments that have been incorporated to the draft deliverables. * There is a need for this energy saving awareness to be substantially increased. It was rather low since limited documentation to this effect was possible. |
| **Outcome 4: Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation.** | | | | |
| **Intended Outputs** | **Progress to Date** | | **Comments** | |
| **Output 4.1**  *Monitoring and evaluation work plan implemented* | * Several NSC meetings have been held although more with a management rather than a monitoring lens. * The Mid-term Evaluation is ongoing, and the final evaluation report will be submitted by end-October 2011. | | * The project has been seriously involved in the delivery of outputs. | |
| **Output 4.2**  *Lessons learned collected, prepared and disseminated* | * Soft copies and hard copies of the final draft deliverables and presentation slides have been provided to the local stakeholders who have participated in the workshops that were organized. | | * The project lacks a communication plan. There is a needto f use the services of a communications consultant at the UNDP office to help in showcasing the lessons learned/achievements met under the project. * Special emphasis should be taken in having a targeted campaign for the project. This may require additional funds for the creation of a website for EEMO or a web page for the project under the existing Ministry of Public Utilities website. This will foster sustainability. | |
| **Outcome 5: Project Management.** | | | | |
| **Intended Outputs** | **Progress to Date** | | **Comments** | |
| **Output 5.1**  Project Management functional to deliver results | * 3 Project managers have been appointed for this project up to now. * 14 National Steering Committee (NSC) meetings have been held up to now. | | * The first two project managers were appointed by UNDP, while the third one has been appointed by the implementing agency (Ministry of Energy & Public Utilities) with consultations with UNDP, upon the recommendation of the NSC. The third project manager has been appointed since 2 August 2011. It should be noted that the long recruitment time impeded project progress greatly. | |

# 

# Annex 6 Outcome: Capacity strengthened and adaptation measures integrated into tourism development and coastal zone management.

**Baseline**: Climate change risk adaptation measures not incorporated into current approaches to coastal zone management.

**Target:** Capacity developed to address future climate change-related risks through adaptive measures in tourism sector development and ICZM.

**Indicator:** National Adaptation Plan developed by Ministry of Tourism by end 2011.

**1. Project Brief**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title** | Supporting Integrated and Comprehensive Approaches to Climate Change Adaptation in Africa:•The Republic of Mauritius. |
| **Project Period** | December 2009-December 2012 |
| **Sources of Funding** | Government of Japan-JICA |
| **Funding Volume** | US$3million |
| **Executing Agency** | Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development |
| **Project Objectives** | To integrate and mainstream climate change adaptation into the institutional framework and into core development policy, strategies and plans of ROM.  **Expected Output(s):**   * Dynamic, long-term planning mechanisms to manage the inherent uncertainties of climate change introduced; * Leadership capacities and institutional frameworks to manage climate change risks and opportunities in an integrated manner at the local and national levels strengthened; * Climate-resilient policies and measures in priority sectors implemented; * Financing options to meet national adaptation costs expanded at the local, national, sub-regional and regional levels; * Knowledge on adjusting national development processes to fully incorporate climate change risks and opportunities generated and shared across all levels. |

**2. Analysis of Outputs**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 1. Countries have introduced dynamic, long-term planning mechanisms to manage the inherent uncertainties of climate change** | | | |
| **Intended Outputs** | **Progress to Date** | | **Comments** |
| **Output 1.1**  **Technical studies and databases have been completed** | Partial Achievement. The Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Consultancy is due to start by early next year. | | This is one of the main consultancies under this project. Activity is late due to the procurement process. |
| **Output 1.2**  **National planning mechanisms are established** | Partial Achievement. Consultancy services for review and drafting of climate resilient policies and legislation and for mainstreaming climate change adaptation in the development process of the tourism, fisheries and agricultural sectors will start by the end of the year. | | Activity is late due to the procurement process. |
| **Output 1.3**  **Technical capacity is developed** | Partial achievement. The procurement process for a dynamic systems modeling tool is ongoing. Two cost benefit analyses have been conducted on sea cucumber and coral reefs as part of ecosystems services assessment. | | Limited data is a constraint to undertake ecosystems services assessment. |
| **Outcome 2: Countries have built leadership capacities and developed institutional frameworks to manage climate change risks and opportunities in an integrated manner at the local and national levels.** | | | |
| **Intended Outputs** | **Progress to Date** | | **Comments** |
| **Output 2.1**  **Awareness and action on climate change adaptation have increased.** | Partial achievement. Consultancy for capacity building on climate resilient policies is ongoing. Consultancies for capacity building in coastal processes and coastal protection works and for capacity building in health sector due to start by early next year. | | Activity is late due to the procurement process. |
| **Output 2.2**  **Institutional structures and mechanisms have been established.** | Partial achievement. Consultancy services for the assessment of capacity of roads, drains, culverts and bridges and to assist architects division of the Ministry of Public Infrastructure on buildings specifications in relation to climate change to start by the end of the year. | | Activity is late due to the procurement process. |
| **Outcome 3: Countries are implementing climate resilient policies and measures in priority sectors** | | | |
| **Intended Outputs** | **Progress to Date** | | **Comments** |
| **Output 3.1**  **Climate change adaptation policies have been approved.** | Partial Achievement. Consultancy services for the assessment of a pilot site will start by end of the year. | |  |
| **Output 3.2**  **Development policy and plans address adaptation** | Partial achievement. Activities achieved through outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3. | |  |
| **Output 3.3**  **Adaptation measures are implemented in various sectors.** | Partial achievement. Four demonstration activities (sea cucumber culture and coral farming and provisions of sea sensors and staff and support to GEF/UNDP's GP) are due to start by early next year. | |  |
| **Outcome 4: Financing options to meet national adaptation costs have been expanded at the local, national, sub-regional and regional levels.** | | | |
| **Intended Outputs** | **Progress to Date** | **Comments** | |
| **Output 4.1**  **A variety of climate change adaptation financing options are available** | Partial achievement. Consultancy services of an international economist to start by end of the year. | Poor response from applicants to EOI has resulted in delays and lack of local expertise results in having to recruit an international consultant | |
| **Output 4.2**  **Adaptation financing mechanisms are being utilized.** | N/A. Activities have been rescheduled pending recruitment of international economist |  | |
| **Outcome 5: Knowledge on adjusting national development processes to fully incorporate climate change risks and opportunities is being generated and shared across all levels** | | | |
| **Intended Outputs** | **Progress to Date** | **Comments** | |
| **Output 5.1**  **Knowledge products on mainstreaming climate change into development are accessible.** | Partial achievement. Consultancy for development of communication strategy, action plan, toolkit and materials will start by end of the year. |  | |
| **Output 5.2**  **Countries are sharing experiences on climate change adaptation.** | Partial achievement. Exhibition on climate change has been organized. |  | |
| **Output 5.3**  **Project results and experiences are being widely disseminated.** | Partial achievement. Organization of activities as part of the research week at the University of Mauritius and sensitization sessions with teachers and parents has been organized. |  | |

# 

# Annex 7–Outcome: Maurice Ile Durable (MID)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **INTENDED OUTPUTS** | **Baseline /targets** | **INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES** | **Evaluator Comments** |
| **Output 1: National Policy for MID**  Baseline: There exists no overarching framework or policy for the Maurice Ile Durable (MID) concept  Indicators: There will be an all-inclusive national policy in place for MID as well as an accompanying Policy Action Plan. Aspects of the policy will be implemented immediately, or possible concurrently, with finalizing the policy, while some aspects of the Policy Action Plan are long-term | Targets (year 1)  - MID policy in place  - Policy Action Plan in place  Targets (year 2)  - Act based on policy completed  - Action Plan implementation  Target (year 3)  - Act in full force  - Action Plan implementation continuing | Activity Result  Policy process to green paper  Policy promulgated  Action plan approved  Activity Result  Act based on policy completed  Action Plan implemented  Activity Result  Act based on policy completed  Action Plan further implemented | Completed |
| **Output 2: Support to the MID Fund**  Baseline: MID Fund exists but with no supporting structure.  Indicators: The MID Fund Technical Support Unit will be in place and operational. | Targets (year 1)  - MID TSA appointed  - MID TSU operating  Targets (year 2 &3)  - MID TSU operating  - Further capacity building for MID Fund | Activity Result  Appointments completed  Work plans implemented  Activity Result  Actions on LFA in progress  Targeted capacity existed and used | Completed |
| **Output 3: Provision of essential Technical Expertise**  Baseline: Some in-country technical expertise exists (ministries and consultants), but some specific technical expertise will be needed.  Indicators: Expertise provided on an as-needed basis. | Targets (year 1)  - Identify expertise needed  - Locate experts  Targets (year 2)  - Expertise provided  - Capacity building | Activity Result  ToRs , work plans available  Experts engaged  Activity Result  Expertise provided  Capacity built | Completed |

# Annex 8– 0utcome: Sustainable Land Management (SLM)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome | Baseline / Status | Evaluator Comments |
| **Outcome 1: Mainstreaming of SLM** | * 1. **Integration of SLM into Forestry and Forest Action Plan:Completed**   The Forestry service has already worked out a first draft and has requested the assistance of FAO for a consultant under the TCP (Technical Cooperation Programme):  **1.2. Development of policy, regulatory economic framework:Final Report submitted; completed**  **1.3. An SLM Investment Plan: Completed**  **Action:** The international consultant has made several visits to Mauritius and participated in the SLM workshop in February 2011,whenshe made a presentation on the Integrated Financing System and submitted an inception report in March 2011. | Outputs achieved with the exception of mainstreaming into local and national government. This will need to be reinforced through linkages with PAN as per the outcome evaluation finding. More leadership and coordination around NRM is needed. |
| **Outcome 2: Training/Human Resource Capacity Building** | **2.1 Enhanced capacities LIS/GIS/Remote sensing: Completed**  **2.1.1. Training in LIS, LMIS, GIS and GPS completed (Report available at PMU)**  **2.1.2 Training in remote sensing application for SLM completed (Report available at PMU)**  **2.2 Enhanced capacities for stakeholders participation for SLM-Completed**  Training activities completed:   1. Sustainable agricultural practices for Mauritius 2. Sustainable agricultural practices for Rodrigues 3. Training course of participatory management of open pastures for Rodrigues 4. Training course on Project Proposal Preparation for SLM for Mauritius 5. Training course on Project Proposal Preparation for SLM for Rodrigues.   **2.3. Integrating SLM into planning at central/local levels:** Further to local advertisement for a planning consultant, no application from qualified local consultants was received. The Town Planning Association of Mauritius has been contacted to provide list of qualified professional planners to undertake the training activity. **Activity to start in January 2011**  **2.4 Development environmental/NR economics expertise: Completed**  **2.4.1 – Training for Trainers Course on Environmental Economics by International Expert Mr. Lars Hein.**  **2.4.2- Training of Staff on Environmental Economics by Mrs. R.Ramsurn& Kevin Ruhomaun**  **2.5 Capacities restoration fire-degraded mountain ecosystems: Completed**  **Action:** Final report on an Integrated Strategy for Forest Fire Fighting has been submitted. Additional training has been undertaken with the Fire Services and Forest Officer at Bras D’Eau on Forest Fire Management and Implementation of Fire Breaks in August 2009. Additional training completed in the southern region of Mauritius in 2011. | **Completed** |
| **Outcome 3: Knowledge management for SLM** | **3.1. Assessment of sustainability of land use systems: Completed**  **Action:** A first payment has been effected on signing of agreement between UoM and Forestry Service. Nine final reports received from UoM in September 2010, and final payment has been effected.  **3.2 Sharing of Knowledge on SLM - sensitization ongoing**  **Action:** Several SLM posters were presented and SLM booklets were distributed in the SGP/UNDP project exhibition in June 2010.More SLM booklets, posters and flyers will be distributed on 1 and 2 December 2010 on the occasion of a National Workshop on Maurice Ile Durable organized by the Prime Minister’s Office at Swami Vivekananda Conference Centre, Pailles.  **3.3. Forest Land Information System:**  **3.3.1 Development of Forestry Management Information System: Completed**  **Action**: LAVIM’s aerial high-resolution imagery has been integrated in the Forest Land Information System as well as all state forest land boundaries. Forest Cover Map, DEM and new forest boundaries are uploaded and regularly updated using GPS by Survey Office of the Forestry Service. Several additional training sessions have been held with forest officers and the Ministry of Health and Quality of Life. The FLIS will be used to develop the Monitoring and Evaluation System for SLM.   * + 1. **Develop LIS in MoHl and Satellite Imagery with Remote Sensing**: **Completed**   LAVIM’s project is developing an interagency LIS protocol for harmonizing the data sharing. Several meetings held with LAVIM’s consultant for the development of a National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) for implementation data sharing, standards and a user group’s protocol to minimize duplication.  **3.4 Development of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems: Ongoing**  **Action:**  The international consultant has made several visits to Mauritius and participated in the SLM workshop in February 2011, when she made a presentation on the Monitoring and Evaluation System and submitted an inception report in March 2011.  **3.5. Improvements to the state lands leasing systems: combined with Activity 3.4**  **Action:** This activity has been combined with activity 3.4 as the same consultant will propose improvement to the state land leasing system based on the Monitoring and Evaluation Systems.  **3.6 Planning for SLM alternatives to sugar cane cultivation: Completed**  **Action:** Several ongoing national projects have been identified on alternatives to sugar cultivation. | **Completed** |
|  | **Outcome 4: Completion of the National Action Programme (NAP)**  **4.1 Preparation of the NAP: Completed**  Further to the comments of the last TAC, the consultant was requested to revise draft NAP report. The reassessment of the second revised draft NAP report was carried out as per the ToR after receiving the views of the Forestry Service Nationa1 Project Director and other stakeholders. A meeting was held with the consultant in September 2010 to discuss the achievements and deliverables. The consultant was made aware of the weak points and gaps of the report and was requested to review the report again. Assessment Report as per ToR is attached. A NAP validation workshop was organized in February 2011 in Mauritius and Rodrigues and the consultant presented his report. Several comments were received during the workshop, and the attendees requested the consultant to overhaul the report. The consultant has been requested to review his report by 1 April, based on the feedback he received in the workshops. | **Completed** |

# Annex 9: Outcome: Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystem (ASCLME)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Outcome 4:****Long-term sustainability of living resources of two large marine ecosystems ensured through ecosystem- based approach to management of the Agulhas and Somali Current large Marine Ecosystem (ASCLME)* | | | | |
|  | | ***Baseline*** | ***Status*** | ***Evaluator comments*** |
| **Outcome : Information Captured for Development of the Trans-boundary Diagnostic Analysis.** | **Indicator 1. Environmental baseline assessments for the ASCLMEs.** | | There is a considerable change against the baseline. The project has been very active and productive in undertaking a series of activities addressing environmental baseline assessment for both the ACLME and the southern portion of the SCLME. The project has adjusted the focus of outcomes/outputs and, therefore, specific deliverables have been made. This is discussed in more detail onwards in the corresponding sections of this report | *Ongoing and indication of success* |
| **Outcome 2:Long-Term LME data collection, management and distribution mechanisms established**. | **Indicator 2. Fill information gaps in the two LMEs and ascertain role of Mascarene Plateau andSouth Equatorial Current.** | | A series of research cruises were successfully undertaken throughout the Agulhas current region, including the Mascarene Plateau area, with new and significant information collected regarding the role and flow of the South Equatorial Current. A new partnership developed with NOAA (US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) for a permanent chain of ocean-atmosphere moorings to act as long-term monitoring and early warning systems. About 45 abstracts for publications were accepted for the biennial WIOMSA meeting in Reunion in August 2009, as well as some other journals. However, the increasing threat of piracy negatively affected achieving the results specified in project document. A series of offshore research cruises have been replaced by inshore activities and studies, additional tasks have been developed. | *Ongoing and indication of success* |
| **Outcome 3: TDAs and strategic action programmes and associated sustainability mechanisms in support of an LME approach are adopted**. | **Indicator 3. Develop TDAs and SAPs for the ASCLME.** | | MTE suggests re-phrasing indicator 3 to represent the actual project outcome, namely: the development of the technical basis, institutional mechanisms and political support for a sustainable ecosystem-based management in WIO. For instance, as reflected in minutes of the Inception Workshop: "*…the ASCLME Project was taking the correct approach in recognizing that the TDAs and SAPs may represent the end deliverables from this project but actually represent* ***the beginning of the overall LME management process and that this is an ongoing and long-term process*** *that will need sustainability in terms of financing, long-term capacity, on-going monitoring and data/information collection, and political support.*" [3]. While achieving this development indicator, the project had to adjust the classic TDA/SAP approach. Since there was not enough knowledge available in the region on the state and dynamics of processes in WIO's ecosystems, an additional step was introduced into the whole process: the development of national diagnostic reports. Within the first two years of the project,theNew Marine Environmental Diagnostic Analysis17 (MEDAs) approach developed work plan and budget were prepared and approved by PSC and UNDP/UNOPS. Originally, there was no budget allocated in the Project Document to this sort of activities. | *This was redesigned and is more about the long-term process of engagement and cooperation. This is a good development.* |
| Outcome 4: LME Coordination, communication, and participation mechanisms were established. |  | |  | ***Determined by evaluator that can be also targeted at the national level as well as regional.*** |
| Outcome 5: Project financing effectively delivered to support all project outcomes’status. |  | |  | ***Ongoing*** |
|  |  | |  |  |

**Outcome 4:**Long-term sustainability of living resources of two large marine ecosystems ensured through ecosystem-based approach to management of the Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystem (ASCLME)

**Baseline:** Lack of a holistic multi-sectoral regional ecosystem management approach to LME for the Agulhas and Somali Current

**Target:** Research and understanding of the coastal and marine Ecosystems within the ASCLME.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Outcome –****Enabling policy and institutional framework for sustainably co-managed marine and terrestrial protected areas through public-private partnership to be developed.*  ***Baseline:*** *Limited protection to globally significant terrestrial, coastal and marine biodiversity*  ***Target:****Reduce threats to biodiversity through participatory stakeholder process to effectively conserve biodiversity through innovative co management of protected areas.* | | | |
|  | | | Evaluator Comments |
| Outcome 1: Develop an enabling policy and institutional framework for the sustainable co-management of MPAs throughout the Republic of Mauritius. | Targets  Policy and legislation for the management and sustainability of marine resources strengthened.  Tools and codes of practice are developed to facilitate the practical application of existing policies and legislation.  Mechanisms for strengthening institutional arrangements for the management and sustainability of marine resources identified and promoted at pilot sites.  National Responsible Tourism Marine Management Principles developed and operationalized.  Awareness increased in fishery sector of the fishery productivity benefits derived from sound MPA management.  Increase in marine conservation awareness within key sectors of the society. | Indicators:  1. Evidence of a change in policies/legislation regarding financial arrangements for MPA’s by end of year.  2. Independent monitoring confirms that, by year 4, tools developed are being utilized outside the project site.  3. Evidence of a multi-institutional arrangement to improve integrated management of marine resources at the national level by end of year 4.  4. Staff trained by end of year 4 in integrated management systems. | Completed |
| Outcome 2: Develop innovative co-management arrangements for MPAs and adapt them at a representative demonstration site in Rodrigues. | Targets:  Integrated Marine Protected Area management board and infrastructure established.  Integrated Marine Protected Area management plan developed.  Capacity developed and Integrated Marine Protected Area plan implemented.  Marine conservation awareness increased. | Indicators:  Evidence of a change in policies/legislation regarding financial arrangements for MPAs by end–of-year 4.  Independent monitoring confirms that, by year 4, tools developed are being utilized outside the project site.  Evidence of a multi-institutional arrangement to improve integrated management of marine resources at the national level by end of year 4.  Staff trained by end of year 4 in integrated management systems.  This objective is designed to develop a model of co-management for a proposed MPA at a demonstration site, which was selected in the southeastern part of the Rodrigues lagoon. Under this objective, a management plan was to be prepared, using the participatory approach, and implementation of the MPA was expected to start. The log frame allows for a comprehensive range of training activities to ensure that all those involved in the future management of the MPA have the necessary skills and capacity. There is also a substantial component on awareness-raising to ensurethat all stakeholders fully understand the purpose of the MPA, the benefits it may bring and the responsibility that it places on those participating in its management. | Completed but now needs focus on sustainability and reinforcements and marketing the MPA in the tourism domain. |

**Other insights on status**

The evaluation team also learned about DLIST (Distance Learning and Information Sharing Tool).A programme was established to promote the sharing of information and ideas between a range of *coastal players*that include governments, industry and the private sector and, most importantly, local communities. DLIST’s emphasis is intended to communicate, and thus promote, effective environmental stewardship, such as the design and execution of management alternatives and actions, and sustainable livelihoods—with coastal and marine resources as the foundation. . DLIST started in 1998 in the BCLME coastal areas. After the WSSD in 2002, the DLIST initiative was funded by the GEF as a medium-size project, partly to promote the MDGs in the LME framework with the BCLME as a testing ground. By 2006 it was recognized as a good practice in promoting a *“bottom up, top dow*n” approach to development, and it became a part of the preparation of the ASCLME Project. DLIST is also a *Community of Practice (CoP)* that consists of registered users, from government to all sectors of society, that share the common interest of promoting equitable and sustainable development. The DLIST toolkit includes a web-based platform (including CoP), distance learning courses, film festivals and demonstration sites9 sites in 8 countries

# Annex 10–Outcome: Partnership for Marine Protected Areas in Mauritius and Rodrigues (MPA)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title | Partnership for Marine Protected Areas in Mauritius and Rodrigues |
| Project Period | 2005-2011 |
| Source of Funding | Global Environment Facility (GEF) United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Government of Mauritius (GoM) |
| Funding Volume |  |
| Executing Agency | UNDP, GoM, Rodrigues Regional Assembly (RRA) |
| Project Objectives | 1. Enabling policy and institutional framework for the effective participation in and sustainable co-management of MPAs in the republic of Mauritius enhanced. 2. Innovative co-management arrangement for MPAs are developed and adapted at a representative demonstration site in Rodrigues. |
| Project Outputs | Develop and test a model for co-management, between government, local communities and the private sector and build an enabling environment for its replication throughout the Republic of Mauritius. |
| Overall Project Status | Satisfactory |
| Views on project governance (Roles and Responsibilities of Steering Committee, National Project Director, Project Manager, etc.) | This project was initially slated to introduce changes in policies affecting MPAs in the whole of the Mauritius Republic, while Rodrigues had been chosen to be the project demonstration site. During project implementation, the context changed with respect to level of political and administrative autonomy that Rodrigues assumed vis a vis Mauritius main island.  With limited results until 2008, it appeared that the project would be restricted to establishing one MPA in Rodrigues and nothing more significant at the national level. There were then questions on the project’s ability to impact national policies.  This situation has been completely turned around with the leadership exerted by the Ministry of Fisheries for the project’s policy frameworks component and the implementation of critical activities for reaching this level.  The changes in national policies that the project is introducing are ensured by the work developed under its Outcome 1 (Enabling policy and institutional framework for the effective participation in and the sustainable co-management of MPAs in the Republic of Mauritius enhanced). This outcome will still be executed primarily in Mauritius, with relevant components in Rodrigues. However, policies/legislations for the management of MPAs have changed since the project document was signed in 2003. Besides the political administrative shift, these changes include, more precisely, the publication of a new Fisheries and Marine Resources Act in 2007 and a current review of the Fisheries and Marine Regulation for MPA from 2001. The project has been instrumental in preparing these legal texts.  To achieve the project’s outcome 1, two technical working groups have been established to revise and amend with co-management principles the current management plans of Blue Bay and Balaclava marine parks. A manager planner will coordinate the working groups and the CTA will supervise and guide the process.  Moreover, a larger group of several stakeholders will be consulted to approve the management plans. The Fisheries and Marine Resources Act 2007 will also be reviewed by the policy and legal expert by including the new features identified in the management plans. |
| Project Ownership(feeling of ownership by stakeholders/commitment of executing agency to the project) | The South East Marine Protected Area is a pilot project in the Republic of Mauritius which seeks to adopt community participation involving all the different stakeholders in the decision making process. The concept of a marine protected area being completely new to the Rodriguan community meant that a continuous, aggressive sensitization campaign was required to enhance better awareness and involvement in the project. The project is in its last year of implementation with the sustainability of the MPA being secured while the exit of the funding agencies is being worked out. The fishers have been recruited as Field Rangers,anew concept in the Republic of Mauritius, and have been empowered by the Regulation 2011 to enforce the SEMPA regulations. The rangers, being ex-fishermen, have more easy communication with their peers and therefore facilitating compliance by the community. There were 50 Community Resource Observers (CROs) who were recruited from the community to provide assistance to the PMU in the implementation of projected activities. These CROs support the rangers in patrol, are involved in monitoring exercises and help wherever needed. A greater sense of ownership is the result since some 50 families are now directly involved in the MPA activities. The management plan and livelihood strategy documents have been prepared to guide forward towards the MPA success. |
| Views on Procurement and Disbursement Process |  |
| Description of Monitoring and Information Management Process | Significant progress was made in the reporting period, whereby a substantive number of key deliverables was achieved. They include the approval of regulation, development of the livelihood strategy document, development of the Management Plan and the recruitment of key staff among others that will steer the project for the remaining project duration. The RRA is showing its full commitment for the SEMPA and has already established SEMPA in its system for the sustainability of the MPA. There has been a change in National Project Director, but the general momentum of the project implementation has been maintained. The local community is constantly being reached by sensitization programs so as to increase awareness about the MPA and enhance greater sense of ownership. Furthermore, the zoning process was undertaken with the active participation of the different stakeholders from construction of demarcation materials to the deployment of the buoys, thereby helping to create greater ownership by the local community. The livelihood strategy document has been prepared and will help to guide the RRA in its objective towards the reduction of fishers indulging in lagoon fishing. Additional staff, including field rangers, an education and communication officer, a scientific officer, and a livelihood coordinator, has been recruited to gear the project towards its objectives. |
| Challenges faced (What can be done better and need adjustment) | Cyclones are an annual risk in the area resulting in severe soil erosion and heavy sediment loading in the lagoon resulting in negative impacts on the lagoon biodiversity. Big waves can also damage the corals and the underwater flora. Ten cyclones have been officially reported for cyclonic period 2009/2010, and one struck the island. Also, coral bleaching, sea level rise and other manifesting effects of climate change present a new environmental risk to the project.  The unit is not adequately staffed, and the structure is not in place to manage the MPA once the project ends.  The project area contains a significant terrestrial component in which erosion control demonstrations can be developed. An important area in need of erosion control is on the new road embankments where significant erosion could be significantly reduced by planting the appropriate plants and ground cover. The project will undertake some studies to best understand how climate change mitigation can be undertaken though ecosystem-based adaptation to counter climate change effects. The RRA is preparing a sustainable land use plan that will help to address the management of land resources including the SEMPA watershed.  By the end of the project, the RRA will be responsible for establishing a new management structure to take over from the present PMU. There will be a transition from the PMU to the long term management unit. This will be developed as part of the exit strategy, and through the implementation of the management plan, which will consist of all elements required for the sustainability of SEMPA (Management strategy and structure, gender, enforcement, scientific research and monitoring among others). |
| Good Practice(What has worked) | A study was undertaken in line with the development of the livelihood strategy for the fisher community. This allowed for a review of the socio-economic condition of the community after that a first socio-economic analysis of data collected in 2008 was conducted in 2010. The study conducted in 2011 has addressed the gender issue and looks to give added consideration to the women who are largely involved in the exploitation of the marine resources.  The GEF Small Grants Programme has approved the funding of an ecotourism project for the fisher cooperative of the SEMPA with the objective of reducing the number of fishers exploiting the meager resources of the lagoon. These come at an opportune time when the regulation has been approved and that the conservation zones are on verge of being enforced. |
| Future Plan and Follow-up Activities | An exit plan and sustainability strategy drafted, management plan drafted for 5 years. |

Table 2: Progress against indicators

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PROGRESS TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES** | | |  |  |  |
| **Description** | **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level[4]** | **Target Level at end of project** | **Level** | **Level** |
| Project Objective [REVISED LOGFRAME]:  Develop and test a model for co-management, between government, local communities and the private sector, and build an enabling environment for its replication throughout the Republic of Mauritius.  [NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION:  The PRODOC was not totally consistent in some parts. What in the revised lo frame has been clearly defined as the project's two "outcomes" were at times referred to as "objectives 1 and 2"? In the current design practice for UNDP/GEF projects, there should be only one immediate objective per project. The immediate objective in the revised log frame has therefore remained what in the PRODOC was termed as "the project's purpose." What were in some PRODOC parts termed as "objectives 1 and 2" (and in previous PIRs) are now the project's Outcomes 1 and 2. There is thus no significant change in the key hierarchical elements of the log frame. Several process indicators were dropped and only the "SMART" ones maintained. A small number of new indicators with baseline reconstructed were added.] | 1. METT Scores for SEMPA increases to at least 50/93 over a baseline of 8/93 (measured in 2005) at the end of the project and as an indicator of area reef under effective management. | [BASELINE RECONSTRUCTED]  8 out of 93 (as there are no indigenous or traditional people) | 50 out 93 (as there are no indigenous or traditional people) | Indicator remains the same: By mid-term evaluation (2008) the GEF3 METT Scores were 29.  Next measurement will be by the terminal evaluation.  Important note:  Outcome 1 will still be executed primarily in Mauritius, with relevant components in Rodrigues. However, policies/legislations for the management of MPAs have changed since the project document was signed in 2003. These changes include the publication of a new Fisheries and Marine Resources Act in 2007 and a current review of the Fisheries and Marine Regulation for MPA from 2001. Following these changes and the recruitment of the new CTA, the UNDP, RRA and the Ministry of Agro-Industry and Fisheries (Motif) have agreed to revise the log frame, which is in progress, in order to address the current issues/barrier affecting sound MPA management. In consultation with key stakeholders and GEF RTA It is proposed that objective 1 will consist of a three main outputs, the strengthening of existing policies, the establishment of a learning group to operationalize MPAs and create within the RoM a better understanding of the economic and social case from MPAs. Outputs and indicators are proposed to be modified and this is reflected in the following text. Indicators will be reduced from 42 to a more reasonable number, c. 20 | Indicator remains the same: By mid-term evaluation (2008) the GEF3 METT Scores were 29.  Next Measurement will be by the Terminal Evaluation  Important Note:  The Outcome 1 will be executed primarily in Mauritius with a close involvement of Rodrigues stakeholders in order to better transfer the good practices learned within the SEMPA into the Mauritius Marine Protected Areas. To achieve the objective, two technical working groups have been established to revise and amend with co-management principles the current management plans of Blue Bay and Balaclava marine parks. A manager/planner will coordinate the working groups and the CTA will supervise and guide the process. Moreover, a larger group of several stakeholders will be consulted to approve the management plans. The Fisheries and Marine Resources Act 2007 will also be reviewed by the policy and legal expert by including the new features identified in the management plans. |
|  | 2. Area of seascape gazette by end of project | [BASELINE RECONSTRUCTED]  0 sq km | 42 sq km | Target achieved.  The South East Marine Protected Area (SEMPA) was gazetted by the Government of Mauritius on the 28th Feb 2009. This represents a significant step forward for the project. The gazette notice included an outer boundary and limited regulations. A full set of RRA regulations and zoning will need to be gazetted to make the MPA fully operational. The SEMPA Management Board continues to function. The Board has been included in the draft regulations for submission to Rodrigues Regional Assembly (RRA) and once approved and gazette, the RRA Commission for Marine Parks indicated at the July 2009 PSC that the Board will become a “Statutory Body.” | The new regulation prescribing the zones and management structures of SEMPA has been approved by the Executive Council and remains to be approved by the Assembly before gazetting by the Government of Mauritius. |
|  | 3. Area of MPA watershed managed and legally recognized | [BASELINE RECONSTRUCTED]  0 sq km | 33 sq km | Currently, the watershed area has no legal recognition. Activities that will lead to a more ICZM (including legal and policy aspects) are ongoing. | The watershed still has no legal recognition. The Rodrigues Regional Assembly is preparing a Sustainable Land Use Plan and Regulation that is being finalized.This will encompass the SEMPA watershed, and this will be considered in an integrated approach. |
|  | 4. Increased scores of the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard for PA Mgt | Baseline reconstructed:  Systemic: 5/30; 17%  Institutional; 12/45; 4%  Individual: 2/21; 11% | Systemic: 18/30; 60%  Institutional: 20/45; 44%  Individual: 10/21; 47% | Systemic; 12/30; 41%  Institutional; 13/45; 29%  Individual; 7/21; 37% | Systemic; 15/30; 50%  Institutional; 15/45; 33%  Individual;10/21; 48% |
| Outcome 1: [REVISED LOGFRAME]  Enabling policy and institutional framework for the effective participation in and the sustainable co-management of MPAs in the Republic of Mauritius enhanced.  [NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION:  the PRODOC was not totally consistent and in some parts, the "enabling policies” were referred to as "outcome 1" and in others as "objective 1". In the current design practice for UNDP/GEF projects, there should be only one immediate objective per project. As seen before, the immediate objective in the revised log frame has therefore remained what in the PRODOC was termed as "purpose." There is thus no significant change in the key hierarchical elements of the log frame.  With respect to this outcome in its current formulation, there has been a slight tweaking of words to make the expected outcome clearer. In the PRODOC, there was reference to "co-management." The text read as "…enabling policy and institutional framework for sustainably co-managed Marine Protected Areas throughout the Republic of Mauritius, including Rodrigues developed." ] | 1. Evidence of a change in policies/legislation regarding financial arrangements for MPAs by project end. | [BASELINE RECONSTRUCTED]  No evidence | Sempa counts on a relevant body of policies/legislation to contribute to its financial sustainability. | The Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) reported that the ”Task Force is unlikely to be established, so this will no longer be a relevant indicator/target” This specific Indicator is therefore dropped; however, a policy review is proposed as part of the MPA learning group that will identify gaps particularly in relation to policies for public consultation, participation and co-management. It will also look at policies related to the financing of MPAs. In addition to recent review of the 2007 act this will take into account the ICZM process now in place.  The Commission for Marine Parks has indicated the potential for a SEMPA fund, and this has been included in the draft regulations. Achievement of this will be subject to overall RRA support.  Furthermore, a tourism plan will be developed for SEMPA as part of the management plan and will be an input into the MPA Learning Group that will consider tourism but not in great detail. The extent to which national guidelines can be developed will depend on the recommendations of AFRC. | Despite recent review of Fisheries and Marine Resources Act in 2007, the possibility for review of same is being envisaged with the AFRC, and this will help towards setting proper policy and legal framework for the management of Marine Protected Areas in Mauritius through the three working groups are being constituted, including all relevant stakeholders in the fields of marine conservation with the objective of enhancing better coordination and sharing of knowledge, knowhow and resources in the setting up of MPA in the RoM. The tourism aspect of the SEMPA project will be addressed in the management plan and addressed in the working groups. |
|  | 2. Evidence of a multi-institutional mechanism (i.e. the MPA learning group operational) to improve MPA management at the national level by project end.  [NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION:  Indicator slightly revised to reflect the streamlining of Outcome 1. Baseline reconstructed.] | No arrangement in place for a multi-institutional mechanism | Progress towards establishing multi-institutional mechanism | First draft of MPA Learning Group Concept note produced. | The MPA working group principles are under discussion with the relevant stakeholders in view of being formally established. The draft Terms of Reference for the working group has been prepared and will be validated at the first sitting of the working roup by all stakeholders. |
|  | 3. Biennial biological survey confirms that reef condition (measured by fish diversity, coral diversity and relative damage from human and natural causes) at demonstration MPA improves beyond established baseline. | [BASELINE CARRIED OUT IN 2007, AS NO MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES EARLIER. THIS IS CONSIDERED VALID]  Hard coral cover inside the lagoon was variable (ranged between 5% and 60%); coral cover on the fore reef ranged from 18% to 50% (2007). Commercially valuable holothurians were very rare (<0.02 individuals m-2), as were mollusks. | 3. Biennial biological surveys confirm that reef condition (measured by fish diversity, coral diversity and relative damage from human and natural causes) at demonstration MPA improves beyond established baseline by year 4. DRAFT DETAILED TARGET TO BE REFINED OVER THE COMING YEAR: No change/no more than 10% decrease in coral cover; increase in abundance of indicator fin fish (butterfly fish and commercial fish); increase in abundance of commercial holothurians; increase in abundance of other commercial invertebrates (e.g. konokono). Increase in abundance of octopus. | The third ecological survey team input nearly completed the baseline survey. This will be completed during the coming year once the zoning regulations are approved and the rangers are in place, which will allow replicates in specific zones and training of implementing staff. | The fourth ecological survey exercise was conducted in February/March 2010 to complete the baseline survey as a platform for ensuring long-term monitoring. The report is currently under finalization. The rangers, community resource observers and other members of PMU and of the SEMPA community will be given training as part of setting up of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. Training for octopus and finfish monitoring will be conducted soon and the data collection will start by September 2010. |
|  | 4. At least 60 stakeholders receive documentation of SEMPA board experience by year 4. | [BASELINE RECONSTRUCTED]  No stakeholder receives any documentation. | Achieved 1 year after MTE | Indicator achieved in the previous reporting period. | There is currently proper documentation, recording and reporting of activities, and these will be shared with stakeholders as part of the working group sharing of knowledge and knowhow. There is regular dissemination of experience on SEMPA to the public on different national and regional forum. |
| Outcome 2: [REVISED LOGFRAME]  Innovative co-management arrangements for Marine Protected Areas (MPA) are developed and adapted at a representative demonstration site. | 1. Existence of IMPAM board, guidelines of operation, evidence of meetings held by end of year 2. | [BASELINE RECONSTRUCTED]  No Board in place | SEMPA MB fully operational in SEMPA  [Note: The renamed SEMPA Management Board has been established since October 2007 and meets regularly (Minutes from the entire meeting are available for verification).] | The SEMPA Management Board continues to function. The Board has been included in the draft regulations for submission to RRA and once approved and gazette. The RRA Commission for Marine Parks indicated at the July 2009 PSC that the Board will become a ”Statutory Body.”  SEMPA Board is very active and the chairmanship has been devolved to community level (tourism operator). Fishers were very actively involved in the March-August 2009 zoning process and developing the regulations. SEMPA Board has been included in the draft regulations for submission to RRA. The Fishers Association is waiting for registration.  All the main water sports operators have been involved in developing the zoning and regulations. The SEMPA Management Board is now chaired by a water sports operator. | The Board is still functional but is yet to be a statutory body, and this will depend on the gazetting of the SEMPA regulation which is expected by September 2010. The SEMPA Board has been very active in supporting the finalization of the SEMPA regulation and approval for the design of the new SEMPA logo among others. A total of twenty-four board meetings have been held, of which eight were held during this reporting period. Appropriate long management structure is being established and will be approved as component of the SEMPA regulation. For proper enforcement of SEMPA regulations, the RRA has approved the recruitment of rangers.To date four rangers have assumed duty and are working with the support of the community resource observer for an initial education, sensitization and awareness of the community about the MPA. |
|  | 2. Participatory management plan developed with full stakeholder endorsement by end of year .2 | [BASELINE RECONSTRUCTED]  No management plan in place | Approved participatory management plan in place | Many elements of an Integrated MPA Management Plan have been developed or are under development. These included Boundary (gazette) Management Board, participation plan with stakeholder representation, regulations, including zoning (participatory), regulations, charges, board and fund. An active public awareness campaign (e.g. The SEMPA logo competition involving mostly school children and the organization of main events at the SEMPA PMU, such as the World Environment Day (5 June 2009) and World Ocean Day (8 June 2009) hundreds of children were exposed to environmental education activities. The project has also designed and is currently implementing an education and awareness campaign with 80 students to start; an additional 300 are targeted.) These now need to be documented into an approved management plan, with the development of other plan elements. Preliminary meetings have been held to outline the development of a capacity building management plan that is developed as much as possible by the MPA staff themselves. This will be developed over the coming year and finalized by December 2010. Current staff will take a role in developing the different written sections. The final product will be peer reviewed. AFRC has indicated that it would like the management plans of Blue Bay and Balaclava MPAs to form a concrete output of the MPA Learning Group. Thus management planning will provide a focus of the MPA-LG activities. | The ToR for the recruitment of a management planner is being finalized, and procedures will be launched by UNDP for filling of the post. The management planner will have the overall responsibility to work with the Technical Committee for the drafting of the SEMPA management plan. Subsequently, there is scope for drafting of appropriate management plan for the Blue Bay and Balaclava Marine Parks by the Management Planner. To better sensitize the general public on SEMPA, the sensitization campaign is still ongoing and is undertaken at grassroots in schools and colleges. During the present 2010 school year, a total of about 852 students (604) and school children (248) have been sensitized on SEMPA. |
|  | 3. Participatory M&E plan developed with defined indicators by end of year 2. | [BASELINE RECONSTRUCTED]  No M&E plans in place | Participatory M&E plan under implementation | Conceptual work and discussions on participatory M&E have been initiated. A Participatory M&E strategy will form part of the management plan that is developed over the next 18 months. The document produced in April 2008 will be reviewed and assessed for applicability in light of recent developments. Community resource observers are now in place and will be trained later in the year in catch, species and habitat monitoring. It is under discussion to use the Most Significant Change Methodology as a mechanism for adaptive management.  Also, training for Ministry of Housing and local authority personnel is expected to start during the coming year once the Rangers are recruited and MPA Learning Group established. | The M & E plan has been drafted and elements of it are being implemented. The SEMPA staff and members of the community will be trained for collection of data for the monitoring of resources within SEMPA in partnership with the Indian Ocean Commission Programme on Coastal Management. This is having a very positive response on the field since this is deterring illegal practices. The Fisheries Protection Services have also been involved in the monitoring and in the training. |
|  | 4. Independent monitoring confirms that MPA zones are being adhered to and infractions are being reported and penalized by year 4. | [BASELINE RECONSTRUCTED]  No zoning in place | Zones legally recognized and being implemented | Once the regulations are approved and rangers recruited by RRA, it will be possible to implement the existing laws and implement the zone regulations. These will be introduced in steps to allow the fishers to adapt to law enforcement and rangers supported by community resource observers experience to develop. The newly recruited socio-economist will assist with compliance studies. Enforcement will also be linked to the sustainable livelihood programme.  With the new PMU team in place from March 2009, a consensus zoning plan has been major achievement. This has high-level fisher participation and support and will be submitted to RRA in August 2008. Proposed regulations include user fees. A code of conduct for kite surfers and other water sports activities was agreed as a principle, but actual development is not planned as yet.  In additional, attitudinal elements were included in the socio-economic survey. The socio-economist resigned before completing the analysis of the one-off socio-economic survey. A replacement socio-economist is being recruited and will analyze the survey, which is desired to act as a baseline. Most significant change methodology will act as a community-based monitoring and adaptive management tool to address a wide range of domains, including attitudes. | The need for better monitoring of activities within SEMPA, particularly with the dwindling existing resources resulting in deployment of greater effort by the fishers. To cope with this problem, the RRA has approved the recruitment of rangers for better education and awareness of the community on the MPA. Presently four rangers have been recruited, and they are active in the field doing sensitization work and also watching for illegal activities within the area. The presence of the rangers in the field is having a positive impact at deterring illegal practices. The Fisheries Protection Services, which is the body with legal powers for enforcement, is working in close collaboration with the Project Management Unit.Whenever required, the rangers report illegal activities to the former for immediate actions. |
|  | 5. MPA financing system in place and operational with user and other stakeholder inputs | [BASELINE RECONSTRUCTED]  No MPA financing system in place | MPA financing system in place and operational with user and other stakeholder inputs. | The Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) reported that the “…Task Force unlikely to be established, so this will no longer be a relevant indicator/target.” This specific Indicator is therefore dropped; however, a policy review is proposed as part of the MPA learning group that will identify gaps particularly in relation to policies for public consultation, participation and co-management. It will also look at policies related to the financing of MPAs. In addition to the recent review of the 2007 act, this will take into account the ICZM process now in place.  Steps will be taken to apply the UNDP Financial Sustainability Scorecard for Rodrigues, through which more light can be shed on the progress achieved with regards to this indicator. | The development of appropriate financing mechanism (sustainable financing) for the SEMPA is being considered and will be an important component the MPA’s working groups as well as the management plan. |

* + Describe the financial management (including and procurement and disbursement issues),
* 2005                                  97,996
* 2006                                  83,513
* 2007                                 186,829
* 2008                                 372,561
* 2009                                 357,816
* 2010                                 414,592
* As at Sept 2011                    167,396
* TOTAL                             1,680,702

# Annex 11–Project Steering Committee Meetings

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Projects | Recorded PSC meetings | Evaluators Comments |
| African Adaptation Programme | 1st SC-14 April 2010  2nd SC-21 July 2010  3rd SC-30 September 2010  4th SC-16 December 2010  5th SC-18 January 2011  6th SC-15 March 2011  7th SC-05 July 2011 | Project Steering Committee meetings are very important mechanisms for capacity strengthening concerning outcome goals. Two questions arise: Has the functioning of these meetings been assessed? has there been a systematic capacity building and a capacity assessment completed in order to assess the level of skills of the members of the committees?  Based on conversation,the team feels that the function and the role and responsibilities of the PSC meeting toward programme outcomes can be improved with assessment and training. In fact where there has been reported active PSC, the results of the projects have been better energy efficiency and where there has been less focus on PSC, the results around capacity strengthening have been less successful. i.e. ASCLME. |
| POPs | 9 Steering committee meetings since the project manager was appointed in January 2009 |
| Energy Efficiency | 15 Steering committee meetings since the project started in 2008. |
| ASCLME | ASCLME regional project; there have been 4 ASCLME steering committees since 2008. |
| SLM | 3 Steering committees and at least 7 technical advisory committees who provide technical guidance to the project. |
| MPA | 10 Steering committees since the start of the project in 2006. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Annex 12–Expenditure of Environment Projects in Mauritius from 2008-2011 (in USD) | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MAURITIUS** | | **2008** | | | | | | | | **2009** | | | | | | | | **2010** | | | | | | | | | **2011** | | | | | | | |
| **TRAC** | **Cost/Sharing** | | | **GEF** | **TOTAL 2008** | **Approved budget 2008** | **Delivery rate 2008 in %** | **TRAC** | **Cost/Sharing** | | | **GEF** | **TOTAL 2009** | **approved budget 2009** | **delivery rate 2009 in %** | **TRAC** | **cost/sharing** | | | | **GEF** | **TOTAL 2010** | **Approved budget 2010** | **delivery rate 2010 in %** | **TRAC** | **cost/sharing** | | | **GEF** | **TOTAL 2011** | **Approved budget 2011** | **delivery rate 2011 in %** |
| **Project** | **Name** | **04000** | **30000** | **11888** | **regional** | **62000** |  |  |  | **04000** | **30000** | **30071** | **regional** | **62000** |  |  |  | **04000** | **30000** | **30071** | **32045** | **regional** | **62000** |  |  |  | **04000** | **30000** | **30071** | **32045** | **62000** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00069694 | MID - Maurice Ile Durable |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | 74,097 |  |  |  |  | 74,097 | 78,000 | 95 | 52,678 |  |  |  |  |  | 52,678 | 88,280 | 60 | 32,401 |  |  |  |  | 32,401 | 35000 | 92.57 |
| 00035947 | MPA - Marine Protected Area |  | 77,086 |  |  | 272,563 | 349,649 | 387,360 | 90.3 |  |  |  |  | 367,325 | 367,325 | 429,504 | 86 |  | 4,403 | 219,635 |  |  | 115,535 | 339,573 | 542,045 | 63 |  |  | 279,509 |  | - | 279,509 | 629664 | 44.39 |
| 00036090 | Energy Efficiency (PDF A) | 16,591 | 7,587 | 19,740 |  |  | 43,918 | 76,794 | 57 | 12,142 | 4,600 | 12,978 |  |  | 29,720 | 37,436 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| 00072174 | Renewable Energy PPG |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  | 25,369 |  |  |  |  | 61,416 | 86,785 | 108,000 | 80 | 8,427 |  |  |  | 9,700 | 18,127 | 27084 | 66.93 |
| 00076772 | Rem. Barriers Solar PV Power Generation |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| 00049100 | CB for SLM in Mauritius | 12,548 | - |  |  | 236,246 | 248,794 | 360,002 | 69.1 |  |  |  |  | 98,201 | 98,201 | 105,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52,856 | 52,856 | 114,126 | 46 |  | 3,941 |  |  | 60,248 | 64,189 | 69655 | 92.15 |
| 00052450 | Protected Areas Network (PAN) - PPG | 18,712 |  |  |  | 86,143 | 104,855 | 159,000 | 66 | 109,155 |  |  |  | 62,652 | 171,807 | 175,000 | 98 | 782 |  |  |  |  | - | 782 | 1,000 | 78 |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |
| 00073392 | Protected Area Network Full Size project |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7,927 | 7,927 | 478,900 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 84,514 | 84,514 | 129100 | 65.46 |
| 00058178 | Energy Efficiency in Buildings | 21 |  |  |  | 21,753 | 21,774 | 248,000 | 9 | 105,105 |  |  |  | 139,726 | 244,831 | 308,726 | 79 | 25,259 |  | 15,000 |  |  | 92,138 | 132,397 | 326,668 | 41 |  |  |  |  | 110,182 | 110,182 | 201782 | 54.60 |
| 00061756 | Sustainable Management of POPS | 65,797 |  |  |  | 1,465 | 67,262 | 204,189 | 32.9 |  | 18,613 |  |  | 81,888 | 100,501 | 201,499 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  | 99,381 | 99,381 | 287,250 | 35 |  | 5,440 |  |  | 85,251 | 90,691 | 172784 | 52.49 |
| 00072168 | Rodrigues - support to water |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | 25,710 |  |  |  |  | 25,710 | 26,000 | 99 | 30,416 |  |  |  |  |  | 30,416 | 56,000 | 54 |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| 00076002 | SAICM UNDP/UNEP |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| 00070342 | Seamounts Project |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | 257,316 | 257,316 | 262,100 | 98 |  |  |  |  |  | 253,342 | 253,342 | 429,400 | 59 |  |  |  |  | 82,081 | 82,081 | 169800 | 48.34 |
| 00054933 | CDM |  |  |  | 30,974 |  | 30,974 | 111,140 | 27.9 |  | 8,156 |  | 58,402 |  | 66,558 | 87,472 | 76 |  |  |  |  | 11,419 |  | 11,419 | 140,000 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  | - | 99604 | - |
| 00050861 | ASCLME - Agulhas & Somali LME |  |  |  |  | 2,389,002 | 2,389,002 | 2,398,890 | 100 |  |  |  |  | 2,746,684 | 2,746,684 | 2,401,270 | 114 |  |  |  |  |  | 2,669,719 | 2,669,719 | 2,578,500 | 104 |  |  |  |  | 1,371,584 | 1,371,584 | 2526426 | 54.29 |
| 00072697 | Climate Change Adaptation in Africa |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | 69,621 |  |  | 69,621 | 1,037,004 | 7 |  |  |  | 228,996 |  | 228,996 | 951820 | 24.06 |
| 00076030 | Adaptation Fund |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| 00076344 | SIDS -IWRM |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
|  | *Total per fund* | *113,669* | *84,673* | *19,740* | *30,974* | *3,007,172* | 3,256,228 | 3,945,375 | 82.5 | *326,209* | *31,369* | *12,978* | *58,402* | *3,753,792* | 4,182,750 | 4,112,007 | 102 | *134,504* | *4,403* | *234,635* | *69,621* | *11,419* | *3,352,314* | 3,806,896 | 6,187,173 | 62 | *40,828* | *9,381* | *279,509* | *228,996* | *1,803,560* | 2,362,274 | *5012719* | 47.13 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Annex 13–Evaluation Stakeholders' Consultations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TIME** | **Monday** | **Tuesday** | **Wednesday** | **Thursday** | **Friday** |
| **10/10/2011** | **11/10/2011** | **12/10/2011** | **13/10/2011** | **14/10/2011** |
| **8h30 -9h30** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **9h00-10h00** | Briefing with Environment Unit in CO-6th floor | **9h30**- Ira Ovesen for MPA/PAN | **MPU**- 10th floor Air Mauritius Building 10th floor M. Bikoo and M. Mungur | **AFD**- Mrs. Laurence Breton Moyer, VaninaDeak, Stephanie Chaleon-5th floor |  |
| **10h00-11h00** | MPA-P.A-Allen Cedras 6th floor | **SGP**-Pamela BappooDandoo |  | **MOI**- Daniel Marie Phone conversation 427 4434 MOI | **10h30**- Presentation of preliminary findings |
| **11h00-12h00** | phone meeting with **RRA**-M. GrandCourt-6th floor | **POPs &ASCLME**-no PM, so P.O SatyajeetRamchurn in CO-5th floor | **GaetanSiew** | **Environment. Unit Meeting**-Ira will be via skype |  |
| **12h00-1300** | **LUNCH** | | | | |
| **13h00-14h00** | **AAP**- P.C - Dr. Joottun in CO-6th floor | **E&E** : PreetamChaundee, ShakilBeedassy, SatyajeetRamchurn 5th floor | **CDM & MID**-Madoo& SR in CO-5th floor | Call with DrSoonarane 256 38 21 |  |
| **14h00-15h00** | **SLM** PM-Mr. ArvindDookhun on 6th floor | 14h30 MoE: -Mrs. Ng & Team for **POPS & AAP**-5th floor | **14h30- MID-** Mr. O. Mohammed 6th level, PMO, New Government Centre , Port Louis |  |
| **15h00-16h00** | **E&E**- PM PreetamChaundee in CO - 6th floor |  |  |  |
| **15h 30**-Phone meeting with Roland Alcindor |  |  |
| **16h00-17h00** |  | **APEXHOM**-RaifaBhundu 5th Floor | **UN Coordination Yan Hookoomsing**-6th floor conference room |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **National priority or goal : To improve environmental protection by accessing and utilizing environmental funds, carbon markets, payment for ecosystem services (PES) and other financing mechanisms** | | | | |
| **Country Programme Outcome** | **Outputs, including key output indicators where needed** | **Outcome indicators, baselines and targets** | **Role of partners** | **Evaluator Comments** |
| National capacities of key institutions to implement global environmental commitments at national and regional levels through integration of environmental concerns in national policies and programmes improved.  **Baseline**: **Limited capacity and tools to integrateglobal and regional environmental obligations into national development policies and programmes and lack of framework for accessing carbon finance.**  **Target: Capacities of institutions and appropriate tools developed facilitating the integration of international and regional environmental obligations into national policies, strategies and programmes.**  **Indicators: 10% improvement reflected in the environmental indicators for Mauritius by 2010 in the various State of Environment Reports preparedas part of the Conventions Obligations and framework for CDM developed and operational by end 2010.** | Capacities for sustainable land management are built in appropriate government and civil society institutions/user groups and mainstreamed into government planning and strategy development. | **Baseline:** Forest Land Information System completed and National Action Programme and National Forestry Action Plan initiated. **Target**: SLM best practices and guidelines are broadly disseminated and used in development planning, zoning and agricultural extension.  **Indicator:** NAP approved by Cabinet of Ministers and submitted to the UNCCD by end 2010. | **Government:** *Ministry of Agriculture* will lead the process and house the PMU. M*inistry of Housing and Lands* and the *Rodriguez Regional Assembly* will be partners in the implementation of the project in Mauritius and Rodrigues Island.  **Cooperating Partners:** *FAO* will provide parallel financing and will be the lead agency for the development of the NFAP, and the global mechanism of the *UNCCD* will provide technical inputs for the development of the NAP. | The lesson arising from this project (aimed at instituting SLM as an approach and provided tool and capacity strengthening) is that information about cost benefits of NRM should be dynamically shared upwards with policy makers and mainstreamed in the budgeting process. Key learning highlights the need for cross-sector coordination and collaboration beyond ad hoc inputs for immediate capacity strengthening. SLM is a long term process, and moreover it is an “approach.”. The key instrument for this is multi-use information management systems providing key information to decision makers about cost benefits, i.e. what exactly is forsaken if this is development-enacted. How this information is packaged and shared is very important for influencing land use planning and policy. The work of natural resource management goes beyond forestry and, therefore, considerations of future linkages between the outcome of this project with MOE and MPU are very important.  Good contribution to the indicator  **Rating: Satisfactory** |
|
| Enabling policy and institutional framework for sustainably co-managed marine and terrestrial protected areas through public-private partnership developed. | **Baseline:** Limited protection to globally significant terrestrial, coastal and marine biodiversity.  **Target**: Reduced threats to biodiversity through participatory stakeholder process to effectively conserve biodiversity through innovative co-management of protected areas.  **Indicators:** (a) A Marine Protected Area under co-management created in Rodrigues by December 2009, and replicated in Mauritius end 2010; (b) Terrestrial Protected Area Network increased by 8% by 2011. | **Government:***Rodriguez Regional Assembly and Albion Fisheries Research Center*will be the lead implementing agencies for the MPA, while the National Parks and Conservation Services work for the PAN project.  **Civil Societies:**  Local communities will be the important partners for the MPA co-management, while the Mauritius Wildlife Foundation works for the terrestrial component. **Private sector**: landowners will be main stakeholders in the terrestrial component as well as for the co-management for the MPA. | The project outcomes are very important toward the overall capacity development outcome goal. The project demonstrated sound cost benefit analysis process at the level of island development. The alternative as a tourism site is testimony that the case as a cost effective land/sea use has been made. For the income generating potential of the MPA, however, it will be important (towards outcome) to retain the attention of the RRA.therefore a strong marketing element is needed to follow up and help the project generate revenue. It will also be important that the MPA advisor be retained in order to work with the RRA as advisor on sustainable development. This will also link and support RRA strategically to the MID process.  Good contribution to the indicator.  **Rating: Satisfactory** |
|
| Long-term sustainability of living resources of the two Large Marine Ecosystems ensured through ecosystem-based approach to management of the Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystem (ASCLME). | **Baseline:**Lack of a holistic multi-sectoral regional ecosystem management approach to LME for the Agulhas and Somali Curren.t  **Target**: Research and understanding of the coastal and marine ecosystems within the ASCLME.  **Indicator**: Regional-based monitoring and information system operational by 2011. | Government: Coordination between 7 direct beneficiaries:governments and oceanographic institutes (Tanzania, Mozambique, Seychelles, Madagascar, South Africa, Comoros, Mauritius) and governments of Norway and France. Cooperating Partners: UNEP (WIO-LaB/IOC), World Bank  (SWIOFP) provide technical expertise and information sharing. | A mid-term evaluation was completed January 2010. This project is on track securing trans-boundary cooperation for the management of the ecosystem. However, the national capacity strengthening objective and also visibility of the initiatives can be improved by ensuring that all the learning and technology developed and shared between project stakeholders can effectively include the wider decision making processes in Mauritius.. This problem might be alleviated by setting up a national communication and public awareness strategy and coordination mechanism.  OK contribution to the indicator.  *Project needs reinforcements towards national capacity strengthening objectives, additional national level monitoring mechanism, visibility and linkages with MOE for cross-sectoral learning as a dynamic process.*  **Rating: Satisfactory** |
| Operational CDM and voluntary carbon market framework developed. | **Baseline:** Lack of National CDM strategy.  **Target:** Promotion of access to the carbon market, financing and technology.  **Indicator**: 3 Carbon Credit projects prepared for submission to the MDG Carbon Finance by end 2010. | **Government;** Ministry of Environment, UNEP and UNDP will be the lead agencies in the development of capacities and the CDM project proposals. | Unfortunately, the project has not materialized nor been successful in harnessing the newly-created enabling conditions created in Phase 1 of the project to promote actual CDM projects due to a number of internal and external reasons. There were delays in getting the funding in place and in struggling with the management of the project at the regional level to get a coordinator and a CDM technical specialist. EEG management has also asked for a reformulation of the project and has reduced the overall budget and reevaluated the originally agreed set of activities and the geographic scope. The first major intended output of this project was the formulation of a coherent CDM National Strategy, which unfortunately did not materialize due to non-delivery by the consultant appointed.  **Rating: Not Satisfactory** |
|

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country Programme Outcome** | **Outputs, including key output indicators where needed** | **Outcome indicators, baselines and targets** | **Role of partners** | **Evaluator Comments** |
| Capacities for management of persistent organic pollutants, mainstreaming climate change adaptation strategies and integrating energy conservation into policy and programme development enhanced at country level.  **Baseline:** Climate Change adaptation measures and Energy Efficiency concerns are not integrated or national development strategies.  **Target:** Build local capacity to mainstream climate change issues into national development programmes.  **Indicators:** National Adaptation Plan implemented. Energy efficiency regulations implemented by end 2011. | Revised National legislation alignment with Stockholm Convention. | **Baseline:** Stockholm Convention is not fully incorporated into national legislation.  **Target**: Compliance with Stockholm Convention by end 2009 and strengthen institutional capacities  **Indicator**: Use of POPs chemical phased out by 2010. | **Government:***Ministry of Environment* and the *Ministry of Health and Quality of Life* will be the main implementing agencies and will cooperate with the *Ministry of Local Government and the State Law Office.* | Disposal of obsolete POPs from the island will be done by the end of the year, thus helping implement the provisions of the Stockholm Convention. Suitable non-DDT solution towards malaria preventive measures in Mauritius has been identified. Development of an effective non-DDT based vector control programme is on-going. Overall there has been up to now a successful partnership strategy.  **Good contribution to the indicator**  **Rating: Satisfactory.** |
| Energy Efficiency market developed. | **Baseline:** Limited investment in energy efficiency in buildings and no proper regulation and codes.  **Target:** GHG emissions reduced substantially through transformation of the energy efficiency market for existing and new building.  **Indicator**: 5 verified investment projects in energy efficiency measures in buildings being implemented by end 2011. Building regulations enacted and codes drafted and necessary legislation enacted by end 2010. | **Government:***Ministry of Public Utilities* will be the main implementing agency through the establishment of Energy Efficiency Unit. The *central Electricity Board* as well as the *State Law office* will be important partners in the implementation of the project as along with the *Ministry of Housing,*  **Private Sector**: *Mauritius Architects Association, Engineers Association will contribute to the development of new building regulations.* | Most deliverables are either completed or well underway. Strong policy presence was achieved through the enactment of the Energy Efficiency Bill and the final drafting of the Building Control Bill. The passage of the EE bill is a proof of the positive link between capacity building in government and policy formulation support via a well-designed project. Activities have advanced less in the awareness creation components. The allocated GEF funds will be insufficient for implementing additional project activities and additional funding from SIDS DOCK has already been secured. Support for an unintended outcome (the SIPP SSDG FIT scheme) was highly valuable. The latest environment statistics indicators show a decreasing trend of the energy intensity of the economy and this project will further contribute to this positive outcome.  **Good contribution to the indicator**  **Rating: Satisfactory.** |
| Capacity strengthened and adaptation measures integrated into tourism development and coastal zone management. | **Baseline**: Climate Change risk adaptation measures not incorporated into current approaches to coastal zone management.  **Target:** Capacity developed to address future climate change-related risks through adaptive measures in tourism sector development and ICZM.  **Indicator:** National Adaptation Plan developed by Ministry of Tourism by end 2011. | **Government:** The Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Tourism will be the main implemented agencies.  **Private Sector:** Association of Hotel and Restaurants of Mauritius will be the main collaborator in the implementation of the project by harnessing support of the private sector. | The clear intention of the AAP project is to build capacity to address the complex and multidisciplinary problem climate change poses. The project is currently not on track, and the delivery rate is low A number of operational issues have been identified that are impacting on delivery and a mid-term outcome evaluation should be done urgently to review the design and maximize impact next year.  **Modest contribution to the indicator**  **Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory** |