PROJECT TERMINAL EVALUATION "EXPANDING COVERAGE AND STRENGTHENING MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS OF THE TERRESTRIAL PROTECTED AREA NETWORK ON THE ISLAND OF MAURITIUS"

UNDP PIMS 3749

GEF ID 3526

GEF FOCAL AREA: BIODIVERSITY

STRATEGIC PROGRAM OF GEF 4:

BD SO1-SP3 'STRENGTHENING NETWORKS OF TERRESTRIAL PAS'

IMPLEMENTING PARTNER: MINISTRY OF AGRO-INDUSTRY AND FOOD SECURITY)/ NATIONAL PARKS AND CONSERVATION SERVICE AND FORESTRY SERVICE

REGION: AFRICA
COUNTRY: MAURITIUS

Evaluation conducted by Mrs Laurence Reno and Dr Dominique ROBY
from 26 February to 9 March 2018
Draft report submitted 23 April 2018
Final report submitted 27 May 2018

Acknowledgements

The consultants would like to sincerely thank the PAN project team, the project Chief Technical Advisor and UNDP Mauritius Country Office for their effective support in allowing the mission to take place in good conditions, for sharing necessary information and for arranging/facilitating the meetings with stakeholders. Project implementation partners and project beneficiaries are sincerely thanked for sharing generously and genuinely their experience in the project and their views on its outcomes.

The collection of information for this evaluation required the collaboration of people who kindly agreed to take the time to meet us and share their experience, opinions and analysis on the implementation of this project. The authors of this report wish to thank them truthfully. However, recognition of their contribution does not bind anyone to any statement in this report, apart from the authors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of tables

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AFA	Administrative and Financial Assistant
AFD	*Agence Française de Développement*
ASL	Authorized Spending Limit
AWP	Annual Workplan
BD	Biological Diversity
BENP	Bras d'Eau National Park
BRGNP	Black River Gorge National Park
CC	Climate Change
CDR	Combined Delivery Report
CEO ER	Chief Executive Officer Endorsement Request
CMA	Conservation Management Area
CO	Country Office
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DWCT	Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust
EA	Executing Agency
EC	Executive Committee
EOP	End of Project
ES	Environmental/Ecosystem Services
FS	Forestry Service
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
HSBC	Hong Kong & Shanghai Banking Corporation (Multinational bank)
HR	Human Resources
IA	Implementing Agency
IAS	Invasive Alien Species
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
IW	Inception Workshop
KM	Knowledge Management
LF	Logical Framework
LPAC	Local Project Appraisal Committee
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for PAs
MoAIFS	Ministry of Agro-Industry and Food Security
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSSNSESD	Ministry of Social Security, National Solidarity and Environment and Sustainable Development
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NIASSAP	National Invasive Alien Species Strategy and Action Plan
NIM	National Implementation Modality
NPC	National Project Coordinator
NPCS	National Parks and Conservation Service
NP	National Park
NPD	National Project Director
NTBNPA	Native Terrestrial Biodiversity and National Parks Act
PA	Protected Area
PAN	Protected Area Network
PANES	Protected Area Network Expansion Strategy
PES	Payment for Environmental Services
PIF	Project Identification File
PIMS	Project Information Management System
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PMU	Project Management Unit
PNC	Project National Coordinator
POPP	Programme & Operations Policies and Procedures
ProDoc	Project Document
PSC	Project Steering Committee

RTA	Region-based Technical Advisor
RTREBS	Rivulet Terre Rouge Estuary Bird Sanctuary
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time related
SP	Strategic Program
SRF	Strategic Results Framework
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TF	Trust Fund
TOR	Terms of Reference
TT	Tracking Tool
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UN RC/UNDP RR	United Nations Resident Coordinator / UNDP Resident Representative

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Summary Table

Table 1. Project Information Board

Project Title:	Expanding Coverage and Strengthening Management Effectiveness of the Terrestrial Protected Area Network on the Island of Mauritius		
Project GEF ID	3526	Date of PIF Approval	Jan 22, 2008
Atlas Business Unit, Award №, Project ID	MUS10, 00058905, 3749	Date of GEF CEO Approval	Dec 15, 2009
Country	Mauritius	Date of ProDoc signature	March 5, 2010
Region	AFRICA	Date of hiring of the project manger	March 22, 2011
GEF Focal Area	Biodiversity	Date of Inception Workshop	Aug 18-19, 2011
Trust Fund [GEF TF, LDCF, SCCF, NPIF]	GEF TF	Expected date of operational closure	March 31, 2015
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective	GEF 4 SO-1 Catalyzing Sustainability of PA Systems	If revised, new date proposed	April 30, 2018
Executing Agency / Implementation Partner	UNDP / Ministry of Agro-Industry and Food Security (MoAIFS) – National Parks and Conservation Service (NPCS) and Forestry Service (FS)		
Other Partners	Ministry of Environment and National Development Unit		
Financial arrangement	At endorsement (millions USD)	Project end (millions USD)*	
[1] GEF Funding:	4,000,000	3,502,832	
[2] UNDP Funding:	-	-	
[3] Government:	4,187,400 (in-kind)	4,418,230 (grant) + 493,467 (in-kind)	
[3] Private:	4,042,000 (in-kind)	n.d. (in-kind)	
[4] Other Partners: NGO	3,200,000 (in-kind)	n.d. (in-kind)	
[5] Total Cofinancing [2 + 3+ 4]:	11,764,400	4,911,697	
PROJECT TOTAL COSTS [1 + 5]	15,429,400	8,414,529	

* Amounts correspond to the project situation as at end of March 2018 and do not include foreseen expenses until end of April 2018.

Project Description

The protected area network in Mauritius is small and fragmented and a number of ecologically important private lands are currently excluded from the PA system, including large habitat blocks and corridor areas. The project aimed to expand and ensure effective management of the PA network to safeguard threatened biodiversity. To achieve this goal, the project was designed to strengthen the systemic, institutional and operational capacity to: (i) identify, prioritize and target gaps in representation that could be filled through protected area expansion, and complementary conservation efforts on private and state-owned land; (ii) develop regulatory drivers and an incentive framework to support PA expansion and conservation on private and state-owned land; (iii) establish and administer a conservation stewardship program to implement PA expansion initiatives on privately owned or managed land; (iv) effectively plan, resource and manage an expanded PAN comprising both private and state protected areas; (v) cost-effectively mitigate the threats to the unique biodiversity in the expanded PAN, notably the spread of invasive alien species; (vi) ensure better integration of the PAN into the country's socio-economic development priorities, in particular development of the tourism industry, to ensure its long-term financial sustainability; and (vi) respond effectively to the needs of, and meaningfully involve, different stakeholder groups in the ongoing planning and operational management of the expanded PAN.

Summary of the project progress

After 8 years of implementation, including a 36-month no-cost extension, this project has a moderately satisfactory rate of technical achievement and financial resources have been almost fully utilized. By the end of the project, as detailed in the Table 7 on Project Progress towards achieving the objective and expected outcomes, i) the improvement of the systemic framework for PA expansion has been strengthened by the participatory development of a strategy to guide the expansion of the terrestrial PA network, the PANES with its Support documents (Legal Framework, Biodiversity Stewardship, Institutional Framework, Conservation Mapping and Tourism Development) that consolidate the Strategy though limited by the absence of a business plan and of a regulatory framework for the creation and management of private reserves, ii) the PA institutional framework has been strengthened by the availability of management plans for 3 national parks (without financial plans and not yet formally adopted at the time of the TE, although BRGNP and BENP have annual operational plans which were used to estimate budget requirements for 2018-2019), and enhanced skills and competencies of PA staff developed through targeted trainings and the participation to the project, and iii)

operational know-how to contain threats such as IAS is enhanced through procurement of equipment to increase the effectiveness of monitoring and surveillance of PAs, improvement of the cost-effectiveness of IAS control and native forest restoration, and the production of a technical guide for the restoration of native vegetation.

Despite a significant increase of the delivery rate after the MTR and especially after the recruitment of the 2nd PM, the delays caused by the slow start of the project, burdensome procurement procedures namely for staff recruitment, equipment and consultancies, poorly formulated TORs for major outputs under components 1 and 2, inadequate quality and delay in the delivery of products by the consultancy firm recruited, and substantial administrative delays for clearing of strategic documents such as PANES and PA Management Plans, could not be fully recovered and some key elements are still missing such as a finalized and validated business plan for the PANES and enabling regulations for the creation and management of private reserves. The underperformance for an important target such as the increased coverage of terrestrial formal PA network is mainly attributable to the project low performance during the first part of its implementation, which delayed the delivery of outputs which completion was required prior to the undertaking of related tasks.

One of the main gaps in the project achievements is that, after 8 years, ~~there is not one hectare of~~no private reserves have been added to the formally protected PA estate, and the private land owners who were met for the interviews were not engaged in a process for establishing protected areas on their lands and did not intend to do so under the current regulatory context. At the end of the project, the necessary incentives and enabling regulatory framework for the establishment and management of protected areas on private land are still missing. This being said, the strong collaboration of the private sector in the development of a biodiversity stewardship template shows that there is interest in furthering collaboration on a formal basis. The document that was developed at a late stage of the project had not yet been vetted by the State Law Office, thus preventing any formal assistance in the establishment of PAs on private lands in the context of the project. No biodiversity stewardship unit was established (although TORs were developed and the NPCS requested for resources to set up this unit within its organisational structure in line with the recommendations of the PANES) and a limited pilot programme was implemented through providing financial incentives to 7 private land owners for the clearing of IAS on their land. The expansion of the PA estate does not include formal private PAs.

Evaluation Rating Table

Table 2. Evaluation Rating Table (Refer to Annex 8 for the TE rating scales)

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	***rating***	**2. IA& EA Execution**	***rating***
M&E design at entry	S	Quality of UNDP Implementation	MS
M&E Plan Implementation	MS	Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	S
Overall quality of M&E	S	Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	S
3. Assessment of Outcomes	**rating**	**4. Sustainability**	**rating**
Relevance	R	Financial resources:	ML-MU
Effectiveness	MS	Socio-economic:	L
Efficiency	S	Institutional framework and governance:	ML
Overall Project Outcome Rating	MS	Environmental :	L
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	ML

Recommendations and lessons

	Recommendations	**Resp. entity**
Implementation		
1	**TORs**. The blame for the fact that some tasks were not completed under components 1 and 2 was mostly focused on the poor performance of the international consultancy firm Eco Africa. However, this 1.5-year contract was awarded only in February 2014, almost four years after the official start of a five-year project and covered most of the project components 1 and 2. The level of effort and the time required to complete all the tasks included in this contract was greatly underestimated. Tasks such as participatory development of strategic documents involving extensive consultation and development and pilot implementation of a PES mechanism, to name these, would have required much more time than what was specified in the contract. This does not diminish the responsibility of the firm to have accepted this contract, but if learning must be drawn from this experience in order to improve the implementation of future projects, they must relate to all the time lost during the 4 first years of the project and on the preparation of the terms of reference, especially when they are of such importance in relation to the project as a whole.	UNPD Future projects Government

	Recommendations	Resp. entity
	Timing: The development of TORs of major importance for a project and conditioning a sequence of subsequent activities should be a priority from the start of the project, within the first 3 months. Responsibility: The CTA, the project manager and the UNDP CO should prepare the ToRs based on the specifications provided in the project document and have them validated by experts, at least by persons able to assess rigorously the consistency of the content and conditions of execution, including level of effort, resources allocated and duration, including the RTA and local specialists. These TORs should be circulated and validated by the PSC, and advertised as broadly as possible. If the TORs are not developed within a short delay, the PSC as the supervisory structure should be vigilant and rapidly inquire about the reasons and take action. While there is consensus on the poor performance of the 1st project manager, he was in post for 2 years. Selection: Procurement rules that require to select the cheapest offer could be misleading and technical criteria should be considered foremost and outweigh the financial criteria, while remaining within the budget of the project. Description: ToRs prepared with clear, detailed, and scheduled deliverables based on a realistic assessment of the level of effort required to achieve the tasks	
2	**Counterproductive delays**. One of the explanations for delaying the formalization of key documents that had gone through all possible stages of participatory discussions, reviews and validation and administrative requirements, was that Government officials had to wait for a major event to declare or publicize major achievements (e.g. launching of a national strategy or declaring sites as Nature Reserves). Delaying the formalization of such documents in turn delays the implementation of other activities that depend on a formal enabling framework or guidance, which impacts the delivery of a project with a limited lifetime. It is thus recommended to seize the opportunity offered by the completion of a key product of national importance and to **create** an event around its formalization.	MoAIFS, UNDP RR/RC
3	**Quality assurance role** - UNDP at country and regional levels must ensure that project implementation arrangements and expenditures comply with UNDP rules and that funds are used for agreed purposes.	UNDP – all levels
Monitoring and evaluation		
4	**Monitoring of IAS clearing and results**. To develop and implement a monitoring procedure for the clearing of IAS and establish a database. One of the PIRs mentions that the mapping of restored areas under the project have been initiated. However, this is far from being sufficient. The *Good Practice Guide to Native Vegetation Restoration in Mauritius* mentions that the frequency of maintenance weeding will vary depending on site-specific factors and that "when, where, and how to weed should be determined by monitoring". In order to expand further clearing of IAS and restoration of native forests at a scale large enough to have a significant long-term impact on restoration of habitats for biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services, it is necessary to plan IAS clearing operations and monitor interventions and results to assess the interventions effectiveness and efficiency (cost) for continuous improvement, as recommended in the Good Practice Guide. Data could be collected by trained supervisors. The following is not exhaustive and could be complemented by specialists, while retaining simplicity and practical feasibility: - Planning of the clearing operations could include the following data on the physical site: a few environmental parameters, such as geographical coordinates of the site, state of invasion of the forest and main target IAS species, canopy cover, slope, distance to a watercourse, and presence of vulnerable species (endemic, rare, threatened). - Monitoring of the interventions: dates of first and subsequent clearings, technique used, number of workers and duration of interventions, area of intervention, weather including occurrence of rain within X hours of the clearing (when herbicide is applied), bundles of cut vegetation left on site. - Monitoring of the results: description and quantification of regrowth and regeneration of IAS within a specific radius around cut stump, occurrence of new IAS species, evidence of impacts such as erosion, and description and quantification of (target) native species regeneration.	NPCS
Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project		
5	**Regulatory framework for private reserves**. To develop and enact a regulatory framework to enable the creation and management of private reserves that contribute to the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services while providing benefits to land owners. The legislative framework should enable the establishment of incentives to encourage landowners to enter the programme, including through payment for ecosystem services schemes.	MoAIFS State Law Office
6	**PES**. The implementation of conservation and restoration actions entails high costs and, in order to scale up conservation and restoration with the participation of the private sector, it is necessary to develop adequate financial incentives. Ecosystem valuation was included in the ProDoc under output 1.4, and the development and testing of a Payment for Ecological Services (PES) scheme was included in the TORs of the consulting firm Eco-Africa, as part of an Integrated Financing Strategy for PAs. This part of the contract was	MoaIFS / NPCS, FS UNDP

	Recommendations	Resp. entity
	not completed and it must be said that the level of effort required to achieve the development and testing of a PES was clearly underestimated. A meta-analysis of 89 restoration assessments in a wide range of ecosystem types across the globe indicated that ecological restoration increased provision of biodiversity and ecosystem services by 44 and 25% respectively, and that values of both remained lower in restored versus intact reference ecosystems.[1] IAS were among the degrading actions addressed by 4 of the studies examined, and extirpation of damaging species and planting of trees were among the restoration actions in 8 and 16 studies. Such results should motivate a reflection (possibly as part of a MSP or as a component of a larger project) on the possibility of establishing voluntary PES schemes as an alternative or complement to binding stewardship agreements with private land owners. PES can be defined as (i) voluntary, (ii) contingent transactions between (iii) at least one seller and (iv) one buyer (v) over a well-defined Ecosystem Service, or a land use likely to secure that service. This could involve valuation studies for high value ecosystem services likely to be improved by conservation, restoration and sustainable use of ecosystems and natural resources (such as carbon storage, regulation of climate and water flow, provision of clean water, and maintenance of soil fertility), an analysis of the market for specific PES to identify service providers (sellers) and users (buyers) of the ES, and the identification of several elements required to operationalize the PES scheme[2]. In line with the Mauritius NBSAP 2017-2025, namely target 7 aiming at developing a policy framework with incentives for pro-biodiversity practices, target 3 related to setting up sustainable incentives for biodiversity conservation and restoration, and target 11 aiming at conserving at least 16% of terrestrial areas and inland waters, it is recommended to further the efforts undertaken under the PAN project to bring the private land owners on board and build on i) existing outputs of the PAN project such as the biodiversity stewardship pilot experiences as MoUs between 7 private companies and the MoAIFS providing a financial incentive of 400,000 Rupees for clearing IAS over 5 ha of native forest, ii) reflections and consultations to develop the Biodiversity Stewardship Programme and the Biodiversity Stewardship Agreement template, and iii) the valuation study of ecosystem services provided by the watersheds of 2 important reservoirs presented as part of the NBSAP 2017-2015.	
7	**Entrance fees to PAs**. The proportion of the financial resources for the PA network sourced from non-governmental sources decreased since the beginning of the project, and more particularly in the 2nd segment of its implementation, as shown under the indicator # 11 in Table 7. It is recommended to put in place mechanisms to generate independent revenue earmarked for conservation in PAs, based on a user-pays principle, such as entrance fees to PAs. Given that some issues have hampered so far the implementation of this obvious and globally widespread solution to raise sustainable income to support the recurrent operational costs of PAs, such as the social acceptability of imposing entrance fees and the fact that PAs are easily accessible (not fenced), it is recommended that the Government commission a consultation to examine the solutions implemented elsewhere in the world and proposes solutions that will be acceptable to all to remove the current obstacles to the mobilization of this source of income for the APs system.	MoAIFS
8	**IAS control field guide**. It is recommended to produce a practical and user-friendly field guide for IAS control, from the instructions provided in the *Good Practice Guide to Native Vegetation Restoration in Mauritius,* with clear and simple instructions in the form of illustrations accessible to non-specialist field workers and separate sheets for the different techniques, in a format resistant to be handled in the field.	NPCS
9	**Business plans**. It is recommended to complete the PANES Financial and Business Model building on the (incomplete) draft developed by the consulting firm and submitted at the Validation Workshop and on the identification of human resources requirements for all competency areas needed to implement the PANES (as part of the Strategic Action Plan for the Implementation of the PANES). It is also recommended to develop individual business plans for each of the 2 National Parks and for the Bird Sanctuary as part of their management plans, based on the following assessments: − Identification and assessment of available finances for the individual PA based on the operational budget (for salaries, maintenance, fuel) and infrastructure investment budget (such as roads, visitor centres), annual revenue generated on the site such as tourism entrance fees, income from concessions such as ecotourism development, and payments for ecosystem services;	MoAIFS/ NPCS, FS

[1] Rey Benayas J.M., Newton A.C., Diaz A. and J.M. Bullock. 2009. Enhancement of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services by Ecological Restoration: A Meta-Analysis. *Science* 325: 1121-1124.

[2] A clear set of criteria, and a procedure to define eligible activities, expected benefits, and level / mode of payment or compensation practices for different land and resource users to generate environmental benefits; A mechanism to transfer payments from buyers to sellers; A procedure to enforce the application the contracts; Indicators and methodology to monitor performance of the contracts to ensure that the scheme effectively achieves its conservation and environmental objectives; An institutional structure capable of managing the funds generated in the PES mechanism and monitoring its implementation and outcomes.

	Recommendations	Resp. entity
	– Assessment of the costs and financing needs for the basic management of the individual PA including recurring operational costs (such as salaries, fuel for transportation, office maintenance), and infrastructure investment costs; – Assessment of the annual financing gap for operations and infrastructure investment based on the previous assessments and identification of additional options and sources of revenues to leverage supplemental financial resources.	

Lessons

Undue procurement delays. The issue of the undue procurement delays was improved by briefing the Officer of the Sector Support to MoAIFS within the Ministry of Finance who is signatory for the project prior to submitting procurement requests and inviting him to attend presentations of the project work plans and achievements. Being better informed about the planning and the needs of the project, these officials are better able to validate them, which facilitates and speeds up the procurement process.

Required oversight. TORs of the international consulting firm EcoAfrica were incomplete and did not include timelines for the deliverables – these TORs were developed under the oversight of the UNV Program Officer who had limited experience - tasks assigned to a junior officer require close oversight by a senior officer of UNDP CO.

Dissemination of UNDP and GEF rules to all project stakeholders. An allowance was paid to civil servants from the project funds for their work to weed Invasive Alien Species, although this is against UN's rules. It has been reported that this kind of issue has occurred repeatedly in Mauritius but is also known to occur in other countries. It thus appears necessary to establish a systematic practice of taking advantage of a meeting or workshop involving the largest number of stakeholders, early in the implementation of the project, such as the inception workshop, to recall and clarify UNDP and GEF essential rules for project implementation.

Rigorous work planning and budgeting. A significant unrealized loss of US$55,887 is recorded in the project expenditure statement as of end of 2017, and is due to poor work planning, over-budgeting, and a high Authorized Spending Limit request. The excess amount had to be repaid at a higher exchange rate than that in effect at the time of the allocation due to the depreciation of the Mauritian rupee to the American dollar, which explains the loss. The lesson learned is to ensure rigorous and realistic work planning and avoid over-budgeting.

Collaboration. The supervisory structures, namely the Steering Committee, the Executive Committee and Technical Working Groups allowed to maximize intra - and inter-sectoral collaboration among the lead agencies and increase the efficiency of interventions.

Involving the private sector. Building trusting relationships and engaging actively the private sector in this project was essential and entailed a long-term process. This is why it is so important to maintain the momentum created by the project and to keep the private sector involved in the development of the regulatory framework for the creation and operation of private reserves and to keep explaining the concepts underlying the Biodiversity Stewardship Programme, in order to build this framework on the basis of common understanding of the principles involved.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

A final project evaluation is a learning exercise and an integral part of the project's monitoring and evaluation cycle, which includes accountability, informed decision-making and experiential learning. The final evaluation provides a detailed and systematic account of the performance of the project that is about to be completed with an assessment of its design, relevance, implementation process, and achievements with respect to the project objectives approved by the GEF, UNDP and the Government of Mauritius, and considering any changes in expected results agreed upon during project implementation. While the progress reports have presented the project's results in terms of mainly operational results, the terminal evaluation also assesses achievements in terms of development results, their chances of sustainability and their replication potential. The objectives of a final evaluation include promoting accountability and transparency, evaluating and communicating the project's degree of achievement, and synthesizing lessons that can help to improve the selection, design and implementation of future activities. The results of this assessment will also contribute to the GEF Evaluation Office database to report on the effectiveness of its operations in achieving global environmental benefits.

1.2 Scope and Methodology

In accordance with UNDP-GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures, all medium and full-size projects must undergo an independent[3] final evaluation by the end of their implementation cycle. The terminal evaluation was planned to meet the requirements of the terms of reference (Annex 1) as well as the most recent GEF guidelines for terminal project evaluations[4].

The evaluation was conducted using a participatory and consultative approach, in collaboration with the UNDP country office (CO), project implementing partners, government representatives, the project team, and key stakeholders. Assessments were firstly made based on the most updated information on the indicators of the SRF and related explanations, as shared by the project team and collected through interviews with stakeholders, and compared with documentation in the annual PIRs, other progress and technical reports/documents. Where inconsistencies were found, additional information was sought from the project team.

The information was acquired through the following tasks:

- Review of project documents. All relevant sources of information were reviewed, such as project document, annual workplans, budgets and progress reports, MTR, the extension request, the GEF tracking tools (METT and FSC), technical reports produced by the project, and any other documentation that was deemed useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The list of documents examined is presented in Appendix 9.
- Meetings with the Project Management Unit (PMU), Steering Committee members, the UNDP Programme Officer and UN RC, implementing partners within the public and the private sectors, as well as other partners who contributed to the project, in order to collect the information required to assess the project development, its implementation (including financial and administrative management) and its achievements. The list of persons interviewed is provided in Annex 4. The programme of meetings is included in Annex 2.
- 3 one-day visits to project intervention sites to note the project achievements. The itinerary of the field visits and people met are provided in Annex 3.
- Interview guides have been prepared to guide semi-structured interviews and systematize the collection of relevant information on outcome indicators and management issues. They are annexed (5, 6 and 7) to this report.

Limitations, challenges, constraints faced by the evaluation team. There were no specific limitations faced by the evaluation team but the relatively short time of the mission to review all project achievements over an 8-year period, and missing documentation about the PSC: TORs and minutes of all meetings but one.

Formulation of the project. The project formulation review focuses on the design of the results framework or logical framework, assumptions and risks, the consideration of learnings from other projects, linkages with other interventions in the same sector, stakeholder participation planning, the replication approach, and management arrangements. The

[3] The independence of the terminal evaluation process is related to the fact that the evaluation consultants were not involved in any stage of project design or implementation.

[4] Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163; Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office. 2008. Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations. Evaluation Document No. 3

logical framework review assesses the relevance of indicators and their targets and whether they incorporate disaggregated indicators to highlight the effects on women's development and empowerment.

Implementation of the project. The project implementation and adaptive management approach affecting the performance of the project are reviewed on the following aspects: work planning, financing and co-financing, monitoring and internal evaluation of the project, the commitment of stakeholders, reporting, and communication. The key financial aspects of the project are assessed and, as needed, explained, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized, and variances between planned and actual expenditures.

Project results. Results are assessed for their relevance (to national priorities and GEF / UNDP programs), effectiveness and impact (against expected results), efficiency (taking into account inputs), likelihood of sustainability, and impact - and rated according to the scales provided in Annex 8. The sustainability of the results is understood as the probability that the beneficial effects will be maintained after the end of the project. The sustainability assessment is based on the four dimensions of risk that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes: i) financial, ii) socio-political, iii) institutional and governance, and iv) environmental. Assessments made using the relevant GEF Tracking Tools and scorecards are reviewed and compared to assessments made during project preparation and at mid-term.

Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons learned. Based on this analytical work, the evaluation presents a synthesis of the main observations concerning the implementation of the project, recommendations to optimize the project results and promote its sustainability, and learnings useful for future projects.

1.3 Structure of the evaluation report

The TE report presents a summary of the main elements of the evaluation (progress, ratings, conclusions and recommendations), introduces the evaluation and presents its methodology (Section 1), describes the project and the context that led to its development presenting its strategy, implementation modalities and stakeholders (Section 2). Section 3 contains the findings of the TE where the design implementation and progress towards the results are presented and evaluated. The conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned are contained in Section 4 and Section 5 includes a set of annexes which present the tools and details of the TE.

2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

2.1 Project start and duration

The project officially started in March 2010 (date of ProDoc signature). Scheduled for a period of 5 years, it has been implemented over a period of 8 years, after the formal approval in April 2016 of a no-cost extension until April 2018 and two previous *de facto* 1-year extensions recorded in the PIRs of 2011 and 2012 which happened before the new UNDP-GEF policy on project extensions came into force. This new policy limits extension requests to only one per project and period of extension to 24 months for GEF-4 projects. The MTR recommendation in 2014 to extend the implementation period was conditional on a list of requirements which were met by the project, and approved by the PSC meeting of February 2016.

2.2 Problems that the project sought to address: targeted threats and barriers

The rich biodiversity of Mauritius is characterized by high levels of endemism in both flora and fauna and related to millions of years of isolation. Less than 2% of the native forest now remains and is concentrated in the Black River Gorges National Park (BRGNP) in the south-west, the Bamboo Mountain Range in the south-east, the Moka-Port Louis Ranges in the north-west, some isolated mountains and several offshore islands. The main threats to terrestrial biodiversity in Mauritius targeted by the project include i) habitat loss and fragmentation related to the conversion of forests to increase farmland and pasture areas for deer ranching and to development of public infrastructure, such as public roads through forested areas and expansion of urban and tourism development, and ii) uncontrolled spread of invasive alien species which are considered the most serious threat to native terrestrial biodiversity and include 16 plant species and 21 animal species including the Rusa deer of which 70,000 heads were raised on 15,000 hectares of private land and 10,000 hectares on privately rented state land. The spread of invasive species is promoted by ongoing deforestation and land disturbance for agriculture, deer ranching and development. The protected area network in Mauritius was small and fragmented and a number of ecologically important private lands were excluded from the PA system, including large habitat blocks and corridor areas. IAS control programs were restricted to small and fragmented CMAs covering less than 0.8% of the mainland PA estate.

The long-term solution was a reconfigured network of private and state PAs designed to safeguard a representative sample of Mauritius's terrestrial biodiversity under an effective and adaptive management regime to secure the conservation status and ecological integrity of the remaining natural habitats on private and state land in Mauritius. Three sets of barriers impeded the implementation of this solution and were related to capacity deficits at the systemic, institutional and operational site-levels.

Capacity deficits at the systemic level included the absence of an enabling policy and legislative framework, and lack of incentives for the declaration of privately owned land as a PA; no biodiversity strategic planning to develop prioritized targets for securing the integrity of the remaining native forests; lack appreciation of the intrinsic and ecological value of forests by communities and users, little demonstration of the economic value of PAs, and limited political and public support for their expansion in the context of an acute scarcity of land for development; and no framework for tourism development related to PAs.

Limited capacities at the institutional level for PA agencies related to shortage of personnel with key management, technical and negotiation skills; no new financing sources mobilized to strengthen PAs financial self-sustainability; insufficient experience and innovative instruments for successful establishment of new PAs on both private and public land and limited partnerships between the public and private sector in the management, development and commercialization of PAs; lack of incentives to protect biodiversity on private land and insufficient capacities in the PA agencies to devise and implement such incentive schemes; limited coordination and collaborative partnerships among institutions in charge of biodiversity conservation with unclear delineation of roles and responsibilities for regulation, enforcement, planning and monitoring; lack of a business plan to guide the strategic decision-making of PA institutions (FS and NPCS) and no sustainable financing plan to secure sufficient long-term financial resources to implement these business plans; no monitoring and evaluation systems to assess the performance of PA institutions in achieving their conservation objectives and weak and inefficient knowledge management system to support decision-making and M&E; and low political commitment to allocate public resources to operational and maintenance costs of PAs mainly related to the lack of perception of the economic benefits they provide to the country.

Site-level operational barriers related to the control of IAS as threats to biodiversity included the very high cost of IAS plant control in the CMAs and insufficient testing of alternative more cost-effective clearing methods with the view to scaling up the IAS clearing program; insufficient professional, technical and operating skills for IAS control, and inadequate financial resources to initiate and sustain an IAS clearing program; lack of technical or financial incentives to private landowners and lessees of state land to initiate and sustain an IAS clearing program in high priority forest areas; and insufficient awareness of the threat posed by IAS and support for their management and control.

Site level operational barriers related to the ineffectiveness of PAs at protecting the remaining high value forests included insufficiently trained and equipped staff; inadequate financial resources; lacking or outdated management plans for PAs and lack of a standardized format for PA management plans; ineffective conservation measure at the ecosystem and landscape scales and too limited active management of IAS in PAs restricted to very small CMAs; and lack of a monitoring system to assess management effectiveness of PAs and of a consolidated and accessible database for PAs in Mauritius.

2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project / Expected results

Project goal. The project goal is to *conserve the globally significant native forest biodiversity of Mauritius*.

Project objective. The project objective, as per the ProDoc, is to *expand and ensure effective management of the protected area network to safeguard threatened biodiversity*.

In the ProDoc, the project strategy is structured into 3 components: the first one being focused on the improvement of the policy and legislative frameworks to enable the expansion of the PA network, the second one, on the strengthening of the institutional framework and capacities, and the third one on developing / strengthening the skills and knowledge to fight main threats to biodiversity.

Outcome 1: *Systemic framework for PA expansion improved*, through the following outputs:

1.1 Enabling national policy for a representative system of protected areas is formulated
1.2 Legislative and regulatory framework for the PAN is updated and reformed
1.3 Rationale for PA expansion in place, and conservation stewardship strategy and tools established to guide implementation
1.4 Business-oriented financial and business plan prepared for PAN
1.5 Awareness of the need to conserve native biodiversity is improved

Outcome 2: ***PA institutional framework strengthened***.

The achievement of this outcome was expected to follow from these outputs:

2.1 Management and governance options for the PAN reviewed
2.2 Strategic planning for PA institutions completed
2.3 Financial sustainability of PA institutions improved
2.4 Conservation stewardship unit established and pilot programme implemented
2.5 Skills and competencies of PA staff improved

Outcome 3: ***Operational know-how in place to contain threats***.

3.1 Integrated management plan prepared for Black River Gorges National Park
3.2 Cost-effective IAS control measures, and ecosystem restoration techniques, developed and tested
3.3 Enforcement and compliance capability improved
3.4 Information management system for recording, exchanging and disseminating information in place

2.4 Baseline indicators established

Baselines and end-of-project targets were established for all indicators and presented in the ProDoc. A few baselines were later reviewed, at the inception workshop (IW), at the Mid-Term Review (MTR), and even one baseline was corrected at the end of the project, for the Terminal Evaluation (TE) to account for data that had been missed by mistake.

2.5 Timeline of project preparation and implementation

The dates of key milestones of the project presented in Table 3 highlight several gaps that affected its implementation largely during the first period, until the MTR:

- Substantial 13-month delay for the recruitment of the first Project Manager and Project Assistant in April 2011, and first disbursement in May 2011, although the Project Document was signed since March 2010.
- First meeting of the PSC held in August 2011, 18 months after the start of the project (ProDoc signature).
- Low delivery in the following two years of the project. This low delivery is attributable to the unsatisfactory performances of the 1st Project Manager who resigned in 2014, and of the first CTA. As an example, the one-year delay between the inception workshop held in August 2011 and the finalization of the report in August 2012.
- Unsatisfactory performance of the first CTA whose contract (August 2011 - July 2012) was not renewed after the first year, leaving the project without this level of technical expertise for 20 months, until the recruitment of a second CTA in January 2014. The late recruitment of this new CTA delayed the training needs assessment and the implementation of the capacity building program. However, the arrival of this new CTA provided increased strategic direction to the project and contributed to boost the implementation rate for the remainder of the project cycle.
- MTR took place in October - November 2013 whereas planned date was December 2012.
- Late contracting in February 2014 of the consultancy firm responsible for most project outputs under components 1 and 2.
- Reduced pace of IAS clearing work for 8 months after the notification to halt the payment of Government staff's overtime on project funds by the project audit of 2015 which required the recruitment and training of additional workers.
- The MTR's explanation for the project poor performance included "*the long bureaucratic delays by the State Law Office over a short and fairly simple legal instrument, and poor communication both externally and internally*".

The delays in the second period of the project, after the MTR in December 2014, were again related to recruitment and administrative delays and lengthy approval processes:

- Overall implementation was generally delayed due to National Legislative elections in December 2014 and Municipal elections in June 2015.
- The delay for the recruitment of the 2nd Project Manager hired in January 2015 when the position had been advertised since September 2014.
- The delay for the recruitment of the 3rd Project Assistant hired in April 2017 when the position had been advertised since August 2016.
- The delays for the approval and formalization of documents submitted by the project, namely
  - the PANES was finalized and submitted to MoAIFS in October 2016 after being validated through a national workshop and was approved by the Cabinet in May 2017;

- the management plans for the Bras d'Eau and Black River Gorges NPs were both finalized in August 2016, submitted to MoAIFS in October and December 2017 after required consultations, and have not yet been approved at the time of the TE mission.

Table 3. Timeline of key stages of project preparation and implementation

Key stages	Dates
PIF approval	Jan 2008
GEF CEO endorsement	Dec 2009
Local Project Appraisal Committee	Feb 2010
ProDoc signature	Mar 2010
1st Project Manager hired	Mar 2011
Project Steering Committee established	May 2011
1st disbursement	May 2011
1st CTA hired (Aug 2011 – Jul 2012)	Aug 2011
1st PSC meeting	Aug 2011
Inception workshop	Aug 2011
1st IAS Manager hired	Mar 2012
Expected Date of MTR	Oct 2012
Actual date of MTR	Oct-Nov 2013
2nd CTA hired	Jan 2014
International consultancy firm (Eco-Africa) contracted	Feb 2014
Expected Date of TE	Jan 2015
2nd Project Manager hired	Jan 2015
Expected date of closure (5 years after ProDoc	Mar 2015
PANES submitted to MoAIFS	Oct 2016
2nd IAS Manager hired	Dec 2016
PANES formally adopted	May 2017
BENP Management Plan submitted to MoAIFS	Oct 2017
BRGNP Management Plan submitted to MoAIFS	Dec 2017
TE mission	Feb -Mar
Revised Project Closure	Apr 2018

Overall, the timeline shows that the project had a very slow start, which has been mainly attributed to lengthy procurement procedures, mostly for recruitment, and inadequate performance of the first CTA. Lengthy recruitment processes are explained in part by unclear recruitment responsibilities as UNDP CO was responsible for recruiting project staff and the Government was responsible for recruiting consultants, which raised the issue of developing ToRs that meet the needs and timeline of the project. This issue was later improved by inviting an officer of the Sector Support to MoAIFS within the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development to attend presentations of the project work plans and achievements. Being better informed about the planning and the needs of the project, these officials are better able to validate them, which simplifies and speeds up the procurement procedures.

The blame for the fact that some tasks were not completed under components 1 and 2 was mostly focused on the poor performance of the international consultancy firm Eco Africa. However, the 1.5-year contract was awarded only in February 2014, almost four years after the official start of a five-year project and covered most of the project components 1 and 2. The level of effort and the time required to complete all the tasks included in this contract was greatly underestimated. Tasks such as participatory development of strategic documents involving extensive consultation and development and pilot implementation of a PES mechanism, to name these, would have required much more time than what was specified in the contract.

The rate of implementation increased significantly after the MTR and especially after the recruitment of the 2nd Project Manager who was able to boost the rate of delivery through a more effective planning and monitoring of implementation and a more dynamic mobilization and motivation of all the project partners. A no-cost project extension was requested in March 2016 and agreed in April 2016 to allow the "*successful completion of the project and ensure that the necessary*

foundations are laid to achieve the overall target of expanding and ensuring effective management of the protected area network to safeguard threatened biodiversity in Mauritius". Despite a 36-month no-cost extension, several targets have not been reached. The late finalisation, submission and approval of the PANES which is a key document providing guidance for a series of subsequent steps that were foreseen in the ProDoc had an important impact on the project delivery under components 1 and 2.

2.6 Main stakeholders

Stakeholders are those who have been or are likely to be affected by the project or its activities, those who participated or contributed to the project, and those who otherwise have an interest in the project results. The stakeholder analysis conducted as part of the PPG phase allowed the identification of main stakeholders and of their role in the project implementation, as follows:

Ministry of Agro-Industry, Food Production and Security (MoAIFS): Executing agency / Implementation partner - responsible Ministry for project supervision and overall coordination of the project. Chair of the Project Steering Committee.

National Parks and Conservation Service (NPCS): main division within the MoAIFS with FS, responsible for different aspects of the project development and implementation process and primary beneficiary of project activities, including trainings - involved in legal and institutional reforms through the technical group, responsible for national parks and bird sanctuaries, for overseeing the development of the management plans for BRGNP and BENP, and negotiating conservation stewardship for landholdings adjacent to national parks and bird sanctuaries.

Forestry Service (FS): main division within the MoAIFS with NPCS, responsible for different aspects of the project development and implementation process and primary beneficiary of project activities, including trainings – involved in legal and institutional reforms through the technical group, responsible for forest and mountain reserves, working with private owners in mountains and river reserves, responsible for the proclamation of forest land as PAs.

Ministry of Social Security, National Solidarity, and Environment and Sustainable Development, as an important project partner, was expected to ensure the alignment of project activities in all components with the implementation of the Strategic Management Plan for Environmentally Sensitive Areas. Member of the PSC and of technical working groups.

Ministry of Tourism was expected to provide support to the implementation of project activities related to communications, tourism products, routes and packages for the PAN, tourism concessions in the PAN, entry and user fee structures for PAs, tourism infrastructure in PAs. Member of the PSC and of the nature-based tourism working group

Ministry of Housing and Lands, was expected to ensure the compatibility of land use designation with the objectives of the different categories of ESA's and areas of high conservation value targeted for future PAs in the PAN expansion strategy and to facilitate the allocation of unused state land in high priority conservation areas for the purposes of establishing PAs, to provide technical support and key datasets for the PAN information management system. Member of the PSC.

Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoF), GEF Focal Point, responsible for ensuring adequate grant allocation funding to the MoA to implement its PA mandate. Member of the PSC.

State Law Office (SLO), as an important project partner, was expected to provide support to the legislative and regulatory reform processes to create a more enabling environment for PA expansion and effective PA management. Member of the PSC.

Ministry of Local Government and Outer Islands, Municipal and District Councils: The project was expected to work closely with affected municipal and district councils to align the municipal/district 'outline schemes' with the priority areas identified for PA expansion.

Mauritian Wildlife Foundation (MWF), has been a partner from the concept stage of the project, was involved in the project preparation phase (PPG) and was identified as an implementing organization and a co-financier to the project. MWF was expected to take an active role in implementing project activities as a specialist service provider such as conducting awareness campaigns and producing educational materials, preparation of the PA policy, legislative and regulatory reform recommendations, drafting of the PA expansion strategy, review of management and governance options for the PAN and strategic plans for PA institutions and individual PAs.

University of Mauritius (UoM), potentially sub-contracted to provide specialist and technical inputs into different project activities and important datasets for the PA information management system.

Private landowners and lease holders were important project partners to be engaged on an individual basis to negotiate the voluntary incorporation of land into the PAN. Outcomes of this negotiation are to be documented in a conservation stewardship agreement between the landowner/lease holder and the state which may include the provision of funding for IAS control and other incentives such as involvement in tourism products and packages and technical support.

Mauritius Sugar Industry Research Institute and Mauritius Herbarium: possibly sub-contracted to provide specialist inputs into different project activities and access to important datasets for the PA information management system

Mauritius Meat Producers Association and Mauritius Deer Cooperative Federation were expected to represent the interests of the leaseholders of state land for deer farming and hunting during project implementation, notably in the case of legal and regulatory reforms, development of incentives for conservation stewardship, enforcement and compliance, IAS control and data for the PA information management system.

National and local media. Expected cooperation on public awareness issues.

3 FINDINGS

3.1 Project Design / Theory of Change

The review of the project strategy focuses on its design and on the results framework or logical framework. The project design includes the identification of the problem, the relevance of the strategy to national priorities, the consideration of stakeholder perspectives and the gender issue. A critical review of the logical framework examines the theory of change, the indicators, risks and assumptions.

3.1.1 Analysis of LFA/Results Framework

The project objective is to *expand and ensure effective management of the protected area network to safeguard threatened biodiversity*.

Observations on the project Theory of Change to achieve the expected results. No theory of change was developed for the project; however, the ProDoc presented an analysis of the threats, root causes, and barriers to achieve the long-term solution put forward by the project, and the components, outcomes and outputs to lift such barriers in order to achieve the objective.

The threats, root causes, and barriers targeted by the project were presented in section 2.2. In brief, to address these threats and safeguard threatened biodiversity, the project goal was to expand the PA network to protect a more representative sample of its terrestrial biodiversity and to improve the management effectiveness of the terrestrial PA network. Since a large part of the ecosystems with significant biodiversity value are found on private lands, the challenge was to develop an enabling framework to enable the creation of protected areas on private lands while securing owners' rights over their lands, and to develop incentives to encourage private owners to commit to biodiversity conservation under the aegis of the Government. At the same time, the capacities of existing PAs at addressing effectively the main threat to terrestrial biodiversity, namely Alien Invasive Species, were inadequate and had to be strengthened. The resulting strategy is built around three components designed to address the barriers and aiming at increasing capacities at the systemic and institutional levels and at strengthening operational capacities at site-level.

Interventions were to: A) **strengthen the enabling legal framework**, develop incentives and mobilize required investments to support the expansion and effective management of the PA network, through i) identifying, and prioritizing representation gaps that could be filled through protected area expansion and complementary conservation efforts on private and state-owned land; ii) developing regulatory drivers and an incentive framework to support PA expansion and conservation on private and state-owned land; B) **strengthen institutional and individual capacities** to establish and maintain an effectively managed PA network comprising both private and state protected areas, through i) developing and implementing a conservation stewardship program to expand the PA estate on privately owned or leased land; ii) devising a strategy to develop tourism related to the PA network to ensure its long-term financial sustainability; and improving skills and competencies of PA staff; and C) support cost-effective and sustainable management of PAs by **building operational capacities** and mobilizing investments to reduce threats to biodiversity at a site level, namely IAS, through increasing the cost-effectiveness of field interventions to mitigate the threats to biodiversity in the expanded PAN, notably the spread of invasive alien species;

Results Framework / Logframe

Use of the LF. Discussions about the logical framework (LF) elements and its use for adaptive management of the project showed that those responsible for the project management have made use of the LF indicators for their presentation of the annual workplan to the PSC. Risks have been analysed for their impact on the project during a Target Setting Workshop organized the UNDP CO, as reported in the PIR 2016.

Observations on indicators. Among the elements of the LF, the TE assesses the correspondence of the indicators and their targets to the SMART criteria[5]. The outcome and impact indicators are examined following the concepts of outcomes and outputs as defined in UNDG's guidance documents[6]. Overall, the observations made in Table 4 are related to the fact that many indicators are reflecting the realization of outputs rather than a measurement of the outcome to which these outputs are contributing. Only the indicators for which observations were formulated are included in the table 4.

Table 4. Review of the objective-level and outcome indicators identified in the logical framework

Indicator / Target	Observations
Objective – To expand and ensure effective management of the protected area network to safeguard threatened biodiversity	
2. Total (annual) operational budget (including HR and capital budget) allocation (US$) for protected area management	The formulation of these indicators could be more specific and indicate whether the operation budget allocation and FS score examined here are for all Mauritius PAs or for a subset of terrestrial PAs only (Mauritius mainland and islets).
3. Financial sustainability score (%) for national systems of protected areas	
4. Capacity development indicator score (%) for protected area system at Systemic, Institutional, Individual levels	The same comment as above applies here. The CD scores have been assessed only with the 2 institutions involved with terrestrial PAs.
Outcome 1– Systemic framework for PA expansion improved	
6. Number of 'Land Types' included in the PAN	This indicator has been selected to reflect the representativeness of the PA network, in terms of "land types" following the assumption that these land types reflect the diversity of ecosystems and associated biodiversity. Its use has, however, been limited by confusion as to the meaning of what is included in the PAN. In 2015, the value of the indicator was estimated on the basis of the inclusion in the PAN of sites corresponding to the land types "Sand beaches and dunes" and "Inland water bodies" which are reported as being missing in the PAN according to the 2017 PIR.
7. Ecological corridors and marine-linkages incorporated into the PAN	This indicator lacks specificity and, based on the targets, it meant 'number of'. It is not clear whether the PAN refers to the formal existing network or to the network proposed in PANES. Also, one may question the use of having an outline on a map, and the meaning of "*incorporated into the PAN*" if there is no tangible intervention or if the purpose of these corridors and linkages is not explicit.
8. Number of rare and threatened plant species (of 231 with a known distribution) having at least 1 wild population represented in the PAN, including Previously considered Extinct, Extirpated in wild, Critically Endangered, Endangered and Vulnerable.	As formulated, this indicator should be reflecting the change in protection, by EOP, of plant biodiversity, especially of rare and threatened plant species provided by the increased coverage of the PA network. Since the Bras d'Eau NP is the only actual addition to the PA network, the indicator should reflect the new rare and threatened plant species found in this PA. It is not clear whether the assessments presented in the various PIRs refer to the formal existing network or to the network proposed in the PANES.
9. Reach (estimated number of people) of the communications and awareness programme, including Broad-based communications (estimated number of audience receiving different media message), Outreach programmes (number of people attending); Experiential learning programmes (number of	The MTR adequately proposed to revise the formulation of this indicator as follows below. Yet, the qualifiers 'enhanced' and 'positive' leave room for interpretation and do not indicate how this change will be measured. 9 a) At least 80% of those participating in experiential learning programmes show enhanced knowledge and attitude 9b) At least 50% of those participating in experiential learning programmes show positive changes in behavior.

[5] As per the GEF M&E Policy: Specific, Measurable, Achievable and Attributable, Relevant and Realistic, and Time-bound, Timely, Trackable, and Targeted)

[6] United Nations Development Group. 2011. Results-based Management Handbook: Harmonizing RBM concept and approaches for improved development results at country level. - **Outputs** are changes in skills or abilities and capacities of individuals or institutions, or the availability of new products and services that result from the completion of activities within a development intervention within the control of the organization. They are achieved with the resources provided and within the time period specified. **Outcomes** represent changes in the institutional and behavioral capacities for development conditions that occur between the completion of outputs and the achievement of goals.

Indicator / Target	Observations
people attending); Lobbying of key decision-makers (number of people and institutions).	
Outcome 2 - PA institutional framework strengthened	
10. Number of strategic plans prepared for PA institutions that are linked to the MTEF	This indicator is output-oriented rather than measuring the effect of the development of those strategic plans (which were not developed anyways). A more appropriate indicator would focus on measuring whether or not the purpose of developing strategic plans is met. Such as the availability of a streamlined institutional framework where redundancies are reduced and complementarities are optimized towards common objectives and targets as an outcome of the institutional strategic planning exercise for the PA institutions.
11. Income from other sources (i.e. non- state budget allocation), as a percentage of the total operational budget of the PAN.	The measurement of this indicator showed that this amount varied from one year to another. To better reflect the project intention, it might be advisable to increase the specificity of this indicator to measure the income from secure or recurrent sources of funds, such as the Conservation Fund.
12. Number of tourism concessions awarded.	The type of information provided by this indicator is not really useful as regards the purpose for establishing tourism concessions in this project, which is to contribute to strengthen the institutional framework for PAs. It might have been more relevant to select an indicator providing information on the fees paid by the tourism concessions that contribute to the PA financial resources.
14. Number of planning support and operational PA staff completing specialised training and/or skills development programs: including Short course training, Mentoring programme, Train-the-trainers programme, IAS and ecosystem restoration skills development, Partnering agreements with counterpart institutions	This indicator is focusing on the output rather than measuring an aspect of the outcome or development result. The number of people trained is an indicator that the training activities were conducted. The indicator should focus on the outcome of those trainings such as skills and abilities developed or increased as a result of the training activities – organizing trainings is not a development result. A more appropriate indicator would focus on enhanced capacities of key staff within the services in charge of PAs and biodiversity conservation to design, manage and monitor interventions related to PA management and reduction of threats (to biodiversity), undertake and achieve specific tasks more effectively and efficiently, or changed perceptions and attitudes towards specific issues by EOP.
Outcome 3 - Operational know-how in place to contain threats	
15. Number of protected areas with updated and approved management plans	Management plans are outputs and not outcomes – if not implemented, this tool does not affect the effectiveness and efficiency of conservation. An indicator reflecting how the contribution of these management plans to improving the operational capacities of individual PAs to contain threats would be more relevant.

3.1.2 Assumptions and Risks

The relevance of the risk analysis and of management and mitigation measures identified in the ProDoc is discussed in Table 5.

The MTR did not assess the identified risks individually, but indicated that "the low rate of delivery and the strategic deficit identified in the MTR report should now be considered critical risks". From the review of the PIRs produced for the project, the delays caused by unduly lengthy procurement processes have been added as critical risks likely to counter the achievement of intended outcomes by the end of the project. These procurement issues were primarily about recruitment of staff within the PMU and of field workers for the clearing of IAS, and also the acquisition of equipment and the hiring of consultants, particularly for the knowledge management system and trainings. The PMU addressed this issue by briefing the Officer of the Sector Support to MoAIFS within the Ministry of Finance who is signatory for the project prior to submitting procurement requests and inviting him to attend presentations of the project work plans and achievements. Being better informed about the planning and the needs of the project, these officials are better able to validate them, which facilitated and sped up the procurement process.

Table 5. Comparison of risk assessment and analysis at end of project and design stage. Risk classification use the ratings required as per UNDP POPP on Project Risk Log[7] as follows C (Critical), H (High), M (Medium), L (Low), N (Negligible) based on a combined assessment of probability and potential impact.

[7] available from http://content.undp.org/go/userguide/results/project

Risks (in ProDoc)	Classification		Mitigation measures (in ProDoc)	Comments (TE)
	ProDoc	TE		
Regulatory risk The legal reform processes become prolonged and drawn out, resulting in delays to the expansion of the PAN into privately owned and leased areas of high biodiversity value.	**H**	**H**	Legal working group including the State Law Office established to guide, direct and cooperate in the legal reform processes. International and national specialists in environmental law will be contracted to provide advisory support to the working group. Capacity of MoA will be developed to lead and complete the legislative reform approval processes, so that the PA expansion activities could be implemented as from years 3-5.	This risk has been adequately identified and assessed as being high. The fact that there is no clear regulatory framework for the creation and management of private reserves has indeed been a major obstacle. This risk also applies to all processes that require a formalization stage. The State Law Office was a member of the PSC which has failed to reduce delays. The consulting firm EcoAfrica included a lawyer on its team. However, it is not clear that the project has contributed to improving the capacity of MoAIFS to lead the process of approving legislative reforms.
Strategic risk Fears of expropriation and/or loss of rights hamper efforts to negotiate conservation stewardship agreements with private landowners and leaseholders	**H**	**H**	Conservation stewardship programme focusing on the voluntary negotiation of a conservation stewardship agreement, without any loss of land or rights, between an individual land owner/lessee, and the relevant conservation agency, to be designed and piloted. Focused communication campaign to specifically address any fears or concerns expressed. The Stewardship staff will first address concerns of those landowners in the targeted PA expansion efforts before any negotiation process. A series of incentives would be developed and used to encourage private landowners and leaseholders to conclude a Conservation Stewardship Agreement, which would then enable the incorporation of the private land (leased or freehold title) into the PAN.	Non-binding MoUs signed between NPCS on behalf of MoAIFS and 7 private forest land owners granting an incentive for conservation stewardship, for the clearing of IAS over 5 ha of forest and restoration of endemic forest. However, discussions with private landowners on the possibility of entering into long-term binding stewardship agreements were not successful. The main obstacle underlying the reluctance of private owners, and fear of government's intrusion or control over their use of their land and of being imposed an administrative burden is related to the risk previously discussed, the absence of a clear regulatory framework for the creation and management of private reserves. In this context, it would not have been relevant to hold a communication campaign to address concerns. Potential incentives are listed in the Biodiversity Stewardship Programme but have not been developed, and could not encourage private landowners to conclude binding agreements for the conservation of biodiversity on their land.
Strategic risk Private landowners and leaseholders do not see sufficient incentive to include their land in the PAN without compromising the income generating opportunities from their landholdings	**M**	**H**	During the first two years, the project will further develop the mechanics of the comprehensive incentive 'toolbox' developed during the PPG phase, which included: (i) direct financial incentives (lease fee, compensation for loss of development rights, conservation payments, subsidized materials and equipment, tax relief, VAT exemptions, tax deductions, interest free loans, performance bonds, etc.); (ii) indirect financial incentives (land swaps, limited development rights, provision of bulk infrastructure, etc.); and (iii) non-financial incentives (technical support, skills and capacity building, marketing, formal recognition, etc.). The required legislative and regulatory amendments will also be made to enable their implementation. The efficacy of these incentives will then be tested during the pilot phase of the conservation stewardship programme, and continuously be adapted and updated based on response from the pilot phase.	

Risks (in ProDoc)	Classification		Mitigation measures (in ProDoc)	Comments (TE)
	ProDoc	TE		
Organizational risk A lack of agreement on the rationalization of management authority for PAs sustains the fragmentation of, and institutional inefficiencies in PA institutions	**M**	**L**	During the PPG phase, an institutional and political commitment was secured to at least critically review and assess the cost-effectiveness of alternative options for the management and governance of protected areas identified, and this commitment will be sustained during project implementation through ongoing high-level discussions with government and the affected institutions to effect the necessary institutional reforms, mediated by the MoA and UNDP. The PSC will maintain and coordinate the commitment of partner public institutions in the implementation of agreed institutional and governance reforms.	The risk was adequately identified but its assessment is revised as low (though not negligible). The institutional review conducted as part of the project focused on the needs for the implementation of the PANES but did not outline the overlaps and lack of complementarity of the conservation mandates of FS and NPCS, as well as impacts on the effectiveness and efficiency of the Government of Mauritius to fulfil its conservation goals. Although a consensus was reached to set up a PAN Unit with resources from both organisations to drive the implementation of the PANES (as reported in the support paper on the institutional framework), there is little evidence that these discussions will lead to a solution that will be effectively implemented. This being said, NPCS and FS keep fulfilling their mandates adequately, which explains the risk level being assessed as low.
Financial risk The cost of the IAS control program inhibits the scaling up of demonstration sites to the landscape level	**M**	**M**	Under the project, cost-effective techniques, implementation arrangements and tools for the control of invasive alien plant and animal species will be developed, tested and implemented. Project investments in initial clearing will also reduce the long-term costs of maintaining these cleared areas. Additional income-generating opportunities will also be identified and facilitated to increase resources available for IAS clearing, follow-up and restoration programs at a landscape scale.	This risk is definitely appropriate and was adequately addressed by the project.
Environmental risk The effects of climate change will further degrade the conservation value of both the existing protected areas and those targeted for designation as protected areas, and increase the costs of their rehabilitation	**L**	**L**	The development of the terrestrial PAN for Mauritius will seek to integrate the PA system into the country's evolving climate change adaptation strategy, particularly in terms of its important role as a buffer to the economically important agricultural and tourism industries. The spatial priorities for expansion of the PAN are directed, in part, at increasing the resilience of the PAN to the impacts of climate change by improving the connectivity between formal protected areas and other conservation areas at the landscape scale. It will seek to achieve this through the: (i) establishment of upland-lowland corridors from the base of mountains (or even sea shore) to mountain peaks; (ii) preservation of terrestrial-marine links where they still exist; (iii) preservation of landscape connectivity; (iv) restoration of landscape linkages where necessary; and (v) restoration of keystone ecosystem drivers (e.g. establishment of populations of land tortoise).	This environmental risk is not yet perceived in the ecosystems where the project carried out its interventions which may justify being evaluated as low. Yet, ecological restoration proceeds in a context of advancing climate change, which imposes additional stress on systems already under pressure from IAS, human use, and other threats, which could undermine the long-term success of restoration efforts. It may be cautious to shift away from fixed restoration goals towards more adaptive goals such as integrating climate-change resilient species in the restoration plans and effectively create upland-lowland corridors from the base of mountains to mountain ridges, as put forward in the mitigation strategy. The concept of corridors mentioned in the PANES does not follow the upland-lowland pattern.

3.1.3 Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design

The project design integrated best practices mainly for component 3 from other relevant projects such as a GEF-funded pilot project *Restoration of Highly Degraded and Threatened Native Forests in Mauritius* implemented in 1996-1999 which aimed to restore a plot of highly degraded native forest in the Black River Gorges National Park. The project created a Conservation Managed Area where experiments were undertaken to remove or control IAS such as fencing and native plants were sown or planted to restore biodiversity. This work was conducted besides control areas to be able to assess its effectiveness. The design of the component 3 further built from MWF's experience and work done at the University of Mauritius and the Mauritius Herbarium in restoration projects in various sites in Mauritius namely for herbicide use for clearing IAS, and from pilot ecosystem restoration carried out under the UNEP-GEF project WIO-LaB (*Addressing Land-Based Activities in the Western Indian Ocean*) implemented by the NPCS in the BRGNP in 2006-2008.

~~The Forest Land Information System and the Monitoring and Evaluation system developed by the GEF-funded *Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management* (SLM) *in Mauritius* project have been used by the PAN project to identify new areas for IAS clearing and ecosystem restoration, and to demarcate existing PAs with GIS coordinates.~~

3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation

Stakeholder analysis. All the main actors have been identified as well as their foreseen role in the project implementation. Information on planned stakeholder participation was presented in the section 2.6: Main stakeholders.

Gender mainstreaming in project design: Women are affected differently by any intervention related to natural resource management and this aspect needs to be taken into account in the design and implementation of activities as well as the evaluation of their outcomes. However, this dimension has not been integrated into the project design and most of the parties involved are indeed men. No gender or social assessment has been carried out during the project preparation and implementation. The project M&E plan did not include disaggregated indicators to account specifically for women's participation in project activities and the effects on them.

Best practices to be adopted for future interventions, which are now required for UNDP projects, will be to complete a gender assessment to be able to develop a strategy to mainstream gender in all project interventions and to ensure that all operational and performance indicators that document the outputs and outcomes of the project in relation to the communities systematically report these results separately for men and women. No recommendation will be formulated since this is now required for all UNDP projects.

3.1.5 Replication approach

As planned in the ProDoc, replication entailed the direct replication of selected project elements and practices and methods, as well as the scaling up of experiences, based on a knowledge management system (set up under Output 3.4) to ensure the effective collation and dissemination of experiences and information gained in the course of the project's implementation. The knowledge management framework was developed and finalized in February 2017 to strengthen the FS and NPCS decision-making capacities for PA planning and management through recording, exchanging and disseminating information as part of the PANES implementation. The system involves 4 main components including a GIS for the PA network, a document management system, an image management system, and soft KM components and governance. A series of short 1-2-day basic courses were provided in 2018 to target users by the CTA to enable the operationalization of the knowledge management framework (KMF). Trainings on various aspects of this system were provided, including on operationalization of document and image management databases and on GIS.

The CTA developed a Good Practice Guide for Native Vegetation Restoration in Mauritius – as a methodological guide for IAS removal and reduction of the costs for initial clearing of IAS, which will allow the replication and scaling up of the most effective IAS clearing practices.

The development, participatory review and validation of templates allow for replication of widely accepted concepts such as the template for the MoU agreement with the private sector and the detailed Biodiversity Stewardship Agreement Template was developed, reviewed by private land owners, and currently under review by the State Law Office (since 2018).

3.1.6 UNDP's comparative advantage

UNDP's comparative advantage for the GEF lies in its global network of country offices resource persons in environment at country and regional levels, and its country presence in Mauritius, which allows connecting the country to worldwide knowledge, expertise and resources. UNDP's experience in integrated policy development, human resources

development, institutional strengthening, and non-governmental participation was also relevant to this project, especially for the components 1 and 2 which aimed at strengthening the legislative framework and institutional capacities. UNDP's comparative advantage is also related to UNDP close relationship with the Government of Mauritius and its credibility as project are subjected to multiple audits, which ensures the transparency of project management.

3.1.7 Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

The project established a cooperation with the following projects:

- UNDP-GEF Protected Areas Financing in Seychelles. The PMU made an agreement with the CTA of this project to assist in reviewing the PA financing strategy as part of the PANES.
- IUCN-EU Invaz'îles project. Both projects collaborated through sharing information and lessons learned.

3.1.8 Management arrangements

The Mauritian government through the MoAIFS received GEF funding for project technical assistance and implementation and the management of this funding was entrusted to UNDP as the GEF **implementing agency** for this project. The project implementation, planned over 5 years, focused on maintaining strong collaboration and cooperation, and avoid duplication of effort, among the main PA agencies responsible for terrestrial biodiversity conservation under the MoAIFS, the NPCS and the FS.

Organization of project management:

- Execution: MoAiFS
- Quality Assurance / technical and financial management: UNDP CO + UNDP-GEF regional office
- Day to day implementation: PMU
- Technical expertise, ToRs, review of consultants outputs: Chief Technical Advisor
- Other technical partner: Mauritian Wildlife Foundation
- Supervision and strategic guidance: Project Steering Committee and, starting in 2015, Executive Committee

Modality of execution. The project was developed to be implemented according to the National Execution Modalities (NEX/NIM), and the project was managed based on quarterly advances justified by a work plan.

Executing Agency. The Executing Agency is the MoAIFS, therefore being accountable to the Government for the project implementation and the timely and verifiable attainment of project objectives and outcomes of the project. The Director of NPCS was appointed National Project Director (NPD) to represent the MoAIFS in the project implementation. Arrangements in the ProDoc had foreseen that the NPD would chair the Project Steering Committee (PSC), and be responsible for providing government oversight and guidance to the project implementation. However, the PSC was chaired by the DPS of the MoAIFS.

Implementing agency. UNDP CO was responsible for financial and audit services to the project, staff recruitment and contracting of consultants and service providers, overseeing financial expenditures against project budgets approved by PSC, appointment of independent evaluators, and ensuring that implementation is in compliance with UNDP/GEF procedures.

Supervisory committees. As per the ProDoc, it was foreseen that two committees would be responsible for overseeing the project, the steering committee and the technical unit. The Project Steering Committee (PSC), chaired by the DPS of the MoAIFS, was responsible to serve as the coordination and decision-making body of the project. It was expected that this committee would meet four times a year. The PSC was established in May 2011, 14 months after the official start of the project. The PSC met annually in the first stage of the project, to fulfill the tasks of approving progress reports and work plans. The minutes of these meetings were not available but the MTR outlined that oversight of the project by the PSC was insufficient and inadequate. The MTR made a recommendation to increase PSC meetings to twice a year and to establish a new Executive Committee to meet monthly, provide a mechanism for the rapid resolution of problems that are beyond the scope of the PMU's responsibilities, and address promptly all issues as they arise to avoid further delays. The Executive Committee consisted of the MoAIFS DPS and Chairperson of the PSC, the UNDP Program Officer, the NPD and project staff, met regularly and provided adequate support to the project. After the MTR, the PSC made all the major decisions regarding investments and reallocation of funds, and validated the workplans, procurement plans, and project deliverables. The PSC was able to play a special role in addressing critical issues for the amendment of the consultancy firm's contract, helped resolve amicably the dispute with the MWF, and supported the decision in 2015-2016 to recruit a large number of labourers to resume work in the field after the suspension of IAS control due to the audit's adverse opinion.

Project Management Unit. The PMU was responsible for day to day implementation as per workplans validated by the PSC, for reporting on project progress and for preparing workplans and budget requests. The PM was also responsible for recruiting specialist services for the project in consultation with UNDP and the MoAIFS, and was technically supported by contracted national and international service providers. The PMU included three full-time staff including a Project Manager, a Project Assistant and an IAS Coordinator. The members of the PMU worked from offices within the Forestry Service located in Curepipe and from offices within the National Parks and Conservation Service located in Réduit.

3.2 Project Implementation

3.2.1 Adaptive management and feedback from M&E activities

No change was made to the project design and project outputs during implementation based on the monitoring and evaluation of the results and indicators, mainly because no such monitoring and evaluation was done prior to developing the annual work plans. Annual work planning was not associated or preceded by a participatory evaluation of the progress of the project while the joint operation of these two activities would have facilitated the adoption of adaptive management by integrating lessons learned from the evaluation of project results and outcomes of the previous year.

3.2.2 Partnership arrangements

NPCS and FS. The main partnership arrangement for the implementation of activities is the involvement of the two key institutions responsible for terrestrial PAs within the MoAIFS, the NPCS and the FS, where the NPCS is responsible for national parks and bird sanctuaries, including the development of the management plans of these PAs, and the FS is responsible for forest reserves and for nature reserves.

The Mauritian Wildlife Foundation (MWF) was identified as an implementing organization and a co-financier to the project to take an active role as a specialist service provider for awareness campaigns and educational materials, contribution to the PA policy, legislative and regulatory reform and to the PA expansion strategy. The MWF was also invited to join the PSC, which had been agreed on the condition that the NGO could still be an implementing partner, although no formal agreement on the principle had been made. When the project implementation started, they were told they could not bid on a training contract as planned because of their role as a member of the PSC. The MWF then quit the PSC and did not take any consultancy, thus depriving the project of a major national expertise in IAS control, in the restoration of native forests and the conservation of Mauritian biodiversity in general.

International consulting firm. A major contract was awarded to an international consulting firm, EcoAfrica, to implement most activities under the components 1 and 2. The contract was signed in February 2014. After one year and 4 (out of a total of 8 as provided in the contract) missions, the consulting firm had produced an inception report and drafted a management plan which was mostly copied from another existing management plan. Three workshops were held for the preparation of the PANES. The work was delayed by significant gaps between the submission of the documents, their revision and the validation of comments, and by significant changes to the implementation of the strategy, on the Mauritian side, so that the strategy was finalized in October 2016. A draft of the business plan has been submitted but has not been completed and the contract was terminated.

3.2.3 Mobilization of stakeholders

Participatory process for the implementation of the project: The interviews conducted as part of the evaluation highlighted the interest of those who had been actively involved in the project, mainly in the development of the PANES and in the restoration of native forests, namely the National Parks and Conservation Service and the Forestry Service of the MoAiFS, and also the private sector and the NGO MWF.

The project document described the extensive consultation processes that went into the project preparation by all the stakeholders in the public and private sectors, as well as the NGO and CSOs. The same participatory process has continued throughout the implementation of the PAN project, involving most of the stakeholders identified in the section 2.6, and most notably throughout the preparation of the PANES over a three-year period through the four working groups set up to review the discussion papers and support documents on the following key aspects: Legal and Institutional Framework, Conservation Planning, Biodiversity Stewardship Agreement, and Nature-Based Tourism Development. Besides the MWF and the UoM, entities such as Vallée de Ferney, Ebony Forest and Société Lavilléon from the private sector also provided invaluable technical inputs throughout the PANES preparation process.

The Ministry of Social Security, National Solidarity, and Environment and Sustainable Development (MSSNSESD, then MOE NDU) endorsed this project in its capacity as the National Focal Point for the UNCBD (at the time of the project preparation), and pledged US$570,000 as co-financing for their participation to the project. The ProDoc had foreseen

that the MSSNSESD (then MOE NDU) would ensure the alignment of numerous project activities (i.e. preparation of PA policy; legislative and regulatory reform; identification of priority areas for PA expansion; development of incentives toolbox for conservation stewardship; review of institutional roles and responsibilities; funding of financial incentives for private landholders; enforcement and compliance and information management) with the then proposed implementation of a Strategic Management Plan for Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA). However, the SMP for ESAs did not proceed as previously planned when the prodoc was drafted, mainly due to issues of incompatibility of software used by the Ministry of Housing and Lands for the Outline Planning Schemes and those used by the consultants for the ESA maps during the ESA Study. This resulted in discrepancies in the actual location of ESAs. Consequently, the SMP for ESAs could not proceed further until a solution be found to properly map the ESAs. Yet, the spatial analyses conducted to develop the PANES integrated biodiversity information from various relevant sources such as wetlands, marshlands and inland water bodies from the Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) dataset.

Besides, the MSSNSESD was involved in the project through its participation to technical meetings with the international consultants and consultancy team recruited within the project (e.g. Workshop on mapping of ESAs, working sessions with EcoAfrica and mid-term evaluation team); provision of comments on Consultants' Inception and other technical reports, and on the legislative review recommended within the project with regards to PAN Expansion Strategy for Mauritius; assistance in the preparation of communications and awareness materials; and participation in the validation workshop for the PANES. Unfortunately, no representative of this ministry was met during the evaluation mission, but the above information and explanations were provided through the review of the draft version of this report by a representative of the MSSNSESD.

Gender mainstreaming in project implementation. No gender or social assessment has been carried out during the project preparation and implementation. The project did not develop disaggregated indicators to account specifically for women's participation in project activities and the effects on them. However, since quite early stages of the project (as reflected in the PIR 2012), women have been targeted and encouraged to participate in the project implementation. An effort was made to take into account gender considerations by involving a number of women (at least 19) in the clearing of IAS. It was found that women labourers were applying IAS removal techniques more efficiently, namely the more careful application of herbicide to minimize any risk of contamination to the surrounding environment which led to higher success rates. Hence, the PMU recommended to include women labourers in all teams of IAS workers (PIR 2013). This practice was, however, not necessarily maintained throughout the duration of the project, since the teams of labourers encountered during field visits were composed of either men or women.

While the PMU did not include women since the beginning of the project, the international consulting firm EcoAfrica has endeavored to hire 50% of women specialists to work on the project, as well as two female students from the University of Mauritius as assistants. Participants from NGOs and the private sector included several women in various roles, and six members of the PSC were women including the chairperson.

3.2.4 Communication

A national communication strategy was developed in 2013 by a marketing and communication consultant to develop and implement an awareness campaign and engage the public in biodiversity conservation. Target audience included the general public, school children, nature lovers, public and private sector institutions and NGOs. Medias included radio, national television reports on the issues addressed by the project, specially on the private sector participation and IAS removal and ecosystem restoration activities, several newspapers, billboards, a website, and social networks. Activities included guided visits, photo exhibition, school college competitions, and a 3-month campaign to raise awareness about the issues addressed by the project in 2014.

The NPCS has undertaken a series of activities to raise awareness and educate school children and the public at large on the role of PAs and the importance of conserving biodiversity. These activities include lectures, guided tours, poster exhibitions, brochures, films and newspaper articles. This has been supported and complemented by the PAN project for marketing and communications activities. Other private companies like HSBC are undertaking public awareness and education through CSR and green marketing.

The project maintained the necessary communications as needs arose. Better and increased internal and external communication with all stakeholders was one of the key success factors of the second segment of the project implementation.

3.2.5 Project Finance

This section assesses the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of planned and realized co-financing. Financial data to complete the financing table were provided by the Project Management Unit.

Finance and co-finance Table 6 shows that, as at 31 December 2017, the GEF had contributed 87.6% of the committed grant at the time of the project evaluation, and that the Government had contributed 136% of the pledged resources. The actual contributions from the NGO MWF and from the private sector were not evaluated and thus could not be compared with pledged contributions.

GEF. The remaining funds of the GEF grant will be used until the end of the project implementation to cover the costs of the project TE (US$46,250), ongoing trainings (~US$45,000), CTA fees (US$43,200), PCU fees (US$20,000), IAS labourers (US$50,000), EcoAfrica fees (US$45,000), consultancy /data management system (US$30,000), training on data management (US$10,000), awareness activities (US$18,000), PA enforcement equipment (US$7500), drones (US$35,500), GPS (US$2,200). Acquisitions are equally distributed between the NPCS and the FS.

Private sector. The private sector in-kind contribution had been evaluated at US$4,042,000 in the ProDoc. According to co-financing letters from seven Mauritian private companies, amounts from US$80,000 to US$2,000,000 have been pledged for IAS control and maintenance work, restoration of native forests, establishment of endemic tree nurseries, and infrastructure work related to restoration. The achievements made by these companies during the project have not been accounted for and evaluated so that it is not possible to compare the actual contributions with those pledged. Nevertheless, these partners (at least a few) contributed to the project by i) participating in the consultations and workshops for the elaboration of the PANES, the biodiversity stewardship programme and the template for the biodiversity stewardship agreements, ii) engaging in the restoration of forests on their property through MoUs with the Government including the supervision of IAS clearing, and on their own funds as in the case of the Ebony Forest Reserve, owned by the Bioculture group, iii) as a member of the PSC for attending meetings once or twice a year, and iv) contributing through grants within the framework of their CSR as reported since the PIR 2013.

The total amount of grant contributions raised from the private sector as part of their CSR has not been systematically recorded so that it is not possible to estimate the private sector grant contribution over the whole project implementation. Financial resources were raised from private companies, namely HSBC, and the international NGO Lions Club to contribute to the financing of ecosystem restoration and IAS clearing as part of the management of PAs. HSBC Mauritius is funding activities to i) raise awareness and educate the public on the importance of conserving and restoring indigenous forests, ii) to clear IAS and restore forest patches in the BRGNP, and iii) to foster the involvement of HSBC Mauritius Branch staff and corporate partners, in assisting the NPCS in restoring the national parks. Lions Club of Ebene in partnership with Emtel Ltd are contributing Rs 597,000 (eq. US$17,585) for the maintenance of one ha of initially weeded forest in the BRGNP for a period of 5 years, which includes the costs for maintenance weeding, logistics, 1000 plants, supervision by NPCS staff, and awareness events and boards.

Mauritian Wildlife Foundation (MWF) pledged a co-financing of US$3,200,000 which was to include control of IAS on Ile aux Aigrettes, restoration of native forests, release of endemic birds and of reptiles on islets, wildlife surveys, awareness programs and labour. These achievements have not been systematically recorded and valuated so that it is not possible to estimate MWF in-kind and grant contribution to the project. All biodiversity data provided by MWF as part of the development of the PANES could have been accounted for as in-kind contribution to the project. The active participation in the consultations and workshops for the elaboration of the PANES and as a member of the PSC should also have been valuated as a grant contribution to the project.

Ministry of Social Security, National Solidarity, and Environment and Sustainable Development (MSSNSESD) previously Ministry of Environment and National Development Unit - MoE NDU) pledged US$570,000 as in-kind co-financing for their participation to the project, namely for providing data on ESAs, participating to PSC meetings, workshops and document reviews, and contributing to the maintenance of PAs (10 workers for 4 months/year over 4 years). While the integration of data on ESAs was limited by technical issues, the MSSNSESD's contribution included attending PSC meetings, technical meetings with the international consultants and consultancy team recruited within the project (e.g. Workshop on mapping of ESAs, working sessions with EcoAfrica and mid-term evaluation team); providing comments on Consultants' Inception and other technical reports, and on the legislative review recommended within the project with regards to PAN Expansion Strategy for Mauritius; assisting in the preparation of communications and awareness materials; and participating in the validation workshop for the PANES.

MoAIFS / NPCS and FS. The MoAIFS pledged US$3,600,000 as in-kind co-financing for their participation in the project implementation, including coordination and meetings with partners and stakeholders, participation of technical and scientific staff, legal advice, office and transport facilities, infrastructure in NPs, other logistics, and other activities related to biodiversity conservation. The estimates detailed below indicate that the MoAIFS contribution is actually US$4,911,697 or **136%** of the initial commitment.

MoAIFS **in-kind** contribution amounts to US$493,467 which includes:

- NPCS provision of 6 vehicles and of premises and office furniture in Petrin, Bel Ombre, Rivière Noire, Bras d'Eau and Reduit over 5 to 7 years depending on site, amounting to US$171,200;
- FS provision of 2 lorries used on a daily basis for 2 years and of premises and office furniture in Perrier, Monvert, La Chaux, Chamarel, Mahebourg, Curepipe Head Office, and Biodiversity Office over 7 years, amounting to US$322,267.

MoAIFS **grant** contribution amounts to US$4,418,230 which includes:

- active participation of NPCS staff, with 30% of the time of all staff, additional 10% of top management extra non-remunerated time for 7 years, amounting to US$2,258,230;
- active participation of FS staff, with 5% of top management time, and staff based in Le Mare, Perrier, Monvert, Ile d'Ambre, Le Morne, Mahebourg and in nurseries, over 7 years, amounting to US$2,160,000.

Leveraged funding. Through a collaboration between NPCS and the Mauritius Port Authority and the financial support of the *Agence Française de Développement* (AFD), a 5-year management plan was developed for the Conservation and Management of Rivulet Terre Rouge Estuary Bird Sanctuary (RTREBS), which is also a Ramsar site, and facilities have been put in place for visitors. AFD's grant amounted to Rs 10 million or US$294,000 and this amount contributed directly to the results of the PAN project.

Additional funding was leveraged from the private sector throughout the project implementation as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility to contribute to the clearing of IAS and restoration of native forests in PAs and in privately-owned lands. The total amount raised through this scheme over the project lifetime has not been evaluated

Table 6. Financial planning of the project and actual contributions of the partners as at the end of the project (amounts in USD)

Financing (type/ source)	GEF		MoAIFS		MSSNSESD		MWF		Private		Total	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants	4,000,000	3,502,832	-	4,418,230			-	n.d.	-	n.d.	4,000,000	> 7,921,062
In -Kind			3,600,000	493,467	587,000	n.d.	3,200,000	n.d.	4,042,000	n.d.	11,429,400	> 493,467
Other									-			
Totals	4,000,000	3,502,832 (87.6 %)	3,600,000	4,911,697 (**136%**)	587,000	n.d.	3,200,000	n.d.	4,042,000	n.d.	15,429,400	>8,414,529 >54.5 %

In-kind and grant contributions. The important differences between planned and actual in-kind and grant contributions from the Government are related to a more rigorous understanding of "grant" and in-kind" co-financing. The contributions from NPCS and FS have been rigorously re-evaluated based on the following definition which allows to account for the real and effective contribution of partners, namely of these two entities without which the project would not have achieved the results observed.

> **Everything that is budgeted for on a 'current basis'** (i.e., as part of a current/operational budget) **can be categorized as 'Grants'** as part of the co-financing, including activities, salaries, new vehicles, new infrastructures and miscellaneous operational costs. **Contrary to common belief, staff time is NOT 'in-kind', but as 'Grants'**. This is because every year a partner, e.g., government, needs to budget for the time of staff, consultants, managers and various other associated costs of an activity / initiative on a current basis. On the other hand, **the estimated value of using existing office space or previously purchased furniture, vehicles, equipment etc. that are to be made available to the project should be reported as 'in-kind'**. In other words, the goods and services that were not acquired on a current basis, but in the past, are 'in-kind'. The 'in kind' category denotes that we only account for their use value (or 'rent').

Project financial execution

Financial management. The project was managed based on quarterly advances justified by a work plan. From the beginning, this management was based on the initially approved budget included in the ProDoc since there has been no budget revision. Also, a new administrative procedure was implemented by the Ministry of Finance for the management of GEF funds where, rather than creating an audited account for the project, the grant is integrated in the current Government budget as well as related indicators.

Financial audits. The financial audits allowed to control and redress practices that were not in line with UN rules. The first project audit was conducted in 2015 to review the years 2010 to 2014. This procedure was not required in the early years because of the very low rate of execution. The audit reports for the years 2010-2014 and for 2015 pointed to a total amount of US$564,000 that had been paid out by the project to government-employees working on overtime basis for weeding IAS. Such practice is not consistent with UN's policy on payment to Government staff which first principle is a clear statement against any monetary compensation to government counterparts for their work/participation in donor-funded programmes or projects. In July 2016, the MoAIFS stated its commitment to adhere to UNDP policies and to reimburse the total amount involved. The reimbursement was to be made through funds earmarked for activities to be undertaken in 2016-2017 as part of five projects implemented by the Government of Mauritius and that contributed to the PAN project objectives. To date, the Ministry has spent a total of US$564,912 in actual expenditures under four of the five projects previously identified by the Ministry. In addition, the Ministry confirmed its intention to renew the contracts of the field workers (who had been hired and trained under the PAN project) from 2018 to 2023. This commitment increases the total reimbursement to US$1,398,912, which far exceeds the requested amount.

Variances between planned and actual expenditures. The data and information required to assess the cost of each outcome and compare actual vs planned expenses for the various budget items have been provided by the PMU. Data are presented in the Annex 15 - Expenditure statement per outcome as at 31 December 2017. Variances between planned and actual expenditures are found for the following categories:

- International technical expertise: the cost for international consultants for all project components corresponds to 133% of the amount budgeted in the TBWP of the ProDoc – this difference is explained mainly by the fact that the contract of the 2nd CTA had to be extended to allow the completion of several outputs which finalization was compromised by the low performance and contract termination of the international consultancy firm.

- National consultants: the cost for individual national consultants for all project components corresponds to 62% of the amount budgeted in the TBWP of the ProDoc, while the cost for local contractual services corresponds to 117% of the amount budgeted in the TBWP of the ProDoc. The difference between planned and actual costs for local consultants (US$333,286) is close to the difference between planned and actual costs for local contractual service companies (US$266,747) and it appears that a trade off was made between the two types of local services.

- Audio-visual & Print Production: the actual cost under component 1 amounts to 39% of the amount budgeted in the ProDoc – which is explained by the fact that the cost of training material was integrated under a different budget line (contractual services)

- Training workshops and conference: The actual cost for the 3 components and Project Management is US$50,707 while this expense was not included in the TBWP of the ProDoc for any of the components. This budget line had to be added to cover the costs for the inception workshop, the numerous workshops for the participatory review of the PANES and other project outputs, and for the presentation of the CTA deliverables.

- Total travel expenses amount to 21% of the budgeted amounts for all components. The variance is explained by the fact that travel expenses have been integrated under different budget lines for international and national consultants contracts.

3.2.6 Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry, implementation, and overall assessment

Operational indicators. The project did not develop operational indicators to monitor its implementation. Monitoring is done on the basis of the progress and completion of activities in the work plans.

Result indicators and TTs. The quality of objective- and outcome-level indicators has been evaluated and reported in section 3.1.1 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (see Table 6). Outcome indicators at the level of impacts and effects have not been systematically measured or assessed every year so that some indicators could not be documented for the final evaluation (eg ind. 6 on land types, ind. 8 on the number of species included in the PAN, ind. 9 on reach of communication and awareness programs). The GEF tracking tools have been completed as required at midterm and end of project.

Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs). The annual reports (PIRs) present a rather narrative account of the progress made for activities related with the expected results. There is a tendency to report on activities rather than reporting on results, or achievements towards results. The justification of ratings provided for the progress made towards the development objective and implementation progress are overall relevant and reliable.

Project Quarterly Reports: These documents provided information on the implementation of activities and monitored the implementation of the MTR recommendations, although largely repetitive from one to the other. The most informative part is the monitoring of restoration progress of IAS clearing for initial and maintenance weeding and reintroduction of native plants in NPs, Nature Reserves, State lands and private forests. These reports did not include lessons learned to integrate in further programming.

Annual audits. The project has been subjected to audits as of 2015 (the first audit in 2015 reviewing the years 2010 to 2014). This procedure was not required in the early years because of the very low rate of execution.

Mid-Term Review. An independent Mid-Term Review (MTR) was undertaken at the mid-point of the project lifetime in 2013 to determine progress made towards the achievement of outcomes and to identify course correction if needed.

Design at entry: **S** or minor shortcomings – Well designed M&E plan providing adequate information and budget, acceptable quality and relevance of the objective- and outcome-levels indicators in most cases and well articulated roles and responsibilities for M&E in the ProDoc, in the Monitoring responsibilities and events section, under Part IV.

Implementation: MS or moderate shortcoming – Adequate implementation despite significant delays, MTR conducted and management response prepared and implemented, some indicators not assessed at the frequency indicated in the plan, TTs completed for the midterm review and for the TE, acceptable quality of PIRs and other progress reports by the PMU, no use of M&E results to implement adaptive management, monitoring of risks in a few years (2016 and 2017), audits conducted as required over the project duration.

Overall assessment: S- minor shortcomings – average based on the above observations.

3.2.7 Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (*) and Executing Agency execution (*), overall project implementation/ execution (*), coordination, and operational issues

Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (MS[8]). As the implementing agency, UNDP was responsible for assuring/controlling quality throughout the stages of project identification, development and implementation oversight, recruitment of project staff and contracting of consultants and service providers, and ensuring that all activities including procurement and financial services are carried out in strict compliance with UNDP/GEF procedures. Planned UNDP contribution and responsibilities were detailed in the stakeholder analysis and in the Management Arrangement section (Part III) of the ProDoc. From the interviews, it appears that UNDP supervision, oversight and quality control, at the Country Office and Regional levels was overall moderately satisfactory as shown by insufficient oversight in the early stages of the project, including for the development of TORs for the international consulting firm, the contracting of Government staff to work overtime to clear IAS against UN's rules, delayed procurement impacting the project delivery, and insufficient intervention by UNDP CO authorities (RR ~~and DRR~~) to address excessive delays for the approval of various outputs of the project. However, it is necessary to emphasize the relevance and usefulness of the orientations given by the program manager, as reported by the project manager and his team. The challenges to provide quality-assurance at the CO level were mainly related to the fact that the first Environmental Program Officer who was supervising the project was inexperienced and did not get adequate supervision from a senior officer.

Executing Agency execution (**S**). As the Executing Agency, the MoAIFS, through the FS and the NPCS, was responsible for several coordination, participation, nomination, supervision tasks related to the PSC, and also for several tasks such as preparing technical, financial and M&E reports. Both institutions were actively involved in all project components as shown by the financial estimation of their participation largely exceeding the committed contribution.

Overall project implementation/ execution (S), coordination, and operational issues. To summarize, overall implementation and execution issues is rated as satisfactory despite delays in the production of outputs, the issue of non-compliance with UN rules regarding the recruitment of Government staff, and gives more weight to the project period after the MTR to outline the effective efforts made by the PMU, NPCS, FS, and UNDP to better mobilize stakeholders and accelerate the rate of delivery.

[8] Refer to Annex 8 for the TE rating scales

3.3 Project Results

3.3.1 Overall results (attainment of objectives and outcomes) (Refer to Annex 8 for the TE rating scales)

The review of progress towards results includes evaluation (rating) based on criteria presented in Annex 8. Table 7 presents the status of progress towards achievement of the purpose and effects as formulated in the project document. Indicators and end-of-project targets are presented as formulated in the project's strategic results framework. The situation at the end of the project is documented from the information gathered in the progress reports of the project and during the evaluation mission.

Table 7. Project Progress towards achieving the objective and expected outcomes at project end

Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project	Terminal Evaluation	
			Value of indicator	Observations
Objective: To expand and ensure effective management of the protected area network to safeguard threatened biodiversity				
1. Coverage (ha) of the terrestrial **formal** protected area network of mainland Mauritius and the islets	State protected areas: 8,027 ha Revised to 8,328 (Inception Workshop - IW)	11,700 ha (adding 3372 ha)	8,825 ha (adding 497 ha)	As regards expansion of PAs, the Bras d'Eau NP, covering an area of 497.2 ha, was established by NPCS in October 2011. No further progress has been made as a result of project interventions, which is far from reaching the target set for this indicator. However, significant progress has been made in the participatory development and adoption of a national document to guide the selection of areas for protection that will contribute to biodiversity conservation in Mauritius. A strategy to guide expansion of the PA network coverage from 4.4% to 16% or more, the PANES, was adopted in May 2017. Following the adoption of the PANES and in line with its guidance, the NPCS submitted a proposal in July 2017 to the Permanent Secretary of the MoAIFS to include Le Morne Heritage site (783.1 ha) in the PA network as a formal PA, through simple procedural 3 options to upgrade its protection status in line with IUCN's definition of a PA. Changing the status of this site would have expanded the PA network to 9,608.1 ha. In May 2018, the FS is finalizing a concept paper to be submitted to the Ministry for the declaration of the Monvert forest (75 ha) as a Nature Reserve under the Forest and Reserves Act of 1983, and Mare aux Vacoas water catchment area (5,966 ha) as a National Forest under the Forest and Reserves Act of 1983 and the Policy for National Forests 2006 to the Minister of the MoAIFS. Gazetting these two areas would add 6,041 ha to the formal PA network. However, one cannot ignore the fact that the addition of these sites to the PA network would not have contributed significantly to the project objective which is **to safeguard threatened biodiversity.** According to Figure 5: Expansion potential parameter for biodiversity, presented in one of the support papers[9] that underpin the national PA Network Expansion Strategy, on a 1 to 5 range (5 being the highest value), the biodiversity value of the Mare aux Vacoas watershed is 3 or less and that of the Monvert Forest is 2 or less.

[9] PAN Project 2016. PANES Support Paper "Conservation Planning for the Protected Area Network Expansion Strategy for Mauritius"

Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project	Terminal Evaluation	
			Value of indicator	Observations
				The inclusion of these 3 sites in the formal PA network would have expanded the total area to 15,649 ha which would have largely exceeded the objective-level target set at 11,700 ha. The reasons for the decisions of the Ministry not to act on these proposals are not clearly understood as the authorities invoked the need for a preliminary consensus on the priorities for the creation or formalization of new PAs, which was available since the adoption of PANES in May 2017. This may reflect a lack of ownership of the project objective related to increasing PA coverage by the higher hierarchical levels of the ministry and the ineffectiveness of supervisory structures, including the PSC, the EC, and UNDP at resolving this institutional obstacle.
	Private protected areas: 0 ha	3,220 ha	0 ha	The PAN project was the first to work formally with the private sector which was in itself innovative and challenging. The need to promote and adopt new models of conservation governance in the form of land stewardship was put forward on the basis that the bulk of high biodiversity land to bring under protection in order to expand the coverage of the formal PAs network from 4.4% of mainland areas to 16% (which is the official target), is under private ownership. 25,000 ha of the few remaining forest areas with some conservation value are privately owned or leased to private owners, of which approximately 19,000 ha are not protected. The part which is classified as Mountain or River Reserves is only protected from deforestation, with no further biodiversity conservation concern, and enforcement is often weak. This being said, no formal expansion was made through the establishment of new private PAs although this was key to the strategy of this project. Yet, progress has been made in this direction. A Biodiversity Stewardship Programme has been developed and validated through a participatory approach as an innovative approach to expand the PA network in Mauritius. It proposes a set of principles and options for developing an appropriate framework for defining, negotiating and implementing biodiversity stewardship agreements with private landowners and lessees using State Forest Land and other State Land. It is integrated in the PANES where it refers to the wise use of natural resources on land in which various land-use activities occur other than biodiversity conservation activities alone, with the aim to ensure that species, habitats, ecosystems and critical ecological functions are restored, maintained and enhanced for present and future generations. It recognizes that land owners are the custodians of their land, including the biodiversity and natural resources. Three types of stewardship agreements are detailed, from strict conservation to control of IAS. The Biodiversity Stewardship Programme could be implemented either - on private land through the designation of Private Reserves under the Native Terrestrial Biodiversity and National Parks Act of 2015 (NTBNPA), or through contract agreements under the aegis of the NPCS; - on leased State forest lands when granting new leases or renewing existing ones, under the aegis of the FS.

Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project	Terminal Evaluation	
			Value of indicator	Observations
				A detailed Biodiversity Stewardship Agreement Template was developed, reviewed by private land owners, and currently under review by the State Law Office (since 2018). Discussions were held with private landowners on the possibility of entering into long-term stewardship agreements at the end of 2016, when the project approached Ebony Forest, and the Benoit Lenoir Society to discuss potential Biodiversity Stewardship agreements. However, private owners have been reluctant to get involved in this as they fear government's intrusion or control over their use of their land and of being imposed an administrative burden. Among other things, owners fear that creating a reserve would prevent setting up infrastructure required to develop ecotourism. Stakeholder consultations, including with private landowners, have drawn attention to some legislative issues related to upgrading a mountain or a river reserve on private land to a formal PA. Mountain and river reserves fall under the Forests and Reserves Act of 1983 whereas private reserves fall under the NTBNP Act 2015, and a land cannot be regulated by two different laws. Options are to i) amend the Forest and Reserves Act of 1983 to include requirements for the protection of biodiversity in the regulations for mountain and river reserves, or ii) to declassify the existing reserves on private land and then create private reserves under the Native Terrestrial Biodiversity and National Parks Act of 2015. Still, although the NTBNP provides a legal mechanism to designate Private Reserves, namely "for the protection, enhancement or restoration of natural ecosystems, wildlife habitat or habitat of rare, threatened or endangered plant or animal species", the requirements for the creation of a private reserve in terms of delineation and planning have not yet been defined and the necessary regulatory framework needed to give incentives for private owners to include their lands in the PAN are not yet in place.
2. Total (annual) operational budget (including HR and capital budget) allocation (US$) for protected area management	US$1.683m revised to US$2.3 at Terminal Evaluation (TE)	>US$4.1m	US$3.9 for NPCS, FS and Osterlog (US$2.748 at Midterm Review - MTR)	Target almost reached. Increased operational budget allocation for PA management as evidenced by the US$3.9 M budget for NPCS, FS, and Osterlog from the revised baseline of US$2.3M. Increase is attributable to a 20% increase in payroll due to increased staff salaries, recruitment of new staff and inflation. In addition, the Ministry approved a 3-year project submitted by NPCS for the restoration of native forest, thus allowing to recruit under a Government Fund all labourers who have been working under the PAN Project. Previous estimations (as reported in the PIRs for previous years) of the total budget for PAs were higher as they included, in addition to the Government budget allocations to the FS and to the NPCS, various contributions used to finance PA management. These contributions included the annual budget (approx. US$800,000) of the PAN project, additional funds from the National Parks and Conservation Fund (approx. US$250,000), contributions from the Maurice Ile Durable fund (approx. US$400,000) and contributions from private companies as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR).

Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project	Terminal Evaluation	
			Value of indicator	Observations
3. Financial sustainability score (%) for national systems of protected areas	17%	>45% revised to 30-40% (IW)	41% (Increased from 32% at MTR)	Target achieved. Observed increase is largely attributable to a 20% increase in payroll due to increased staff salaries, recruitment of new staff and inflation, to an increase in government activities for conservation purposes, and to the contribution of the Maurice Ile Durable program which is funding PA management and Ecosystem restoration in newly identified areas. Other initiatives also improve the financial score of the PA system as several private companies are contributing to the management of PAs in terms of ecosystem restoration and IAS removal activities as part of their CSR. The consulting firm submitted a draft framework for the PANES Financial and Business Model at the Validation Workshop. The draft version of the Business Model was commented and revised but not finalized, and due to poor quality in the outputs and delays by the consultancy firm for bringing the financial strategy forward, the contract was terminated.
4. Capacity development indicator score (%) for protected area system	Systemic: 50%	78%	56%	The capacity development scores reflect progress well above the project target at the institutional level, but below end-of-project target at the systemic level, and below baseline at the individual level. This underperformance at the systemic level is difficult to understand given the importance of the strategic documents that were developed during the project, including NBSAP 2017-2025 and PANES 2017-2026 and all supporting documents. It is even more difficult to interpret the end-of-project score at the individual level given all targeted trainings that were organized for the staff of the various organizations involved in the management of biodiversity and PAs, and the hands-on experience gained through participating to the project implementation. Clearly, this reflects the challenge -and limitations- of applying such tools consistently at different stages of the implementation of a project implemented over a period of eight years. Various people may use these tools and weigh differently the elements used to evaluate each question on the basis of their individual perceptions.
	Institutional: 56%	65% revised to 60% (IW)	77%	
	Individual: 62%	82% revised to 75% (IW)	57%	
5. METT scores for different categories of formal protected areas on mainland Mauritius and the islets	National Parks (2) 40% & 58%	All >70%	73 and 74	Targets achieved for the Bras d'Eau and Black River Gorges National Parks where progress is mainly attributable to the development and implementation of the management plans, planning process and awareness. Target surpassed for the Rivulet Terre Rouge Estuary Bird Sanctuary Reserve where AFD supported the development of a management plan, and provided fencing, bird observatories, and other facilities for visitors, which account for the score increase. The scores remained similar or lower for the Nature Reserves where little intervention to improve management has been implemented. No management plan has been developed for any Nature Reserve. The decreases in scores are in fact adjustments to the erroneous answers provided in previous versions (as explained by one of the assessors) and do not reflect a deterioration in the
	Bird Sanctuary (1) 57%	65%	73	
	Nature Reserves (14) - 37-65%	All >60%	38-56	
	Forest Reserves (3) - < 37%	All >55% Dropped (MTR)	n.a.	

Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project	Terminal Evaluation	
			Value of indicator	Observations
				management of PAs. However, when compiling the total score, these negative corrections mask real progress that may have been recorded for other aspects (under separate questions).
The progress towards the objective can be described as: MS				
Outcome 1: Systemic framework for PA expansion improved				
6. Number of 'Land Types'[10] included in the PAN	8 of 16	12 of 16	10 of 16	Based on the information provided in the PIR 2015, the geomorphic land types listed below are included in the PAN. The Bras d'Eau NP is the only addition to the PAN in the period of implementation of the project. The two land types found in the Bras d'Eau NP, 'Late lava plains and inland slopes' and 'Sand beaches and dunes' were identified from the Figure 6 of the ProDoc on Geomorphic Land Types. Since these two land types were already represented in the PAN, the addition of the Bras d'Eau NP did not increase the representativeness of the PAN in terms of geomorphic land types, which were used as a proxy for vegetation or habitat types to assess the representativeness of the PA network in terms of biodiversity. Since 2014, the annual PIRs report that target has been surpassed and that all land types under forest have been included in the PAN, noting that Sand beaches and dunes, Inland water bodies, NW intermediate lava plains & slopes, and Coastal salt marshes land types were not included. Yet, sand beaches and dunes are represented on the Gabriel islet and in Bras d'Eau NP which are formal PAs. Also, it is likely that the conclusions of the PIRs since 2014 were based on the inclusion of land types in PANES rather than in the PAN. If the purpose of the indicator was to assess the representativeness of the PANES rather than the PAN, then the value of the indicator may well be 13 (all land types but those three land types that are not represented), although the project did not list the land types and the sites included in the PANES where they are found.
				Late lava plains and inland slopes — Bras d'Eau NP incl. Mare Sarcelle
				Lower mountain slopes — Anse Jonchee, Bel Ombre
				Central upland early lava plains and slopes — Cabinet
				Old volcanic mountain and gorges — Lower Gorges
				Central upland early lava plains and slopes — Petrin, Macchabee
				Central late lava plateau — Monvert
				Old volcanic mountain and gorges — Le Pouce

[10] The following land types have been classified for the mainland: Central intermediate lava plateau; Central late lava plateau; Chamarel inter-mountain valley flat & slopes; Eastern coastal valley flats & slopes; Late lava plains & inland slopes; Lower mountain slopes; NE, E & southern intermediate lava plains & slopes; NW intermediate lava plains & slopes; Riverine lands; Sand beaches & dunes; Western coastal valleys, plains & slopes; Central uplands early lava plains & slopes; Inland water body; Old volcanic mountain & gorges; Coastal salt marshes; and Lakes.

Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project	Terminal Evaluation	
			Value of indicator	Observations
				Sand beaches & dunes — Ilot Gabriel, Bras d'Eau NP Chamarel intermountain valley flat and slopes — Chamarel Riverine land and lower mountain slopes — Combo The participatory development of the Protected Area Network Expansion Strategy (PANES) was undertaken to increase the representativeness of the PA network. The strategy produced a series of maps showing areas to include in the PAN to meet various percent coverage, based on an expansion priority value. The spatial analyses integrated biodiversity information from various relevant sources such as the conservation planning maps developed during the preparatory (PPG) phase of the project, forest maps, Key Biodiversity Areas identified with the support of the Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund (2014), wetlands, marshlands and inland water bodies from the Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) dataset, Important Bird Areas (IBAs), coastal biodiversity (mangroves, coastal vegetation, coastal rocks and beaches) and the location of critically endangered flora species provided by MWF. This information on biodiversity was weighed with other parameters including proximity to the potential PAN, slope, and vulnerability to one type of threat: coastal and urban development, to calculate a composite expansion priority index. Based on this index, different scenarios are put forward to increase the coverage of the existing network (4.4%) to 16% for a "existing + proposed PAN", to nearly 30% for a "existing + proposed +potential areas for inclusion PAN". This provides a general and rather conceptual framework for expanding the PA network which still needs to be translated in the identification of priority sites for the creation of PAs.
7. Ecological corridors and marine-linkages incorporated into the PAN	None	2 (1 in South; 1 in North)	0	Two corridors have been identified in the North (Moka mountains Range to Bras d'Eau NP) and in the South (Le Morne and La Vallée de Ferney) but have not been effectively established. Discussions have been initiated to proclaim the state land around La Nicolière Reservoir as National Forest, and Valley de Ferney as a Private Reserve. These corridors have not been created yet and there is no substantial rationale for creating these corridors beyond stating that it will increase ecosystem resilience and biodiversity connectivity, without specifying which ecosystems or ecosystem functions or processes or which biodiversity, species or habitats would benefit from these corridors. This does not provide any basis for managing these corridors or for assessing the effectiveness of their contribution to conservation. The following excerpt from the UNDP document "Protected Areas for the 21st Century: Lessons from UNDP/GEF's Portfolio"[11] clearly supports this observation.

[11] Ervin, J., N. Sekhran, A. Dinu. S. Gidda, M. Vergeichik and J. Mee. 2010. Protected Areas for the 21st Century: Lessons from UNDP/GEF's Portfolio. New York: United Nations Development Programme and Montreal: Convention on Biological Diversity.

Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project	Terminal Evaluation	
			Value of indicator	Observations
				Identifying and mapping areas important for connectivity is an inherently complex process, especially when added to the already complex task of conducting a gap assessment. **Planners must first answer the question of connectivity of what, to what and for what**, and the answers may be clear only in areas with high degrees of fragmentation and conversion. **Protected area planners may want to avoid the easy but potentially erroneous solution of simply identifying contiguous patterns of land cover** when incorporating connectivity into gap assessments, and instead create summative maps that combine the **connectivity needs for multiple species and ecosystems**, to find the most efficient and effective scenario.
8. Number of rare and threatened plant species (of 273 with a known distribution) having at least 1 wild population represented in the PAN	Prev. considered extinct: 2	6	5 (value in PIRs 2012 to 2016)	Target achieved overall. The number of species newly included in the PAN increased as a result of rediscovered or newly recorded species during the clearing of IAS in the National Parks (Bras d'Eau National Park and Black River Gorges National Park), areas under jurisdiction of the Forestry Service, and other private land where the PAN project was implemented. The total number of rare and threatened plant species was previously estimated at 231 –the increase to 273 represents the total number of endemic species. The number of vulnerable, endangered and critically endangered species that were found during clearings in the NPs is much higher than expected and highlights the critical and urgent need to carry out extensive biodiversity surveys in all native habitats to acquire or update the knowledge required for the conservation of Mauritius biodiversity of high global significance. It was reported to the evaluation team that no comprehensive forest inventory had been completed for over 35 years, besides local limited-scale surveys. An inventory conducted in the Lavilléon private natural forest in January 2017 after the clearing of IAS over 5 ha identified 81 plant species that are endemic to Mauritius or Mascarenes, or native to Mauritius, of which 35 are vulnerable, 14 are endangered and 7 are critically endangered (as per IUCN Red List). Such results are a blatant example of the urgency to put in place arrangements that protect biodiversity on private land. Although the project has raised the awareness of this landowner about the importance of preserving this globally significant biodiversity and provided an incentive to clear invasive alien species on a 5-ha plot, this does not guarantee a sustainable conservation of the globally significant biodiversity found on its lands.
	Extirpated in wild: 1	2	2 (value in PIRs 2013 to 2016)	
	Cr. endangered: 44	70	207 (value in PIR 2017)	
	Endangered: 25	33	67 (value in PIR 2017)	
	Vulnerable: 62	71	112 (value in PIR 2017)	

Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project	Terminal Evaluation	
			Value of indicator	Observations
9. Reach (estimated number of people) of the communications and awareness programme				This indicator was adequately revised at MTR as follows on the basis that the previous formulation accounted for the activities rather than their outcome: 9a) At least 80% of those participating in experiential learning programmes show enhanced knowledge and attitude; 9b) At least 50% of those participating in experiential learning programmes show positive changes in behavior. To inform this indicator, the project undertook surveys in various segments of the population to measure enhanced knowledge and attitude, and behavior change. Unfortunately, at the time of the evaluation, those results were not yet available.
- Broad-based communications (estimated audience receiving different media message)	n.a	100,000	Over 100,000	The project achievements to reach these outcomes include the following: A national communication strategy was developed in 2013 by a marketing and communication consultant to develop and implement an awareness campaign and engage the public in biodiversity conservation. Target audience included the general public, school children, nature lovers, public and private sector institutions and NGOs. Medias included radio, national television reports on the issues addressed by the project, specially on the private sector participation and IAS removal and ecosystem restoration activities, several newspapers, billboards, a website, and social networks. Activities included guided visits, photo exhibition, school college competitions, and a 3-month campaign to raise awareness about the issues addressed by the project in 2014. The NPCS has undertaken a series of activities to raise awareness and educate school children and the public at large on the role of PAs and the importance of conserving biodiversity. These activities include lectures, guided tours, poster exhibitions, brochures, films and newspaper articles. This has been supported and complemented by the PAN project for marketing and communications activities. Other private companies like HSBC are undertaking public awareness and education through CSR and green marketing.
- Outreach programmes (no. of people attending)	n.a	500	Over 500	
- Experiential learning programmes (no. of people attending)	n.a	300	355	
- Lobbying of key decision-makers (no. of people and institutions)	n.a	10 of 4	--	
The progress towards the outcome can be described as: MS				
Outcome 2:	**PA institutional framework strengthened**			
10. Number of strategic plans prepared for PA institutions that are linked to the MTEF	0	2 revised to 3 (IW)	0	A large number of meetings and discussions have taken place during the elaboration of the PANES, including meetings of the Legal and Institutional Working Group, high level working sessions within the Ministry, working sessions with the Forestry Service (FS) and National Parks and Conservation Service (NPCS), separate and combined, as well as individual meetings with key officials and other parties. Discussion papers were circulated to stimulate debate and the emergence of new ideas regarding the optimal institutional arrangement for the implementation of the PANES. The

Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project	Terminal Evaluation	
			Value of indicator	Observations
				problem of overlapping responsibilities of the two key institutions responsible for protecting terrestrial biodiversity was examined. After much debate, a new structure was proposed based on the functions to be fulfilled to manage effectively the expanded PA network which include entities in charge of tourism, PA management, science, *monitoring*[12] and enforcement, financing and administration. Human resource needs were identified for the NPCS and the FS in specific competency areas, for the implementation of the PA network expansion strategy, which is likely to cover the major part of NPCS mandate and part of the FS mandate. Yet, no institutional strategic planning -as outlined in the ProDoc- has been undertaken. It was foreseen that a national specialist consultant in institutional strategic planning would support PA agencies to integrate strategic planning and result-based budgeting in the preparation of their annual performance plan. Instead, this task was entrusted to the international consulting firm EcoAfrica. The PIR 2013 reports that several consultative working sessions were held at all levels, community, local government, private sector and central government level, to discuss the strengths, opportunities, constraints and weaknesses of the national parks. This reflects a misunderstanding of the strategic planning process and is not in line with the procedure outlined in the ProDoc. Strategic planning is an internal and inclusive review and planning process that is undertaken to make thoughtful decisions about an organization's future to ensure its success. The exercise conducted here is somewhat different as it focused on the needs for the implementation of a strategy rather than focusing on the needs for fulfilling each organization's mandate and responsibilities within its operational and institutional context. This would have highlighted the overlaps and lack of complementarity of the conservation mandates of FS and NPCS, as well as impacts on the effectiveness and efficiency of the Government of Mauritius to fulfill its conservation goals and commitments towards global environmental agreements. The support paper on the institutional framework states that a consensus was reached to set up an intermediary unit -the PAN Unit- to drive the implementation of the PANES with resources from both organisations. This PAN Unit would include four sub-units necessary for the implementation of the strategy: Conservation Planning Unit, Biodiversity Stewardship Unit, Ecotourism and communication unit, and Alien Invasive Species (AIS) Unit. During the interviews conducted by consultants for the final evaluation, the issue of institutional fragmentation, overlaps, and the resulting lack of effectiveness and efficiency have been raised repeatedly. However, the PAN Unit, which, according to the PANES Support Paper was the consensus solution, was not mentioned~~However, the solution that apparently did consensus among a large number of stakeholders, the establishment of the PAN Unit, was~~

[12] Note that *Monitoring* should be coupled to Conservation and Scientific Services, and *Surveillance* should be coupled to Enforcement and Regulations.

<table>
<tr><th rowspan="2">Indicator</th><th rowspan="2">Baseline Level</th><th rowspan="2">Target level at end of project</th><th colspan="5">Terminal Evaluation</th></tr>
<tr><th>Value of indicator</th><th colspan="4">Observations</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td colspan="4">~~not mentioned~~. This institutional fragmentation issue was previously raised a number of times including as part of the NCSA process. The fragmentation in the responsibilities for achieving the goals of the agreements distributed among various ministries and other partners that are operating within their respective institutional and regulatory frameworks has been identified as a key barrier to achieving synergy and effectiveness. This issue was addressed more or less successfully through the establishment of several committees for inter-institutional communication, collaboration and coordination. A solution put forward in the NCSA report included i) establishment of an Inter-Institutional Coordination committee as a policy-making structure, ii) streamlining of bureaucratic procedures to improve collaboration, and iii) amendment of legislation to avoid duplication and enhance harmonisation (e.g. Nature Reserve Act and Wildlife & National Park Act). More than ten years later, little progress has been made in implementing these recommendations, which nevertheless emerged from a national consensus, and the issue of institutional fragmentation remains unresolved.
Given the important efforts that were invested to optimize the institutional framework for conservation as part of the PAN project or earlier projects, such as the NCSA in 2006, and the lack of evidence that these discussions led or will lead to a solution that will be implemented, it appears that the optimal/feasible solution has not been identified yet or that the members and authorities of the institutions concerned who have themselves contributed to the reflections do not appropriate the recommended solutions.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">11. Income from other sources (i.e. non- state budget allocation) converted to USD (to counteract the effect of inflation on the local currency) as part of the total budget of the PAN (as revised at MTR and as formulated in the following PIRs)</td><td rowspan="2">US$ 760,000 (as revised at MTR)
Previous value: 33%
Corrected to US$ 2,130,000 (as per the FSC 2018)</td><td rowspan="2">US$ 2.2 million (as revised at MTR)
Previous value: 54%
or initial target of US$ 4.1 million</td><td rowspan="2">US$ 3,290,768 corresponding to 46% of the total budget of the PAN</td><td colspan="4">The total income from non-state sources was not estimated in the PIR 2017. However, the following values for total income from non-state sources were reported in previous annual PIRs: 2011: 33% (total not indicated); 2012 and 2013: not estimated; 2014: US$1,265,000; 2015: US$1,330,000; 2016: US$742,856, showing that this contribution is variable from year to year.
Income from other sources (i.e. non- state budget allocation) for terrestrial mainland Mauritius and islet PAs- is taken from the figures provided in the Financial Sustainability Scorecard completed in 2018. In this scorecard, an error for the baseline figures has been corrected, which raised the baseline contribution from non-state budget allocation close to the end-of-project target for this indicator. The figures provided in the FSC for the income from non-state sources show that the PA network budget from non-governmental sources has been increasing since the beginning of the project. However, these values are significantly different from values provided in the annual PIRs for this indicator.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>2009 (US$)</td><td>2013 (US$)</td><td>2018 (US$)</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Gov. budget allocation</td><td>1,683,145</td><td>2,748,027</td><td>3,912,000</td></tr>
</table>

Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project	Terminal Evaluation			
			Value of indicator	Observations		
				Non-state budget allocation	2,130,000 (56%)	3,238,800 (54%)	3,290,768 (46%)
				Total budget for PAs	3,813,145	5,986,827	7,202,768
				From 2014 to 2016 (not indicated in previous PIRs), the non-state sources that contributed to the total budget of the PAN included: income to the NPCS from non-governmental sources, donor funding channelled through a third party or project, grant to the NPCS by the AFD for the production of a Management Plan for RTREBS and additional works, site based revenues from hunting concessions, revenue from non-tourism related fees and charges, the Conservation Fund which collects proceed from the sales of macaques for research dedicated to NPCS operations, the Maurice Ile Durable fund (extra budget allocation from the Government), and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) funds. The relative contributions of each of these sources are likely to vary from one year to the next, the most secure being probably the NPCS Conservation Fund and the CSR funds. Through their CSR contributions, financial resources are raised from private companies, namely HSBC, and the international NGO Lions Club to contribute to the financing of ecosystem restoration and IAS clearing as part of the management of PAs. HSBC Mauritius is funding activities to i) raise awareness and educate the public on the importance of conserving and restoring indigenous forests, ii) to clear IAS and restore forest patches in the BRGNP, and iii) to foster the involvement of HSBC Mauritius Branch staff and corporate partners, in assisting the NPCS in restoring the national parks. Lions Club of Ebene in partnership with Emtel Ltd are contributing to the maintenance of one ha of initially weeded forest in the BRGNP for a period of 5 years – the contribution is estimated at Rs 597,000 over the 5 years to cover the costs for maintenance weeding, logistics, 1000 plants, supervision by NPCS staff, and awareness events and boards. Although the cabinet had approved a user fees charge of MRU 100 per tourist in 2013, this has not yet been implemented, although this could provide significant revenues to support the operational management of PAs. Other institutions such as Vallée D'Osterlog Endemic Foundation trust and Vallée de Ferney Conservation Trust charge user fees and generate revenue for conservation, in accordance with the user-pay principle.			
12. Number of tourism concessions awarded.	0 revised to 2 (MTR)	1 revised to 3 (MTR)	3	Target reached. The three tourism concessions include the 2 nature reserves that were leased to private operators for ecotourism projects, the Ile aux Aigrettes NR leased to MWF and the Ilôt Gabriel NR leased to Ocean Blue Island Co. Ltd, and the Vallée d'Osterlog Endemic Garden Foundation (created in 2007). Besides, the project helped several private sector operators to engage in eco-tourism activities. La Vallée de Ferney, la Vallée des Couleurs, and Ebony Forest have diversified the range of activities offered by proposing nature trails in restored forests where		

Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project	Terminal Evaluation	
			Value of indicator	Observations
				clearing was partly supported by project funds, as part of the incentive program for private forest land owners. While personal ethics and values to conserve the environment to leave a legacy for future generations and the love of nature are strong motivations for a few, the prevalent motivation of private land owners to invest in ecosystem restoration is the opportunity to develop ecotourism. The support paper to the PANES, Nature-based Tourism Development, provides guidance for the development of nature-based tourism within the PAN.
13. Number of private landowners concluding stewardship agreements:	Informal non-binding agreements: 0	> 6	7	Target achieved. Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) have been signed between NPCS on behalf of the Ministry of Agro-Industry and Food Security and seven (7) private forest land owners. Each MoU is granting a 400,000 rupees subsidy as an incentive for conservation stewardship, for the clearing of IAS over 5 ha of forest and restoration of endemic forest. The MoU was developed in consultation with the State Law Office. The seven (7) private forest land owners include Société Lavilléon (Chamarel), La Vallée Des Couleurs (Chamouny), la Compagnie Sucrière De Bel-Ombre (Case Noyale), le Domaine de Saint Denis (Plaine Champagne), la Baie Du Cap Ltée Estate, Bioculture ltd (Ebony Forest, Chamarel) and Compagnie de Vallée De L'Est. A few owners have shown interest to further benefit from the scheme for the clearing of additional 5 ha land areas but will not necessarily support further restoration works by themselves, which shows the need to put in place clear incentive schemes.
	Formal legally binding agreements: ~~0~~1	>~~2~~3	~~0~~1	A detailed Biodiversity Stewardship Agreement Template was developed, reviewed by private land owners, and currently under review by the State Law Office (since 2018). Discussions were held with private landowners on the possibility of entering into long-term stewardship agreements at the end of 2016, when the project approached Ebony Forest, and the Benoit Lenoir Society to discuss potential Biodiversity Stewardship agreements. However, private owners have been reluctant to get involved in this as they fear government's intrusion or control over their use of their land and of being imposed an administrative burden. Among other things, owners fear that creating a reserve would prevent setting up infrastructure required to develop ecotourism. (Also see discussion under Indicator 1b.). The Vallee de Ferney Conservation Trust represents a public-private partnership between the Government of Mauritius and CIEL Group that came into existence in 2006. The Trust is dedicated to the restoration and protection of the natural habitats contained within the reserve.
14. Number of planning support and operational PA staff completing specialised training	Short course training: 0	>40	15 to 20 people for each training	Target achieved. A series of short 1-2-day basic courses were provided by the CTA to enable the **operationalization of the knowledge management framework (KMF)**: - operationalization of an image management database– loading images into an Adobe Light room catalogue and adding keywords, for 15 people, - operationalization of a reference management database – entering references into a Zotero

Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project	Terminal Evaluation	
			Value of indicator	Observations
and/or skills development programs:				database and acquiring PDFs for each reference, for 20 people, - preparation of technical posters on the expansion of restoration sites, rediscovery and conservation of rare plant species and the development and implementation of the National Invasive Alien Species Strategy and Action Plan (NIASSAP) and production of a technical paper on the NIASSAP, - GIS basic training for 11 people. Additional trainings to be provided after the TE to FS and NPCS staff include drone handling (6), GIS (20), use of PA enforcement equipment (15). Participants found the short course on image management useful as a tool for developing awareness material. A knowledge management system was developed (Feb 2017) to strengthen the FS and NPCS decision-making capacities for PA planning and management through recording, exchanging and disseminating information as part of the PANES implementation. The system involves 4 main components including a GIS for the PA network, a document management system, an image management system, and soft KM components and governance. Trainings on various aspects of this system were provided to target users, including on GIS and document and image management systems.
	Mentoring programme: 0	5	26	**Mentoring programme**: In the ProDoc, it was planned that an international protected area training service provider would oversee the mentoring and career development program for 4 senior management staff of the FS and NPCS. As reported in the project PIR 2017, this mentoring programme had been developed for 26 staff of the FS and NPCS, including Parks Rangers, Assistant Park Rangers, and Forest Enforcement and Conservation Officers.
	Train-the-trainers programme: 0	5	Over 16	Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust (DWCT) provided consultancy services to develop and deliver technical training modules in PA management for PA staff which entitled successful participants to secure a certificate in Protected Area Management accredited by the Scottish Qualifications Authority. Trainings included a short **Training of Trainers** programme and a programme leading to a **certificate in PA management**. The consultancy included the development of a training handbook that was approved by the PSC. **Training of Trainers** involved practical training in designing and delivering training sessions and presentations to train junior staff and manual workers. Target beneficiaries included 16 Park Rangers and Assistant Park Rangers, senior staff of governmental, private and NGO institutions directly involved in the management of PAs. Participants found the training particularly useful for facilitating group discussions and for conflict resolution.
	Certificate in PA management (added TE)	n.a.	Over 30	

Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project	Terminal Evaluation	
			Value of indicator	Observations
				The basic training in **PA management** comprised five 4 to 5-day modules on External Communications and Scientific Writing, Socio-Economic and Cultural Assessment, Awareness, Education, Public Relations and Tourism, Natural Resource Assessment, and Conservation Management and Leadership. All modules which started in June 2017 were held over a period of 6 months, including evaluations to award the certification. Beneficiaries of the **certificate in PA management** included 30 enforcement cadre officers (13 from NPCS, 10 from FS, 1 from Osterlog, 3 from other ministries, 1 from the private sector and 2 from NGOs) and national park rangers and forest rangers. Participants appreciated the effective guidance provided by high level lecturers and have expressed interest in pursuing such training at the diploma level. The beneficiaries interviewed mentioned that the training had given them a perspective forward – 'what to do next' – and the motivation to self-learn since they were encouraged to use training materials and additional documentation that were made available online to participants to enable them to delve into different training topics independently. Another particularly appreciated aspect was their enhanced capacity to approach people and stakeholders to conduct more effective awareness interventions and connect them to nature.
	IAS and ecosystem restoration skills development: 0	50	147	Hands-on **training on removal of IAS** and restoration of native forest has been provided to 4 Park Rangers, 12 Assistant Parks Rangers,10 Forest Officers, and 121 manual workers including 19 women.
	Other	n.a.	~~3~~13	Capacities of the PMU staff was developed throughout the project implementation through hands-on experience and specific trainings and guidance provided by UNDP on the following topics: procurement (UNDP) Atlas, budget revision, annual workplan, CDR, office resource overview, requisition, detailed expenditure. Trainings have facilitated their work, increased effectiveness and efficiency of the project implementation. Training for some officers has been provided through local and international exposure (courses, workshops). 10 NPCS and FS staff trained in the concepts behind the implementation of a document management system by Price Waterhouse Coopers.
	Partnering agreements with counterpart institutions: 0	3 revised to > 4 (IW)	~~1~~8	Information provided in the project PIRs about this sub-indicator (related to capacity development) reports that this target was reached with partnering agreements made with Valley D'Osterlog, Ebony Forest (Chamarel), Vallee de Ferney Conservation Trust ,CSBO (Case Noyale), Vallee des Couleurs (Chamouny) ,Société St Denis (Plaine Champagne), Baie Du Cap Ltee , Lavilleon Chamarel where all the personnel working on removal of IAS control have been trained.~~2 counterpart conservation institutions, the Forestry Service and Ireland Blyth Ltd.~~

Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project	Terminal Evaluation	
			Value of indicator	Observations
				According to the ProDoc, such partnerships should have been sought **to establish knowledge exchange programs, share expertise and skills** with relevant counterpart conservation agencies and international NGOs on IAS control, conservation stewardship, PA financing and knowledge management. While the partnership with the Forestry Service was effectively established to share expertise and skills on ecosystem restoration field work training, it appears that the agreement with Ireland Blyth Ltd was a commitment to the restoration and maintenance of 2.5 ha of native forest at Pétrin in the BRGNP, rather than for sharing of skills and expertise. Nowhere in the project reports was it reported that the sharing of expertise and skills was involved. Therefore, the TE considers that the project established only one partnering agreement with a counterpart conservation institution to share expertise and skills on IAS control.
The progress towards the outcome can be described as: MS				
Outcome 3:	**Operational know-how in place to contain threats**			
15. Number of protected areas with updated and approved management plans	1	>3	3	Target almost achieved. Three management plans have been developed following a widely participatory approach with all stakeholders, finalized in December 2016, submitted for public consultation (60 days), and submitted to the MoAIFS for adoption at various dates. These management plans do not include business plans. These management plans had not yet been approved at the time of the project TE, which may reflect a lack of ownership of the project objective related to increasing PA management effectiveness by the higher hierarchical levels of the ministry and the ineffectiveness of supervisory structures, including the PSC, the EC, and UNDP at advocating for the project to resolve institutional obstacles. - 1 management plan for Black River Gorge NP updated with the support of the project and submitted to the MoAIFS for adoption in December 2017; - 1 new management plan for Bras d'Eau NP developed with the support of the project and submitted to the MoAIFS for adoption in October 2017; - 1 new management plan developed for Rivulet Terre Rouge Estuary Bird Sanctuary Reserve in collaboration with Mauritius Port Authority, funded by AFD, and submitted to the MoAIFS for adoption in February 2016.
16. Extent of area (ha) under active IAS management and ecosystem restoration	60 ha	>400 ha revised to 500 ha (IW)	572.5 ha	Target achieved. Current value for the area under active management and ecosystem restoration shows a ten-fold increase as compared to the baseline. This result is much higher than the figure presented in the 5th national report to the CBD in 2015 which reports that restoration of native forests has been multiplied by 2.5 since 2010 in Mauritius through the PAN project, and NPCS and FS interventions. Which highlights the important progress made during this last period.

Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project	Terminal Evaluation	
			Value of indicator	Observations
				The sites under active management and ecosystem restoration are located on public and private lands in the Conservation Management Areas (CMA), national parks, nature reserves, and mostly concentrated in key biodiversity sites.
17. Average cost (US$/ha) of IAS control and ecosystem restoration	17a) Initial clearing and first follow-up: US$9,000	US$1,500 rev. to US$2,000 (IW) rev. to US$3,000 (MTR)	US$2,800/ha	Target achieved. The cost per hectare for initial IAS clearing and maintenance was reduced to 31% of the baseline costs, below the end-of-project target which had been revised to US$3,000 as recommended by the MTR. One of the obstacles to scale up restoration of native forests is the high cost of doing the work through contractors. Reducing the cost of the initial weeding was thus one of the challenges faced by the project, which NPCS has addressed by adopting the "cut stump and herbicide applications" technique, and recruiting and training labourers on contract from local communities to work under their direct supervision, which ensured NPCS's control over the weeding operation. According to the Good Practice Guide, the adoption of the cut stump method by government agencies in 2012 allowed them to reduce the cost per ha to US$3,000 (equivalent to approx. US$3,100 in 2017 – which is close to the EOP target), of which 70% is for labour costs and 30% for consumables and other costs. While reducing the costs of initial weeding, this solution also provided employment opportunities to poor neighbouring communities, men and women as well. As a comparison, the adoption of the same technique by private landowners in the early 2000s allowed them to achieve a cost of about US$1,500 per ha (equivalent to approx.US$ 2,400 in 2017).
	17b) Subsequent follow-ups: US$1,000	US$500 rev. to US$500 (IW) rev. to US$700 (MTR)	US$860/ha	In the PIR 2017, it is reported that average cost per hectare for maintenance weeding was lowered to approximately US$860, which is below the baseline value but still higher than the end-of-project target. According to the Good Practice Guide, the cost per ha is broken down into 75% for labour costs and 25% for consumables and other costs.
18. % of PAs with no, or poorly, demarcated boundaries	At least 95%	< 50% Indicator dropped (MTR)	n.a.	--
The progress towards the outcome can be described as: S				

3.3.2 Relevance

This section assesses the extent to which the project responds to local and national development priorities and policies, and is in line with GEF operational programs. As appropriate, the question of relevance also examines whether the objectives of an intervention or its design remain appropriate in light of changing circumstances. Rating: **R**[13]

Consistency of the project with national policies. The project builds on, and is consistent with, the country's political and legislative framework. The project contributed to the implementation of the *National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan* (NBSAP, 2005) through the participatory development of 2 PA management plans, and of the new *National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan* 2017-2025, more specifically to the national target 5 to halt the loss of natural habitats and restore the ecological integrity of significant areas of degraded and fragmented habitats, and to the national target 11 to conserve at least 16% of terrestrial and inland water areas of importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services through systems of PAs. By integrating biodiversity information on wetlands, marshlands and inland water bodies from the Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) dataset in the spatial analyses conducted to identify priority biodiversity areas for the PANES, the project contributed to the implementation of the *National Development Strategy* 2004 and the *Strategic Management Plan for Environmentally Sensitive Areas* 2009. The project also contributed to the implementation of the *Forestry Policy* 2006 through its contribution to rehabilitate and restore native forests in the BRGNP, the BENP, and in private lands where globally important biodiversity was found. The project supported the National Invasive Alien Species Strategy and Action Plan 2010-2019 for activities related to IAS control and ecosystem restoration, and namely to the cross-cutting elements of Capacity Building, Public Awareness and Engagement, and Provision of Adequate Resources. The project is also consistent with the *Maurice Ile Durable* Policy, Strategy and Action Plan 2013 which is a national political statement for sustainable development.

Consistency of the project with the national Institutional framework. The project worked with the two key institutions who share the responsibility for the protection of terrestrial biodiversity, the NPCS and the FS.

Compliance with GEF Operational Programs. As per the ProDoc and CEO ER, the project is aligned with the GEF-4 Biodiversity focal area strategy, namely with the Strategic Objective (SO) 1: 'Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems'. The project contributed to this SO by increasing the spatial extent of protected areas in Mauritius, within the context of a 'sustainable protected area system' design; consolidating and strengthening the enabling legal, planning and institutional framework for the expansion and effective management of terrestrial protected areas; and strengthening the capacity (strategies, tools, knowledge, skills and resources) to support the operational management and financing of PAs. More specifically, the project complies with the eligibility criteria for the Strategic Programme (SP) on Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks. The focus of the SP is on ensuring better terrestrial ecosystem representation through filling ecosystem coverage gaps, to which the project contributed through the development of the PANES which provides guidance to increase the integration of biodiversity priority areas for future expansion of the PA network.

Contribution of the project to SDGs and Aichi Targets

SDGs. Through the control of IAS and restoration of native forests and natural habitats of threatened species, the project is contributing to the **SDG 15 - Life on Land**, which is to protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and biodiversity loss.

Aichi Targets. The project is contributing to the following Aichi targets: **1.** Increased **awareness** of biodiversity values, through the awareness activities and campaigns; **3.** Progress towards the development of positive **incentives** for biodiversity conservation through biodiversity stewardship agreements with the private sector; **5. Reduced loss, degradation and fragmentation of habitats** namely by extending the area of forests under restoration (IAS control) and protection (PAs), and of suitable habitats for endangered species such as the pink pigeon and the echo parakeet; **9.** Progress towards control and eradication of priority **invasive alien species**; **11.** Increased coverage and management effectiveness of **PAs** through the creation of a new PA, the development of management plans and increasing the capacities of staff and institutions in charge of PAs; **15.** Enhanced **ecosystem resilience** and contribution to biodiversity as shown by increasing population trends of forest-dependent bird species in forests under restoration; **20.** Increased **resource mobilization** from all sources including contributions from the private sector through the CSR.

[13] Refer to Annex 8 for the TE rating scales

3.3.3 Effectiveness

Rating: **MS**. Effectiveness assessment reviews the extent to which intended results have been achieved and is included in the Section 3.3.1 – Table 7. Results include direct outputs, short and medium-term outcomes and longer-term impacts, including global environmental benefits. This assessment is carried out based on the indicators identified in the logical framework and used to report annually on the progress of the project to UNDP-GEF, and considering the factors that may have facilitated or hindered their achievement.

3.3.4 Efficiency

Efficiency reflects how inputs, costs and implementation time are translated into results - or the extent to which environmental and development outcomes and project outputs have been achieved with the lowest possible cost; also called cost-effectiveness. It also examines the project's compliance with the incremental cost criteria and the effectiveness of the co-financing search. Rating: **S**

Increasing efficiency was one of the project intended outcomes under the 3rd component, namely as regards IAS clearing operations which expansion was limited by their high costs. Learning from experience of project partners conducting restoration work (Ebony Forest Reserve, University of Mauritius, Mauritius Herbarium and Mauritian Wildlife Foundation) and gained through earlier projects, the project has succeeded in continuously and significantly improving the efficiency of these operations, as shown by the reduction in the cost per hectare (see Indicator 17 in Table 7) of the initial weeding and of maintenance of cleared areas.

The foundations of a biodiversity stewardship programme laid by the project contribute to put in place a cost-effective mechanism for securing the protection of privately owned land of high conservation value.

Investments in strengthening institutional and individual capacities of PA agencies are highly cost-effective as it contributes to increase staff productivity and effectiveness at achieving the tasks under their responsibility. Enhanced national capacities meeting high-level standards reduces the need to resort to costly external expertise. Motivating training sessions coupled with the development of training material accessible online proved to be a very efficient investment for building capacities as it encouraged self-learning, which is the most efficient capacity development approach, as long as training material is available and motivation sustained.

3.3.5 Country ownership

National ownership is demonstrated, among other things, by respect for the government's financial commitments and the direct involvement of government officials to participate in project activities and support its interventions. In this case, the MoAIFS has exceeded its financial commitment as shown by the combined in-kind and grant contributions of the two key institutions, the NPCS and the FS, that were estimated at 136% of what had been initially committed (please refer to section 3.2.5 for a detailed assessment).

The development of the PANES required the active participation of high level officers in the NPCS and FS. Their involvement to review and improve the draft strategy and several supporting documents produced by the consultancy firm was necessary and much higher than expected as the drafts did not meet satisfactory standards.

Key ministries concerned by the issues addressed by this project were represented in the PSC and ensured an inter-ministerial liaison with the project team. Besides, the Steering Committee, the Executive Committee and the Technical Working Groups allowed to maximize intra - and inter-sectoral collaboration among the lead agencies and increase the efficiency of interventions.

Also, the adoption of the Protected Areas Network Expansion Strategy 2017-2026 developed by the project and of other legislation and policies in line with the project's objectives such as the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action plan 2017-2025, the Native Terrestrial Biodiversity and National Parks Act (2015), the amendment to the Fishing and Hunting Lease Act to include ecotourism, the National Invasive Alien Species Strategy and Action Plan 2010-2019, and the formalization of a National IAS Committee are as many indications of the Government's ownership of the project objectives. Conversely, the fact that the PAs management plans have not been adopted may also be interpreted as a lack of ownership.

3.3.6 Mainstreaming

UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are key elements of UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programs. The evaluation is assessing the extent to which the project has successfully integrated other UNDP priorities, including reducing poverty, improving governance, prevention and recovery from natural disasters.

Although this was not an objective, the project allowed the creation of jobs for 121 labourers, including 19 women, for the clearing of IAS and forest restoration providing a source of income to poor neighbouring populations. These people have been trained and gained experience through the project and are now recruited by the Government to continue the expansion and maintenance of the restoration of native forests. The NPCS submitted a 3-year project for the restoration of native forest which has been approved by the Ministry, thus allowing to award a new contract under a Government Fund to all labourers who have been working under the PAN Project.

The PANES and supporting documents were all developed following a highly participatory approach, where all stakeholders were consulted repeatedly to review and reach a consensus on each component of the strategy, including the institutional framework required to implement it and the foundations to develop a biodiversity stewardship programme. Such an approach is in line with UNDP's understanding of what is good or democratic governance which entails meaningful and inclusive political participation – basically people having more of a say in all of the decisions which shape their lives.

3.3.7 Sustainability

This section provides an assessment of the extent to which the main project results are likely to continue after UNDP and GEF assistance or other external assistance has ended under this project. Sustainability is classified by evaluating factors within four dimensions of risk that may affect the persistence of project outcomes, including sustainable funding mechanisms, changes in perception and attitude within communities and other stakeholders, capacity building, socio-political context, the institutional and governance framework, and the environment. These dimensions of risk are assessed according to the scale provided in Annex 8.

Financial risks to sustainability - Rating: **ML-MU** (moderate to significant risks to sustainability)

This rating is a compromise between the low risk level for the sustainability of the 3rd component outcome and the high risk level for the sustainability of some outcomes under the 2nd component. No budget is secured for the implementation of the PANES and for the 3 new or updated NP management plans besides the National Conservation Fund whose revenues are allocated to the operation of the NPCS for the maintenance of IAS-cleared areas and extension of new ones, for which the MoAIFS has renewed the contract of 121 labourers. The National Conservation Fund provides income in the order of 25 million rupees per year, or approximately US$750,000 (based on current exchange rate).

The business plan for the PANES has not been finalized. However, the Strategic Action Plan for the Implementation of the Protected Area Network Expansion Strategy for 2017 - 2026 provides estimates of the costs for the implementation of the PANES. It estimates the cost of implementing PANES over a 10-year period at **US$50M**, including US$40M for human resources (compiled in Table 1 of the document) and US$10M for recurrent capital and operating expenditures (compiled in Table 4 of the document). Yet, there is no clear indication that such resources will be available and, based on opinion shared during interviews, that there will be political will to allocate them.

Some important outputs identified in the ProDoc were not well reflected in the ToRs of the consulting firm recruited to work on the elaboration of the PANES, namely a detailed feasibility assessment of environmental services schemes (water supply and carbon sequestration potential of restored native forests). This assessment was critical to support the establishment of incentive PES schemes to engage the private sector in restoration works and in conservation, and as part of a sustainable financing strategy to support biodiversity conservation in private lands, whether included or not in the PAN. A study for the valuation of ecosystem services[14] provided by the watersheds of two reservoirs was commissioned as part of the updating of the Mauritius NBSAP 2017-2025. The capacity of these reservoirs differed during a period of drought and this was attributed to the fact that the native forest in one of them had been replaced by exotic pine trees and to unsustainable land management. The results have suggested that significant economic benefits could be gained through improved biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management in the watershed. Further work will be required to assess the feasibility of

[14] MoAIFS. 2017. Ecosystem valuation of catchment from Mare Longue / Mare aux Vacoas to downstream users. Preparatory study for the NBSAP for the Republic of Mauritius 2017-2025.

establishing PES schemes that would contribute to finance biodiversity conservation and the restoration of native forests, namely further valuation studies of the ES provided by restored forests valued through ecotourism and other activities, the identification of service *providers* and *users*, and the identification of several elements required to operationalize the PES scheme.

The project did not establish adequate financial incentives to convince private land owners to invest in biodiversity conservation and restoration of ecosystems, namely native forests. Currently, the main incentive for privates is the possibility to develop ecotourism, which was made possible on State Land through the amendment of the Shooting and Fishing Leases Act (to which the project contributed) that enables lessees to develop ecotourism in addition to fishing and hunting.

Socio-economic risks to sustainability - Rating: **L** (negligible risks to sustainability)

There are no real socioeconomic risks to the sustainability of this project results. Through the various awareness activities, the project and its partners are contributing to educate the public on the importance of native species and ecosystems, and the ecotourism activities conducted in restored forests give the public the opportunity to connect with native forests rather than with exotic ones.

One negative socio-economic impact that has been reported in relation to the interventions of this project is that of guava collectors who came every year in large numbers to harvest these fruits in areas where these shrubs were eventually cleared. No signs informing them of the ongoing restoration work had been installed so that some ventured further to find their fruits and accidents occurred.

Institutional framework / governance risks to sustainability - Rating: **ML** (moderate risks to sustainability)

On the one hand, the strong commitment and involvement of the two key PA institutions, NPCS and FS, and their increased capacities thanks to the strategic guidance provided by documents developed through the project, trainings provided as part of the project, and experience gained through effective and active participation to the project activities, including for the development of the PANES, consolidate the institutional framework for the PA system and for reducing threats to biodiversity such as IAS. On the other hand, the institutional fragmentation issue remains unresolved and there is apparent insufficient political will to address it, thus reducing effectiveness and efficiency of the conservation efforts of terrestrial ecosystems under the MoAIFS.

Environmental risks to sustainability - Rating: **L** (negligible risks to sustainability)

This environmental risk to the sustainability of the project outcomes is mostly relevant to the third outcome as the first and second outcomes rather contributed to strengthen national and institutional capacities to address the threats to biodiversity and their root causes. A reservation, however, concerns the fact that PANES has not integrated upland-lowland corridors which would have increased the potential resilience of the proposed PA network to climate change. As concerns the outcomes of the third component, the additional stress related to climate change on systems already under pressure from IAS, human use, development, and other threats could undermine the long-term success of ecological restoration efforts, reduce the conservation value of the existing and potential PAs and increase the costs of their rehabilitation. Also, any environmental degradation of these areas is also likely to affect the ecosystem services they provide and consequently their potential to be valuated as part of a PES scheme.

3.3.9 Impact

The evaluation is assessing to what extent the project has achieved impacts or has actually made progress towards achieving the expected impacts in terms of measurable or verifiable improvement of the ecological condition, verifiable reduction of pressures on ecological systems, and/or demonstrated progress toward achieving such impacts. Rating: **MS**

This project goal was to *conserve the globally significant native forest biodiversity of Mauritius*. Early indications of improving and reducing pressures on biodiversity are supported by the evidence of the natural regeneration of endemic tree species, successful reintroduction of two endangered endemic species, the pink pigeon (*Nesoenas mayeri*) and the echo parakeet (*Psittacula eques*), and increased occurrence of the Mascarene Paradise Flycatcher (*Terpsiphone bourbonnensis*), endemic to Mauritius and Reunion, in restored native forest ecosystems, thus indicating the enhanced suitability of the restored forests as habitats for these endemic species. This was observed in restored areas of the BRGNP and in Ebony Forest Reserve owned by one of the private land owners who participated actively to the project. Other benefits of restored native forests were

reported by interviewees who have been actively involved in the project implementation and include increased local fauna, flora and microbiota biodiversity, increased occurrence of medicinal plants, increased diversity and abundance of pollinators, increased soil and water conservation (as IAS are water demanding) and increased soil quality.

4 Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons

Conclusions

After 8 years of implementation, including a 36-month no-cost extension, this project has a moderately satisfactory rate of technical achievement and financial resources have been almost fully utilized. By the end of the project, as detailed in the Table 7 on Project Progress towards achieving the objective and expected outcomes, i) the improvement of the systemic framework for PA expansion has been strengthened by the participatory development of a strategy to guide the expansion of the terrestrial PA network, the PANES with its Support documents (Legal Framework, Biodiversity Stewardship, Institutional Framework, Conservation Mapping and Tourism Development) that consolidate the Strategy though limited by the absence of a business plan and of a regulatory framework for the creation and management of private reserves, ii) the PA institutional framework has been strengthened by the availability of management plans for 3 national parks (without financial plans and not yet formally adopted at the time of the TE), and enhanced skills and competencies of PA staff developed through targeted trainings and the participation to the project, and iii) operational know-how to contain threats such as IAS is enhanced through procurement of equipment to increase the effectiveness of monitoring and surveillance of PAs, improvement of the cost-effectiveness of IAS control and native forest restoration, and the production of a technical guide for the restoration of native vegetation.

Despite a significant increase of the delivery rate after the MTR and especially after the recruitment of the 2nd PM, the delays caused by the slow start of the project, burdensome procurement procedures namely for staff recruitment, equipment and consultancies, delayed and insufficient quality of the outputs delivered, could not be fully recovered and some key elements are still missing such as a finalized and validated business plan for the PANES and enabling regulations for the creation and management of private reserves. The underperformance for an important target such as the increased coverage of terrestrial formal PA network is attributable to the project low performance during the first part of its implementation, which delayed the delivery of outputs which completion was required prior to the undertaking of related tasks. One of the main gaps in the project achievements is that it has failed to engage the private sector in the establishment of protected areas on their lands and to provide the necessary incentives and enabling regulatory framework for the establishment and management of protected areas on private land. No biodiversity stewardship unit was established and a limited pilot programme was implemented through providing financial incentives to 7 private land owners for the clearing of IAS on their land. The expansion of the PA estate does not include formal private PAs.

Recommendations

Recommendations are listed with the suggested implementers of the recommendations (Responsible entity) and include corrective actions for the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project, and actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project.

	Recommendations	Resp. entity
Implementation		
1	**TORs**. The blame for the fact that some tasks were not completed under components 1 and 2 was mostly focused on the poor performance of the international consultancy firm Eco Africa. However, this 1.5-year contract was awarded only in February 2014, almost four years after the official start of a five-year project and covered most of the project components 1 and 2. The level of effort and the time required to complete all the tasks included in this contract was greatly underestimated. Tasks such as participatory development of strategic documents involving extensive consultation and development and pilot implementation of a PES mechanism, to name these, would have required much more time than what was specified in the contract. This does not diminish the responsibility of the firm to have accepted this contract, but if learning must be drawn from this experience in order to improve the implementation of future projects, they must relate to all the time lost during the 4	UNPD Future projects Government

	Recommendations	Resp. entity
	first years of the project and on the preparation of the terms of reference, especially when they are of such importance in relation to the project as a whole. Timing: The development of TORs of major importance for a project and conditioning a sequence of subsequent activities should be a priority from the start of the project, within the first 3 months. Responsibility: The CTA, the project manager and the UNDP CO should prepare the ToRs based on the specifications provided in the project document and have them validated by experts, at least by persons able to assess rigorously the consistency of the content and conditions of execution, including level of effort, resources allocated and duration, including the RTA and local specialists. These TORs should be circulated and validated by the PSC, and advertised as broadly as possible. If the TORs are not developed within a short delay, the PSC as the supervisory structure should be vigilant and rapidly inquire about the reasons and take action. While there is consensus on the poor performance of the 1st project manager, he was in post for 2 years. Selection: Procurement rules that require to select the cheapest offer could be misleading and technical criteria should be considered foremost and outweigh the financial criteria, while remaining within the budget of the project. Description: ToRs prepared with clear, detailed, and scheduled deliverables based on a realistic assessment of the level of effort required to achieve the tasks	
2	**Counterproductive delays**. One of the explanations for delaying the formalization of key documents that had gone through all possible stages of participatory discussions, reviews and validation and administrative requirements, was that Government officials had to wait for a major event to declare or publicize major achievements (e.g. launching of a national strategy or declaring sites as Nature Reserves). Delaying the formalization of such documents in turn delays the implementation of other activities that depend on a formal enabling framework or guidance, which impacts the delivery of a project with a limited lifetime. It is thus recommended to seize the opportunity offered by the completion of a key product of national importance and to **create** an event around its formalization.	MoAIFS, UNDP RR/RC
3	**Quality assurance role** - UNDP at country and regional levels must ensure that project implementation arrangements and expenditures comply with UNDP rules and that funds are used for agreed purposes.	UNDP – all levels
Monitoring and evaluation		
4	**Monitoring of IAS clearing and results**. To develop and implement a monitoring procedure for the clearing of IAS and establish a database. One of the PIRs mentions that the mapping of restored areas under the project have been initiated. However, this is far from being sufficient. The *Good Practice Guide to Native Vegetation Restoration in Mauritius* mentions that the frequency of maintenance weeding will vary depending on site-specific factors and that "when, where, and how to weed should be determined by monitoring". In order to expand further clearing of IAS and restoration of native forests at a scale large enough to have a significant long-term impact on restoration of habitats for biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services, it is necessary to plan IAS clearing operations and monitor interventions and results to assess the interventions effectiveness and efficiency (cost) for continuous improvement, as recommended in the Good Practice Guide. Data could be collected by trained supervisors. The following is not exhaustive and could be complemented by specialists, while retaining simplicity and practical feasibility: - Planning of the clearing operations could include the following data on the physical site: a few environmental parameters, such as geographical coordinates of the site, state of invasion of the forest and main target IAS species, canopy cover, slope, distance to a watercourse, and presence of vulnerable species (endemic, rare, threatened). - Monitoring of the interventions: dates of first and subsequent clearings, technique used, number of workers and duration of interventions, area of intervention, weather including occurrence of rain within X hours of the clearing (when herbicide is applied), bundles of cut vegetation left on site.	NPCS

	Recommendations	Resp. entity
	- Monitoring of the results: description and quantification of regrowth and regeneration of IAS within a specific radius around cut stump, occurrence of new IAS species, evidence of impacts such as erosion, and description and quantification of (target) native species regeneration.	
Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project		
5	**Regulatory framework for private reserves**. To develop and enact a regulatory framework to enable the creation and management of private reserves that contribute to the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services while providing benefits to land owners. The legislative framework should enable the establishment of incentives to encourage landowners to enter the programme, including through payment for ecosystem services schemes.	MoAIFS State Law Office
6	**PES**. The implementation of conservation and restoration actions entails high costs and, in order to scale up conservation and restoration with the participation of the private sector, it is necessary to develop adequate financial incentives. Ecosystem valuation was included in the ProDoc under output 1.4, and the development and testing of a Payment for Ecological Services (PES) scheme was included in the TORs of the consulting firm Eco-Africa, as part of an Integrated Financing Strategy for PAs. This part of the contract was not completed and it must be said that the level of effort required to achieve the development and testing of a PES was clearly underestimated. A meta-analysis of 89 restoration assessments in a wide range of ecosystem types across the globe indicated that ecological restoration increased provision of biodiversity and ecosystem services by 44 and 25% respectively, and that values of both remained lower in restored versus intact reference ecosystems.[15] IAS were among the degrading actions addressed by 4 of the studies examined, and extirpation of damaging species and planting of trees were among the restoration actions in 8 and 16 studies. Such results should motivate a reflection (possibly as part of a MSP or as a component of a larger project) on the possibility of establishing voluntary PES schemes as an alternative or complement to binding stewardship agreements with private land owners. PES can be defined as (i) voluntary, (ii) contingent transactions between (iii) at least one seller and (iv) one buyer (v) over a well-defined Ecosystem Service, or a land use likely to secure that service. This could involve valuation studies for high value ecosystem services likely to be improved by conservation, restoration and sustainable use of ecosystems and natural resources (such as carbon storage, regulation of climate and water flow, provision of clean water, and maintenance of soil fertility), an analysis of the market for specific PES to identify service providers (sellers) and users (buyers) of the ES, and the identification of several elements required to operationalize the PES scheme[16]. In line with the Mauritius NBSAP 2017-2025, namely target 7 aiming at developing a policy framework with incentives for pro-biodiversity practices, target 3 related to setting up sustainable incentives for biodiversity conservation and restoration, and target 11 aiming at conserving at least 16% of terrestrial areas and inland waters, it is recommended to further the efforts undertaken under the PAN project to bring the private land owners on board and build on i) existing outputs of the PAN project such as the biodiversity stewardship pilot experiences as MoUs between 7 private companies and the MoAIFS providing a financial incentive of 400,000 Rupees for clearing IAS over 5 ha of native forest, ii) reflections and consultations to develop the Biodiversity Stewardship Programme and the Biodiversity Stewardship Agreement template (currently under review by the State Law Office), and iii) the valuation study of ecosystem services provided by the watersheds of 2 important reservoirs presented as part of the NBSAP 2017-2015.	MoaIFS / NPCS, FS UNDP

[15] Rey Benayas J.M., Newton A.C., Diaz A. and J.M. Bullock. 2009. Enhancement of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services by Ecological Restoration: A Meta-Analysis. *Science* 325: 1121-1124.

[16] A clear set of criteria, and a procedure to define eligible activities, expected benefits, and level / mode of payment or compensation practices for different land and resource users to generate environmental benefits; A mechanism to transfer payments from buyers to sellers; A procedure to enforce the application the contracts; Indicators and methodology to monitor performance of the contracts to ensure that the scheme effectively achieves its conservation and environmental objectives; An institutional structure capable of managing the funds generated in the PES mechanism and monitoring its implementation and outcomes.

	Recommendations	Resp. entity
7	**Entrance fees to PAs**. The proportion of the financial resources for the PA network sourced from non-governmental sources decreased since the beginning of the project, and more particularly in the 2nd segment of its implementation, as shown under the indicator # 11 in Table 7. It is recommended to put in place mechanisms to generate independent revenue earmarked for conservation in PAs, based on a user-pays principle, such as entrance fees to PAs. Given that some issues have hampered so far the implementation of this obvious and globally widespread solution to raise sustainable income to support the recurrent operational costs of PAs, such as the social acceptability of imposing entrance fees and the fact that PAs are easily accessible (not fenced), it is recommended that the Government commission a consultation to examine the solutions implemented elsewhere in the world and proposes solutions that will be acceptable to all to remove the current obstacles to the mobilization of this source of income for the PAs system.	MoAIFS
8	**IAS control field guide**. It is recommended to produce a practical and user-friendly field guide for IAS control, from the instructions provided in the *Good Practice Guide to Native Vegetation Restoration in Mauritius,* with clear and simple instructions in the form of illustrations accessible to non-specialist field workers and separate sheets for the different techniques, in a format resistant to be handled in the field.	NPCS
9	**Business plans**. It is recommended to complete the PANES Financial and Business Model building on the (incomplete) draft developed by the consulting firm and submitted at the Validation Workshop and on the identification of human resources requirements for all competency areas needed to implement the PANES (as part of the Strategic Action Plan for the Implementation of the PANES). It is also recommended to develop individual business plans for each of the 2 National Parks and for the Bird Sanctuary as part of their management plans, based on the following assessments: − Identification and assessment of available finances for the individual PA based on the operational budget (for salaries, maintenance, fuel) and infrastructure investment budget (such as roads, visitor centres), annual revenue generated on the site such as tourism entrance fees, income from concessions such as ecotourism development, and payments for ecosystem services; − Assessment of the costs and financing needs for the basic management of the individual PA including recurring operational costs (such as salaries, fuel for transportation, office maintenance), and infrastructure investment costs; − Assessment of the annual financing gap for operations and infrastructure investment based on the previous assessments and identification of additional options and sources of revenues to leverage supplemental financial resources.	MoAIFS/ NPCS, FS

Lessons

Undue procurement delays. The issue of the undue procurement delays was improved by briefing the Officer of the Sector Support to MoAIFS within the Ministry of Finance who is signatory for the project prior to submitting procurement requests and inviting him to attend presentations of the project work plans and achievements. Being better informed about the planning and the needs of the project, these officials are better able to validate them, which facilitates and speeds up the procurement process.

Required oversight. TORs of the international consulting firm for were incomplete and did not include timelines for the deliverables – these TORs were developed under the oversight of the UNV Program Officer who had limited experience - tasks assigned to a junior officer require close oversight by a senior officer of UNDP CO.

Dissemination of UNDP and GEF rules to all project stakeholders. An allowance was paid to civil servants from the project funds for their work to weed Invasive Alien Species, although this is against UN's rules. It has been reported that this kind of issue has occurred repeatedly in Mauritius but is also known to occur in other countries. It thus appears necessary to establish a systematic practice of taking advantage of a meeting or workshop involving the largest number of stakeholders, early in the implementation of the project, such as the inception workshop, to recall and clarify UNDP and GEF essential rules for project implementation.

Rigorous work planning and budgeting. A significant unrealized loss of US$55,887 is recorded in the project expenditure statement as of end of 2017, and is due to poor work planning, over-budgeting, and a high Authorized Spending Limit request. The excess amount had to be repaid at a higher exchange rate than that in effect at the time of the allocation due to the depreciation of the Mauritian rupee to the American dollar, which explains the loss. The lesson learned is to ensure rigorous and realistic work planning and avoid over-budgeting.

Collaboration. The Steering Committee, Executive Committee and Technical Working Groups allowed to maximize intra - and inter-sectoral collaboration among the component lead agencies and increase the efficiency of interventions.

Involving the private sector. Building trusting relationships and engaging actively the private sector in this project was essential and entailed a long-term process. This is why it is so important to maintain the momentum created by the project and to keep the private sector involved in the development of the regulatory framework for the creation and operation of private reserves and to keep explaining the concepts underlying the Biodiversity Stewardship Programme, in order to build this framework on the basis of common understanding of the principles involved.

5 ANNEXES

Annex 1. ToRs

Annex 2. Schedule of meetings for the TE of the Project PIMS 3749

Annex 3. Itinerary of site visits

Annex 4. List of persons interviewed

Annex 5. Assessment Matrix for Evaluation

Annex 6. Questions to document results based on logical framework

Annex 7. Evaluation questions (indicative list included in ToRs)

Annex 8. Rating scales used in the terminal evaluation

Annex 9. List of documents reviewed

Annex 10. Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Annex 11. Evaluation Report Clearance Form

Annex 12. *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Report audit trail (to be completed)

Annex 13. *Annexed in separate files:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool, Financial Sustainability Scorecard for PA Systems, Capacity Development Scorecard

Annex 14. Risk Assessment Guiding Matrix

Annex 15. Expenditure statement per outcome as at 31 December 2017

ANNEX 1. TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE (WITHOUT ANNEXES)

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the **"Expanding coverage and strengthening management effectiveness of the protected area network on the island of Mauritius"** *(PIMS 3749)*

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Expanding coverage and strengthening management effectiveness of the protected area networ			
GEF Project ID:	3526		*at endorsement (Million US$)*	*at completion (Million US$)*
UNDP Project ID:	3749	GEF financing:	4.000	
Country:	Mauritius	IA/EA own:	0	
Region:	Africa	Government:	4.1874	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	7.577	
FA Objective (OP/SP):	GEF 4: BD–1 (Catalyzing Sustainability of PAs)	Total co-financing:	11.7644	
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Agro-Industry, Food Production and Security (MoA)	Total Project Cost:	15.7644	
Other Partners involved:	Forestry Service (FS), National Parks and Conservation Service (NPCS), Ministry of Social Security, National Solidarity, and Environment and Sustainable Development, Ministry of Tourism (MoT), Ministry of Housing and Lands (MoHL), Ministry of Finance and Economic Empowerment (MoF), State Law Office (SLO), Ministry of Local Government and Outer Islands (MoLG): Municipal and District Councils, Mauritian Wildlife Foundation (MWF), University of Mauritius (UM), Private landowners and lease holders, Mauritius Meat Producers Association (MMPA)	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		05th March 2010
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: March 2015	Actual: April 2018

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

Mauritius, like most oceanic islands, has high levels of floral and faunal endemicity and has suffered high extinction rates caused by a growing human population, habitat destruction and degradation. In order to safeguard the remaining biodiversity, the Government of Mauritius have established a terrestrial protected area network on the mainland, and associated offshore islets, comprising 20 formal state protected areas (8027ha). This is supplemented by a number of different types of less secure conservation areas (7,168ha), under varying levels of protection. Under current conditions, the terrestrial protected area network (PAN) is however not effectively safeguarding the country's unique terrestrial biodiversity because: (i) a number of natural ecosystem processes, habitats and species are not adequately represented in the existing PAS; (ii) the capacity of the institutions responsible for the planning and management of the protected areas is generally weak; and (iii) the technical knowledge to cost-effectively contain the threats to biodiversity within the PAN is under-developed.

This project seeks to strengthen the systemic, institutional and operational capacity to: (i) identify, prioritize and target gaps in representation that can be filled through protected area expansion, and complementary conservation, efforts on private and state-owned land; (ii) develop regulatory drivers and an incentives framework to support PA expansion, and complementary conservation, efforts on private and state-owned land; (iii) establish and administer a conservation stewardship program to

implement PA expansion initiatives on privately owned or managed land; (iv) effectively plan, resource and manage an expanded PAN comprising both private and state protected areas; (v) cost-effectively mitigate the threats to, and pressures on, the unique biodiversity contained within the expanded PAN (notably the spread of invasive alien species); (vi) ensure better integration of the PAN into the country's socio-economic development priorities, in particular development of the tourism industry, to ensure its long-term financial sustainability; and (vi) respond effectively to the needs of, and meaningfully involve, different stakeholder groups in the ongoing planning and operational management of the expanded PAN.

The global environmental benefits of the project are represented by: (i) adding 6,893 ha of terrestrial landscapes under formal protection; (ii) increasing management effectiveness at the PA level (from a METT baseline of <37% -65% to a METT target of all PAs scoring >55% and IUCN category II PAs >70%); (iii) improving the overall PA institutional capacity (from baseline of 56% in the Capacity Assessment Scorecard to >65%); and (iv) increasing the financial sustainability of the PAN (from a financial sustainability baseline score of 17% to >45%).

The original components / outcomes are summarised below:

Component / Outcome 1: Systemic framework for PA expansion improved

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

Component/ Outcome 2: PA institutional framework strengthened

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

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

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

Executing Agency/Implementing Partner: Ministry of Agro-Industry, Food Production and Security

Implementing Entity/Responsible Partners: National Parks and Conservation Service, Forestry Service

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method[17] for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluation should include a mixed methodology of document review, interviews, and observations from project site visits, at minimum, and the evaluators should make an effort to triangulate information. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (see *Annex C*). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Mauritius, including implementation sites. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Ministry of Agro-Industry, Food Production and Security (MoA)
- National Parks and Conservation Service (NPCS),
- Forestry Service (FS),
- Ministry of Social Security, National Solidarity, and Environment and Sustainable Development,
- Ministry of Tourism (MoT),
- Ministry of Housing and Lands (MoHL),
- Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoF),
- State Law Office (SLO),
- Ministry of Local Government and Outer Islands (MoLG): Municipal and District Councils,
- Mauritian Wildlife Foundation (MWF),
- University of Mauritius (UoM),
- Private landowners and lease holders,
- Mauritius Meat Producers Association (MMPA)

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

Functions and key results expected:

The International Consultant will be the team leader and will be responsible for the quality of the report and timely submission. The National Consultant will provide supportive roles in terms of professional inputs, knowledge of local policies, local navigation, translation / language support, etc.

A. The review team is expected to prepare an Evaluation Report based on the outline listed in *Annex C* while specifically including the following aspects:

    1. Adequacy of the overall project concept, design, implementation methodology, institutional structure, timelines, budgetary allocation or any other aspect of the project design that the evaluation team may want to comment upon.

[17] For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

2. Extent of progress achieved against the overall project objective disaggregated by each of the individual Outcomes, Outputs and Activities (including sub-activities); as against the Impact Indicators identified and listed in the project document. Extent of the incremental value added with project implementation.
3. Performance in terms of in-time achievement of individual project activities as well as overall project in terms of adherence to planned timelines.
4. Relevance and adequacy of mid-course changes in implementation strategy with PSC approval, if any and the consequent variations in achievements, if any.
5. Degree of effectiveness of the Project Management Unit to identify gaps, if any with lessons learned and alternative scenarios, if any
6. Extent to which systemic framework for Protected Area expansion has been improved. Identify gaps, if any, and provide alternative scenarios.
7. Extent to which Protected Area institutional framework has been strengthened. Identify gaps, if any, and provide alternative scenarios.
8. Extent to which the Operational know-how is in place to contain threats related to Protected Area.
9. Evaluate the impact of the project activities on the various government and private institutions
10. Extent of effectiveness of awareness generation activities by way of quality of promotional packages / awareness material, number of Awareness Programmes, Trainings undertaken and level of awareness created. Quality of documentation, if any, produced under the project like, brochure, etc. should also be considered
11. Pattern, in which funds have been leveraged, budgeted, spent and accounted for in the project

B. The team should also focus their assessments on project impacts as listed:

1. Perceptions on the "Situation at the end of the Project" as it seems to the review team at the terminal review stage
2. Nature and scale of the policy impact made by the project, if any, on relevant line departments of the Government or other policy making bodies
3. Extent of effectiveness of capacity building initiatives undertaken under the aegis of the project
4. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the institutional arrangement deployed in the project with alternative scenarios, if any
5. Details of co-funding, if any, leveraged by the project and its impact on the project;
6. The effectiveness of monitoring and overseeing systems such as Project Steering Committee and suggestion on improvements if any

C. Terminal Evaluation and Knowledge Management Workshop

1. The International consultant will conduct a minimum one-day terminal evaluation and knowledge management workshop (during the evaluation mission) on monitoring and evaluation concepts and methodology for capacity development of relevant stakeholders. One of the aims of the workshop should be to enable the stakeholders to be capacitated to monitor and document project experiences, draw out lessons learned and envision how to implement the lessons learnt going forward. The program of the workshop must be included in this offer.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex D.

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	***rating***	**2. IA& EA Execution**	***rating***
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	

Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	**rating**	**4. Sustainability**	**rating**
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration.

The position of financing and co-financing as on September 2013 which was assessed during the Mid Term Review is given in table below:

Project Budget, Financing and Co-financing (Million USD)

GEF			
	Budget	**Actual**	**%**
Outcome 1: Systemic framework for PA expansion improved	478,000	47,278	9.9
Outcome 2: PA institutional framework strengthened	745,000	0	0
Outcome 3: Operational know-how in place to contain threats	2,377,000	193,436	8.1
Project Management	400,000	213,843	53.5
TOTAL	**4,000,000**	**454,556**	**11.4**

The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US$)		Government (mill. US$)		Partner Agency (mill. US$)		Total (mill. US$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[18]

[18] A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: ROTI Handbook 2009

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**. The evaluators will also follow and provide response according to the "management response template" at Annex I. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Mauritius. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

The Consultants shall comply strictly with comments made on any deliverable by the UNDP CO, the UNDP GEF Regional Technical Adviser and the UNDP Independent Evaluation office (IEO).

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 20 person days over a period of two months according to the following plan for the international consultant:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	5 days	15 August 2017
Evaluation Mission including workshop	8 days	31 August 2017
Draft Evaluation Report and GEF Tracking Tool	4 days	21 September 2017
Final Report and GEF Tracking tool	3 days	16 October 2017

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO, IEO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO, Project Steering Committee, Key Stakeholders, IEO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PAN Project team, GEF OFPs, IEO
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to IEO and CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail' (see annex H), detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

ANNEX 2 – SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS FOR THE TE OF THE PROJECT PIMS 3749

Programme for TE Mission, 26 February - 10 March 2017 (Final)				
Day	**Date**	**Time**	**Entity**	**Name/Title**
Monday	26-févr	09:30 - 16:00	PAN Team + CTA - working session	
Tuesday	27-févr	09:30 - 10:30	Mauritian Wildlife Found	Dr Vikash Tatayah Dir. Conservation
		11:00 - 12:00	NPCS	Mr Vishnu Bachraz,Director
		13:00 - 13:30	UNDP RR/UN RC	Ms. Christine Umutoni
		15:00 - 17:00	UNDP	Mr. Satyajeet Ramchurn, PO
Wednesday	28-févr	08:30 - 09:00	NPCS/ Deputy Director	Mr. Kevin Ruhumoun
		09:00 - 17:00	PANES workshop, Petrin - meeting with project partners & beneficiaries of trainings	
		17:00 - 18:00	Jet Ranch (Priv Deer Farm)	Mr R. Chakowa, Director
Thursday	01-mars	10:00 -11:30	Forestry Service	Mr Vishnu Tezoo, Conservator
		13:30 - 17:00	Forestry Service	Ms Cecily Cyparsade & Mr Zayd Jhumka, Assistans Conservator
Friday	02-mars	08:00-10:00	Meeting with training participants. Monvert Visitors Centr	
		11:00 - 12:30	MoAIFS - Chairperson PSC	Ms C. Jhowry, Deputy Permanent Secretary
		14:00 -15:00	Ministry Finance Econ Dev	Ms R Ramsurn GEF Focal Point
		15:00 - 16:30	ex-IAS Coordinator,PAN	Mr. Parmananda Ragen
Saturday	03-mars	09:30 -11:00	ex-National Proj Dir, PAN	Mr. Mannickchand Puttoo
		11:00 - 17:00	TE Working session	
Sunday	04-mars	09:00 - 17:00	TE Working session	
Monday	05-mars	09:30 - 13:00	Site visit at BRGNP and Ebony Forest	
		14:00-19:00	TE working session	
Tuesday	06-mars	09:00 - 18:00	Working session with project team, FS & NPCS teams	
Wednesday	07-mars	09:30 - 16:00	Site visit / meeting with private land owners potential partners for stewardship agreements (Ebony Forest &	
Thursday	08-mars	09:00 - 20:30	TE team - preparation for debriefing session	
Friday	09-mars	09:00 - 12:00	Debriefing with Project team & UNDP	
		15:00-18:00	Working session with project team	

ANNEX 3 – ITINERARY OF SITE VISITS

DATE	LOCATION	TIME	ACTIVITIES
28 Feb. 2018	**Pétrin, Black River Gorges National Park**	8:30	Departure from Quatre-Bornes
		9:30	Interview with Mr Kevin Ruhumoun, Deputy Director, National Parks and Conservation Service
		10:00	Quick visit to restored sites with 2 senior rangers and interviews with labourers and overseers
		11:00 – 17:00	Interviews with officials from Forestry Service and beneficiaries of trainings under the PAN project
		17:00	Visit to Jet Ranch, private deer-farming on leased public land with exotic (pine) forest
5 Mar.2018	**Black River Gorges National Park**	7:45	Departure from Quatre-Bornes
		9:00 – 13:00	Site visit of restored sites including sites for the reintroduction of the pink pigeon and echo-parakeet – Interviews with rangers and labourers involved in the clearing of invasives
		14:00	Meeting with project team at office
6 Mar. 2018	**Ebony Forest and Société Lavilleon in Chamarel – private land owners**	8:00	Departure from Quatre-Bornes
		10:00 – 13:00	Ebony Forest – Meeting with Ms Christine Griffith and site visit to visitor centre, and restored sites
		13:30 -	Société Lavilleon - Meeting with Mr Frédérick d'Hotman and site visit to restored sites
		16:00	Return to Project Office

ANNEX 4. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Government of Mauritius

Ministry of Agro-Industry and Food Security

Ms C. JHOWRY, Deputy Permanent Secretary/MoAIFS, and Chairperson of the PAN Project Steering Committee

National Parks and Conservation Services

Mr Vishnu BACHRAZ, Director, and National Project Director
Mr Kevin RUHUMOUN, Deputy Director
Mr Souraj GOPAL, Senior Scientific Officer
Mr Manikchand PUTTO, ex-Director, and previous National Project Director

Forestry Service

Mr Vishnu TEZOO, Senior Conservator of Forests
Mr Poojanraj KHURUN, Deputy Conservator of Forests, FAO National Correspondent
Ms Cecily CYPARSADE, Assistant Conservator of Forests
Mr Zayd JHUMKA, Assistant Conservator of Forests

Ministry of Finance and Economic Development

Ms Rachna RAMSURN, Lead Analyst/Resource Mobilization Unit, GEF Focal Point
Mr Sianduth HURRY, Assistant Financial Manager/ Sector Support to MoAIFS
Mr Subiraj JEEBODHUN, Senior Analyst/ Sector Support to MoAIFS

Ministry of Arts and Culture

Mr Avinash SEEGOLAM, Conservation Officer, Le Morne Heritage Trust Fund

Ministry of Ocean Economy

Ms Nabiihah ROOMALDAWO, Technical Officer, Fisheries Division / Marine Science Division

PAN Project Team / Management unit

Mr Shakil BEEDASSY, Project Manager
Mr Seewajee PANADOO, IAS Manager
Mr Jean-Lindsay AZIZ, Project Assistant
Mr John MAUREMOOTOO, Chief Technical Advisor
Mr Parmananda RAGEN, ex-IAS Coordinator, Project Manager of UNDP-GEF "Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Management of the Coastal zone of the Republic of Mauritius" Project

UNDP-Mauritius Country Office

Ms Christine UMUTONI, UN Resident Coordinator - UNDP Resident Representative
Mr Satyajeet RAMCHURN, Environment Program Officer

Private Sector

Ebony Forest

Ms Christine GRIFFITH, General Manager
Mr Nethy CHUNWAN, Conservation / Education Officer

Société Lavilleon

Mr Frederick D'HOTMAN, General Manager

Vallée de Ferney

Mr Arnaud BERTHELOT, General Manager

Jet Ranch Ltd.

Mr Rajen CHAKOWA, Director

International NGO

Mauritian Wildlife Foundation

Dr Vikash TATAYAH, Conservation Director
Mr Dominique BAHO, Senior Conservation Biologist, Pink Pigeon project

ANNEX 5. ASSESSMENT MATRIX FOR EVALUATION. QUESTIONS TO GUIDE INTERVIEWS WITH PROJECT TEAM AND PARTNERS ON PROJECT MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Report section	Questions	Source d'information
Purpose of the final evaluation	More detailed specific expectations than those mentioned in the ToRs?	Meetings with: Mauritius RC/ UNDP RR Project coordination Project Steering Committee/ NPD
Project Design		
National ownership	Project consistency with national development, environmental, biodiversity conservation, and sustainable land management action plans	National Strategy and Action Plan for Biodiversity of Mauritius, and other environmental policy docs
Participation of stakeholders in the design stages	Have partners and beneficiaries been consulted during the project preparation phase?	PIF, CEO ER Government Representatives Local authorities and partners
Links between the project and other interventions in the sector	Are there other projects that collaborate or complement project interventions? Projects that focus on biodiversity and habitat / ecosystem conservation, sustainable management of natural resources, land degradation and rehabilitation, integration of BD and SLM concerns into development planning? What is the relationship / coordination / communication between this project and the others?	UNDP Program Officer Project coordination
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION **Implementation approach**		
Use of logical framework as a management tool during implementation	Was the LF used during the project to monitor results (other than completing the PIR) with implementing partners? and re-evaluate the risks and assumptions?	Project coordination
Annual planning	How were the annual work plans developed? Have implementing partners been involved in the development or validation of work plans?	Project coordination Project Implementation Partners
Adaptive management reflected in the development of work plans	Has the work plan been revised / adapted based on the results of the annual / mid-term monitoring / evaluation of results and lessons learned?	Project coordination
Monitoring and evaluation		
Project Steering Committee	What role did the PPC play in the project? Was the Steering Committee helpful in resolving critical issues during the implementation of the project? What are the main decisions made by CP during the project? Who will play this role after the project, if needed?	Project coordination Project Implementation Partners
Quarterly Progress Reports	How were the different units coordinated to monitor results, prepare quarterly and annual reports?How many reports (narrative and financial) / formats to be submitted? To whom?	Project coordination Project Implementation Partners
Annual Monitoring and Reporting	How often were the LF outcome indicators measured?	Project coordination
Definition of appropriate indicators (SMART)	Have the indicators been changed / modified during the project? If so, following whose recommendation? Was it validated by the RTA?	Project coordination
	Did UNDP or the GEF provide assistance / advice in identifying appropriate indicators or improving the PRODOC indicators?	Project coordination
National ownership	Has the project contributed to developing or supporting a regulatory and policy framework? Is the country adopting new regulations or policies that support project objectives? Did the national government fulfill its financial and in-kind co-financing commitment? What did the contribution account for?	UNDP Program Officer Government representative
Participation of Stakeholders		

Report section	Questions	Source d'information
Participation of local partners and resource users in project implementation and decision-making	Were they involved and how?	National project manager
Mechanisms for dissemination of information as part of project implementation	Has the project developed a communication strategy? How was communication established through the project structure and with partners?	National project manager Project Implementation Partners and other stakeholders
Financing plan, state of expenditure and efficiency		
Financing plan and contributions paid	Request table	Project assistant
	If there are significant differences between the amounts pledged and paid, are there any specific explanations?	Project assistant / National project manager
	Has the project had a leverage effect to mobilize additional contributions from other partners? Request details of amounts, partners and allocation of funds	National project manager Project assistant
Statement of Expenditure by Result and Source of Co-financing from March 2010 to February 2018	Request tables	Project assistant
	Have there been any major revisions to the budget? Have they been the subject of decisions of the project's steering committee?	Project assistant / National project manager
	If there are significant differences between the budget and the amounts realized, are there any specific explanations?	Project assistant National project manager
In-kind contribution from local stakeholders	Is it possible to estimate the contribution of local stakeholders in the various interventions throughout the duration of the project? In time? In $?	Project assistant / National project manager
Cost of major achievements under each component	Request tables	Project assistant
Planning for sustainability	Has the project developed a sustainability strategy? Is it the one that was planned in the PRODOC?	National project manager
	What institutional arrangements and financial mechanisms are in place to ensure the sustainability of project results?	National project manager
Execution and Implementation arrangements		
Implementation	Coordination mechanisms for all stakeholders / partners	National project manager Project Implementation Partners
Financial Management	UNDP management and coordination of project implementation partners	National project manager Project Implementation Partners

ANNEX 6. QUESTIONS TO DOCUMENT RESULTS BASED ON LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions	Additional questions
Objective To expand, and ensure effective management of, the protected area network to safeguard threatened biodiversity					
1. Coverage (ha) of the terrestrial **formal** protected area network of mainland Mauritius and the islets: State protected areas Private protected areas	 8,027ha 0ha	 11,700ha 3,220ha	Protected Area Information System Annual Reports of FS and NPCS Ministry of Housing and Lands Land Use/Class database MoE NDU ESA database	Assumptions: – The government commits to an incremental growth in the grant funding allocation to finance the protected area network – The financial reporting of the MoA (FS and NPCS) develops dedicated budget codes for PA planning and management functions Risks: – The legal reform processes to support the effective management and expansion of the PAN become prolonged and drawn out	See areas in PIR 2017 and request EOP (actual) areas See FSC for Gov budget
2. Total operational budget (including HR and capital budget) allocation (US$) for protected area management	~US$2.3m	>US$4.1m	Audited financial reports of FS and NPCS Audited financial reports of NEF and NCF Audited financial reports of MWF		See values in PIR 2017 and request EOP (actual) values See FSC values as compared to CEO ER
3. Financial sustainability score (%) for national systems of protected areas	17%	>45%	Annual Financial Sustainability Scorecard		Analyse results of the FSC, level and detail of score increase Was this measured annually? Request and review the PAN business plan
4. Capacity development indicator score (%) for protected area system: Systemic Institutional Individual	 50% 56% 62%	 78% 65% 82%	Annual Institutional Capacity Development Scorecard		What are increases attributable to, if any? Was this measured annually? Are increases solely attributable to project interventions? Or did the Gov provide some support, namely through other projects? What is the impact of these increased capacities?
5. METT scores for different categories of formal protected areas on mainland Mauritius and the islets National Parks (2) Bird Sanctuary (1) Nature Reserves (14) Forest Reserves (3)	 40% & 58% 57% 37-65% <37%	 All > 70% > 65% All > 60% All > 55%	METT applied at Mid-Term and Final Evaluation		What are increases attributable to, if any? Are increases solely attributable to project interventions? Or did the Gov provide some support, namely through other projects? Review METT scores, compare with midterm and baseline scores – request explanations, if not provided in the METT, for any significant difference Have METTs been submitted to the ERC team for validation?
Outcome 1 Systemic framework for PA expansion improved					
Outputs: 1.1: Enabling national policy for a representative system of protected areas is formulated					

Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions	Additional questions
1.2: Legislative and regulatory framework for the PAN is updated and reformed 1.3: Rationale for PA expansion in place, and conservation stewardship strategy and tools established to guide implementation 1.4: Business-oriented financial and business plan prepared for PAN 1.5: Awareness of the need to conserve native biodiversity is improved					
6. Number of 'Land Types'[19] included in the PAN	8 of 16	12 of 16	Protected Area Information System	Assumptions: – Legislative and regulatory reforms are supported and adopted by Government, and provide for the establishment of private protected areas – Land designated as category 1 and category 2 ESA's will remain under some form of protection or conservation in the medium-term – Distributional data of threatened native species is being updated and maintained Risks: – The effects of climate change degrades the conservation value of areas targeted for PAN expansion	See value in PIR 2017, request actual value Is the EOP target in line with the national PA strategy?
7. Ecological corridors and marine-terrestrial linkages incorporated into the PAN	None	2 (1 in South; 1 in North)[20]	PA Information System Ministry of Housing and Lands Land Use/Class database MoE NDU ESA database		See value in PIR 2017, request actual value What exactly has been achieved (i.e. what means incorporated?) and how did the project proceed to incorporate those corridors? Are there specific issues in these corridors?
8. No rare and threatened plant species (of 231 with a known distribution) having at least 1 wild pop present in the PAN. Previously considered extinct Extirpated in the wild Critically endangered Endangered Vulnerable	 2 1 44 25 62	 6 2 70 33 71	Protected Area Information System Mauritius Herbarium		See value in PIR 2017, request actual value If there are significant gaps with targets, request explanations How many inventories have been conducted over the lifetime of the project to assess these values, and by whom? Are resources available to conduct such inventories periodically after the project end?
9. Reach (estimated number of people) of the communications and awareness programme Broad-based communications (est no of audience receiving different media message) Outreach programmes (no of people attending) Experiential learning prog. (no of people attending) Lobbying of key decision-makers (no people & institut.)	 n/a n/a n/a n/a	 100,000 500 300 10 of 4	Project Reports		Did the project develop a communication plan/ strategy? See value in PIR 2017, request actual value How did the project estimate these values? What were the main messages i) related to project activities / events? ii) to raise awareness on specific thematic issues? What media were used?
Outcome 2 PA institutional framework strengthened					
Outputs					

[19] The following land types have been classified for the mainland: Central intermediate lava plateau; Central late lava plateau; Chamarel inter-mountain valley flat & slopes; Eastern coastal valley flats & slopes; Late lava plains & inland slopes; Lower mountain slopes; NE, E & southern intermediate lava plains & slopes; NW intermediate lava plains & slopes; Riverine lands; Sand beaches & dunes; Western coastal valleys, plains & slopes; Central uplands early lava plains & slopes; Inland water body; Old volcanic mountain & gorges; Coastal salt marshes; and Lakes.

[20] The targeted areas are: (i) the southern corridor stretching from the SW of the island (Le Morne/Souliac/Chamarel) across to the Bamboo mountains; and (ii) the northern corridor stretching from the NE (Le Pouce/Port Louis) across to the Aubin/Roches Noires area).

Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions	Additional questions
2.1: Management and governance options for the PAN reviewed. 2.2: Strategic planning for PA institutions completed 2.3: Financial sustainability of PA institutions improved 2.4: Conservation stewardship unit established and pilot programme implemented 2.5: Skills and competencies of PA staff improved					
10. Number of strategic plans prepared for PA institutions that are linked to the MTEF	0	2	Annual Reports of FS and NPCS	Assumptions: – Stakeholder institutions constructively engage in the identification of the most cost-effective institutional and governance arrangements for the PAN – The individual PA institutions maintain a clear mandate and unequivocal authority to fulfil oversight and management obligations for the protected area network Risks: – Government institutions cannot agree on the rationalisation of the management authority for PAs – Fears of expropriation and/or loss of rights hamper efforts to negotiate conservation stewardship agreements – Insufficient incentives are created to facilitate conservation stewardship negotiations	See value in PIR 2017, request actual value Review strategic plans for contents and consistency with the national strategy for the PA system How were these developed? By whom? With what financial resources? Who is responsible for implementation? With what resources?
11. Income from other sources (i.e. non- state budget allocation), as a percentage of the total operational budget of the PAN	33%	54%	FS and NPCS audited financial reports NEF and NCF audited financial reports MWF audited financial reports		See value in PIR 2017, request actual value Is this info integrated in the FSC – consistent? Are these resources secured? i.e. recurrent or temporary – as a grant as part of a project? How are these resources managed? By whom? What proportion gets back to individual PAs?
12. Number of tourism concessions awarded	0	1	Concession agreements		See value in PIR 2017, request actual value Review the agreement-s. Does it include clear rules regarding benefit sharing and specific allocation of resources to individual PAs and to the PA system? Are local communities affected? Involved? If so are there measures to consult? Involve? Protect their land and resource access/use rights?
13. Number of private landowners concluding stewardship agreements: Informal, non-binding, agreements Formal, legally binding, agreements	 0 0	 >6 >2	Stewardship agreements Project reports		See value in PIR 2017, request actual values Review the agreements. Does it include clear rules regarding benefit sharing and specific payment to the PA system? Are local communities affected? Involved? If so are there measures to consult? Involve? Protect their land and resource access/use rights?
14. Number of planning support and operational PA staff completing specialised training and/or skills development programs Short course training Mentoring programme Train-the-trainers program IAS and ecosystem restoration skills	 0 0 0 0 0	 >40 5 5 50 3	Training reports Project reports Annual reports of FS and NPCS		See value in PIR 2017, request actual values Review training material Who conducted the trainings? How many people attended each type of training? Have these trainings been integrated in the cursus of a national academic institution or in a 'formation continue' program supported by the concerned department-s? Who could provide such trainings in the future? What is the likelihood that it will continue? Plan interviews with beneficiaries: What has changed in their practices, perceptions, attitude as a result of

Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions	Additional questions
Partnering agreements with counterpart institutions					those trainings? What was the duration for each type of training? For theoretical and practical learnings? Was it sufficient? Adequate? Which institutions have made agreements? Review agreements for resources allocated, duration of the agreement
Outcome 3 - Operational know-how in place to contain threats					
Outputs 3.1: Integrated management plan prepared for Black River Gorges National Park 3.2: Cost-effective IAS control measures, and ecosystem restoration techniques, developed and tested 3.3: Enforcement and compliance capability improved 3.4: Information management system for recording, exchanging and disseminating information in place					
15. Number of protected areas with updated and approved management plans	1	>3	Annual reports of FS and NPCS	Assumptions: – A generic management planning format for PAs is adopted by all responsible PA institutions – The Government sustains, or improves, its financial commitment to IAS control and ecosystem restoration – Biological control agents will remain under development by other countries for targeted IAS, and available for release within the time frame of the project – Stakeholder groups continue to work collaboratively in IAS control and ecosystem restoration – Information to support the planning and management of the PAN is made available by existing public and private data suppliers Risks: – The high costs of IAS clearing and maintenance inhibits the scaling up of the IAS control program across the PAN network on the mainland and islets	See value in PIR 2017, request actual values Review management plans – How were management plans developed? Participatory? Has a generic management plan been developed? Does it include budget and management plan? Coherent with the Government budget allocation?
16. Extent of area (ha) under active IAS management and ecosystem restoration	60	>400	Annual reports of FS and NPCS Project Reports		See value in PIR 2017, request actual values Rate of success of interventions? Who was involved and who led these works? Who will continue after the project? And with what resources?
17. Average cost (US$/ha) of IAS control and ecosystem restoration Initial clearing & first follow-up Subsequent follow-ups	 US$9,000 US$1,000	 US$1,500 US$500	Protected Area Information System		See value in PIR 2017, request actual values How were these costs assessed? What is the impact of CC on the population dynamics of the most important IAS? Could this have an incidence on future costs for IAS control?
18. % of PAs with no, or poorly, demarcated boundaries	95%	<50%	Project reports Annual reports of FS and NPCS		See value in PIR 2017, request actual values How were PAs demarcated? Any consultation / participation with neighbouring land owners/users? What are the landmarks used? Any signs? Was this demarcation preceded by an exhaustive review of tenure and land/resources use/access rights? Were any issues raised during the demarcation process? By whom and what for? If so, how did the project handle it?

ANNEX 7: EVALUATION QUESTIONS (INDICATIVE LIST INCLUDED IN TORS)

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•

ANNEX 8. TERMINAL EVALUATION RATING SCALES

Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution	***Sustainability ratings:***	***Relevance ratings***
6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

ANNEX 9. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

UNDP. Evaluation Office. 2012. *Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects.* iii + 53 p.

Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluation for Full-Sized Projects. 2017

Rey Benayas J.M., Newton A.C., Diaz A. and J.M. Bullock. 2009. Enhancement of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services by Ecological Restoration: A Meta-Analysis. *Science* 325: 1121-1124.

Project development documents:

UNDP-GEF - Government of Mauritius. 2010. Project Document.

CEO Endorsement Request. 2010

Technical Documents developed as part of the project implementation:

Protected Area Network Expansion Strategy 2017-2026, and supporting documents

Strategic Action Plan for the Implementation of the Protected Area Network Expansion Strategy 2017-2026

Rays of Hope 2015

Black River Gorges National Park Management Plan 2017-2021

Bras D'eau National Park Management Plan 2017-2021

Good Practice Guide to Native Vegetation Restoration in Mauritius 2018

MoU between MoAIFS and private land owner for removal of IAS - Template

Biodiversity Stewardship Agreement Template

PANES Business Model 2017-2026 - Draft of November 2017

Project Management Documents:

Inception Workshop Report - 2012

Terms of reference of the international consultancy firm Eco Africa - 2014

Project Budget and financial data

Project monitoring and evaluation reports, including GEF tracking tools and CD scorecards

Annual reviews of the implementation of the project (PIRs 2012 - 2017)

Quarterly Progress Reports (Q1 – Q4 2015, Q1 – Q4 2016, Q1 – Q4 2017)

Minutes of the Steering Committee Meeting (Feb 2016)

Minutes of the Executive Committee Meetings (several dates 2015, 2016, 2017)

Annual Audit Report (for the years 2014, 2015, 2016)

Final Report of the Mid-term Evaluation Mission 2014

National Documents

Country Programme Document and UNDAF Mauritius

National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2017-2025

Forests and Reserves Act, No 41 of 1983

Native Terrestrial Biodiversity and National Parks Act 2015

Fifth National Report on the Convention on Biological Diversity 2015

Maurice Ile Durable http://mid.govmu.org/portal/sites/mid/aboutMID.htm

National Capacity Needs Self Assessment for Global Environmental Management 2005

Project Document *Mainstreaming Invasive Alien Species (IAS) Prevention, Control and Management*

The National Invasive Alien Species Strategy and Action Plan for the Republic of Mauritius: 2010-2019

ANNEX 10: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[21]

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

Name of Consultant: __Dominique Roby

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant)**:** _____

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

Signed at *Montreal* on *February 20, 2017*

Signature: 

[21] www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX 11: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: ____ _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____Penny Stock_____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ANNEX 12: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL (TO BE COMPLETED IN A SEPARATE FILE)

To the comments received on (*date*) for the Terminal Evaluation of "Expanding Coverage and Strengthening Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas Network on the Island of Mauritius" (UNDP PIMS 3749)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and by comment number ("#" column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	Evaluator response and actions taken

ANNEX 13. (ANNEXED IN SEPARATE FILES) TERMINAL GEF TRACKING TOOL OBJ I SECT I, II & III, CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT SCORECARD

ANNEX 14. RISK ASSESSMENT GUIDING MATRIX

Risk Assessment Guiding Matrix						
	Impact					
Probability		CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	NEGLIGIBLE
	CERTAIN / IMMINENT	Critical	Critical	High	Medium	Low
	VERY LIKELY	Critical	High	High	Medium	Low
	LIKELY	High	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
	MODERATELY LIKELY	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Negligible
	UNLIKELY	Low	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Considered to pose no determinable risk

ANNEX 15. EXPENDITURE STATEMENT (IN US$) PER OUTCOME AS AT 31 DECEMBER 2017.

ORIGINAL BUDGET AS STATED IN PROJECT DOCUMENT (TOTAL BUDGET WORK PLAN)									
GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	**Resp Party**	**Fund ID**	**Donor Name**	**Atlas Account Code**	**ATLAS Budget Description**	**Total planned grant (USD)**	Expenditure through end 2017 (USD)	Revised	B note
				76125	Realized Loss		$23		37
				76135	Realized Gain		-$32		38
				76120	Unrealized loss		$88 124		39
				76130	Unrealized gain		-$55 887		40
					TOTAL GAIN/ LOSS		**$32 228**		
Outcome 1: Systematic frameork for PA expansion improved		62000	GEF	71200	International Consultants	$129 000	$72 871	113987	1
				71300	Local Consultants	$114 000	$119 721	161741	2
				71400	Contractual Services Individual		$1 328	1328	3
				71600	Travel	$17 000	$9 487	12083	4
				72100	Contractual Services- Companies	$95 000	$45 194	45194	5
				72500	Publications		$7 545	7545	6
				74100	Professional Services		$0	0	
				74200	Audio Visual & Print Prod Costs	$115 000	$44 630	44630	7
				74500	Miscellaneous	$8 000	$0	10387	
				75700	Training Workshop and Conference		$14 710	23616	8
					TOTAL ACTIVITY 1	**$478 000**	**$315 486**	**420511**	
				64300	Services to projects -CO staff		$1 400	1400	9
Outcome 2: PA institutional framework strengthened		62000	GEF	71200	International Consultants	$105 000	$182 117	223233	10
				71300	Local Consultants	$523 000	$162 395	204415	11
				71400	Contractual Services Individual		$76 358	76358	12
				71600	Travel	$35 000	$0	2596	13
				72100	Contractual Services- Companies		$77 459	77459	14
				72200	Equipment &Furniture	$26 000	$9 449	19836	15
				72400	Communic Equip		$284	284	16
				72800	Information Technology Equipment	$38 000	$12 847	12847	17
				74200	Audio-Visual and printing production costs	$10 000	$6 728	6728	18
				74500	Miscellaneous	$8 000	$600	600	19
				75700	Training, Workshops and Conference		$14 952	23858	20
					TOTAL ACTIVITY 2	**$745 000**	**$544 590**	**649614**	
Outcome 3: Operational Knowhow in place to contain threats		62000	GEF	71200	International Consultants	$76 000	$34 902	76018	21
				71400	Contractual Services Individual		$32 051	32051	22
				71300	Local Consultants	$243 000	$28 801	70821	23
				71600	Travel	$38 000	$5 598	8194	24
				72100	Contractual Services- Companies	$1 457 000	$1 696 094	1696094	25
				72200	Equipment & Furniture	$360 000	$99 528	109915	26
				72300	Materials and goods	$165 000	$173 690	173690	27
				72800	Information Technology Equipment	$34 000	$9 653	9653	28
				74500	Miscellaneous	$4 000	$7 630	7630	29
				75700	Training Workshop and Conference		$3 233	3233	30
					TOTAL ACTIVITY 3	**$2 377 000**	**$2 091 180**	**2187299**	
Project Management		62000	GEF	71200	International Consultants	$150 000	$137 054	13705	31
				71300	Local Consultants	$224 000	$315 146	189088	32
				71600	Travel		$7 789	0	33
				72200	Equipment & Furniture	$14 000	$41 546	10387	34
				72800	Information technology equipment	$11 500	$0	0	35
				74500	Miscellaneous	$500	$0	0	
				75700	Training Workshop and Conference		$17 812	0	36
					TOTAL ACTIVITY 4	**$400 000**	**$519 348**	**213180**	
PROJECT TOTAL						**$4 000 000**	**$3 470 604**	**3470604**	