

1. Project Data:		Date Posted: 06/24/2003		
PROJ ID	: P036030	-	Appraisal	Actual
Project Name:	Biodiversity Restora	Project Costs (US\$M)	1.6	1.49
Country	Mauritius	Loan/Credit (US\$M)	1.2	1.09
Sector(s):	Board: ENV - General agriculture fishing and forestry sector (48%), Central government administration (25%), Other social services (25%), Forestry (2%)	Cofinancing (US\$M)	0.15	0.2
L/C Number:				
		Board Approval (FY)		96
Partners involved :	Mauritius Wildlife Trust	Closing Date	12/31/2001	12/31/2001

John English Ridley Nelson Alain A. Barbu OEDST	Prepared by:	Reviewed by :	Group Manager :	Group:	
	John English	Ridley Nelson	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST	

2. Project Objectives and Components

a. Objectives

The project was designed to help the Government of Mauritius (GOM) to meet some of its global environmental obligations specified under the Biodiversity Convention and identified in domestic environmental strategies and olans.

Its specific objectives were to:

- protect critically endangered biodiversity of international importance on three islands by restoring degraded habitats on the islands and propagating and re-introducing endemic species to these habitats; and
- strengthen capacity for the management and monitoring of biodiversity restoration .

b. Components

.

The project comprised four components:

- Surveys (US\$110,000 or 7 percent of base cost) to assist in (a) identifying the original habitats/community types for determining species recovery and habitat restoraton targets at the three project sites (Rodrigues Island, Ile aux Aigrettes, and Round Island); and (b) determing the best approach to the eradication and control of undesired, exotic species.
- Infrastructure investment (US\$125,000 or 8 percent of base cost) for nurseries and buildings for the ex-situ
 propagation and cultivation of threatened plants.
- **Supplies and equipment** (US\$685,000 or 43 percent of base cost) for propagation, replanting and reseeding of endemic plants and reintroduction of endemic animals from captive -bred populations.
- **Technical assistance** (US\$670,000 or 42 percent of base costs) to strengthen the governmental and non-governmental institutions involved, based on a skills audit and training needs analysis

c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates

The Mauritius Wildlife Trust (MWF) managed the field operations of the project and agreed to provide US\$ 0.15 nillion in cofinancing. MWF's actual contribution is estimated at US\$ 0.2 million.

3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:

Substantial progress has been achieved in protecting the critically endangered biodiversity on the three islands. Careful monitoring of experimental trials and restoration work has resulted in improved knowledge of relevant restoration techniques. The project also contributed significantly to a large increase in awareness (both internationally and locally) about biodiversity value in Mauritius and the efforts being made for its conservation.

4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:

With respect to the work on the small islands:

Rodrigues. This is the largest of the three islands. It is inhabited and lies about 500 km east of the island of Mauritius. All except one of the target list of 54 species have been successfully propagated. Many of these species have been brought back from the brink of extinction. Ninety percent of the island's reserve area of Grande Montagne

and about half the area of the Anse Quitor nature reserve have been weeded of alien plants and planted with natives . Ile aux Aigrettes. The last significant remnant of the Mauritian coastal ebony forest is now well on the way to restoration with 90% of the island having been cleared of alien plants and replanted where necessary . A secure funding base for the sustainable financing of the Ile uax Aigrettes restoration program has been established .

Round Island. Weed control and native planting techniques and capacity have been developed that will allow large scale restoration to proceed. This is now being implemented as part of a successor Bank /GEF project.

Institutional strengthening. Practical restoration work has proceeded alongside experimental trials and careful monitoring throughout the project, and has been linked to training of project personnel. These processes have resulted in an increasing efficiency in restoration techniques as the project has proceeded. This has allowed the more precise timing of restoration operations that has helped planning; the burning of weed biomass (so as to reduce reinfestation of weeds); the judicious use of herbicides and mulching (based on the results of trials); and the better choice of pioneer species to use for the planting of areas cleared of weeds.

The MWF has developed an ecotourism program. A visitors' center was constructed on Ile aux Aigrettes with funds from the Japan World Exposition Commemorative Fund and the island opened to vistors for paid guided tours in 1998. Day visits are now also available. The number of vistors has risen to 4,000 in 1991, It is anticipated that, by 2004, income from these visits will be sufficient to cover the basic costs of maintaining the ecosystem and facilities on Ile aux Aigrettes and Round Island.

5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies): There were no significant shortcomings.

6. Ratings:	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments			
Outcome:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory				
Institutional Dev .:	Substantial	Substantial				
Sustainability :	inability : Highly Likely Highly Likely					
Bank Performance :	Satisfactory	Satisfactory				
Borrower Perf .:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory				
Quality of ICR :		Satisfactory				
NOTE: ICR rating values flagged with '*' don't comply with OP/BP 13.55, but are listed for completeness.						
7. Lessons of Broad Applicability: There is as much to learn from failure as from success, as illustrated from the experience at Round Island, where trial and error led to a fuller understanding of how the ecosystem of the island can be restored. Collaboration between an NGO and public entities benefits from being clearly spelled out, and is best organized through the use of a formal memorandum of understanding.						
8. Assessment Recommended? O Yes No						
9. Comments on Quality of ICR: The ICR is generally satisfactory. It's preparation was hampered by limitations of the appraisal document, in						

which the project description, especially in terms of the stated components, was skimpy and did not provide a clear template for implementation and assessment.