

Small Grants – Project Completion and Impact Report

Instructions to grantees: please complete all fields, and respond to all questions listed below.

Organization Legal Name	Mauritian Wildlife Foundation
Project Title	Developing the vision for conservation of St-Brandon
Grant Number	024/15/BIOO
Date of Report	17 th March 2020

CEPF Hotspot: Madagascar and Indian Ocean Islands

Strategic Direction: Enable civil society to mainstream biodiversity and conservation into political and economic decision-making.

Grant Amount: MRU 700 000

Project Dates: 1st March 2016 to 31st August 2019

PART I: Overview

1. Implementation Partners for this Project (*list each partner and explain how they were involved in the project*)

Raphael Fishing Co. Ltd: provided boat transport to St Brandon, accommodation on site and transport between island and logistics.

2. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project

- Production of one document requesting views on management strategies for the St Brandon islands
- Two scientific expeditions to the St Brandon islands
- A pre-feasibility for the eradication of invasive alien animals on the islands
- One stakeholder workshop and one follow-up meeting to discuss management priorities
- Production of a St Brandon Action Plan
- Production of an Institutional Mapping
- 13 articles and 1 facebook post
- 7 presentations covering the project to the public
- Mainstreaming St Brandon into national policy planning and dialogues e.g. Marine Spatial Planning

3. Briefly describe actual progress towards each planned long-term and short-term impact (as stated in the approved proposal)

List each long-term impact from your proposal

a. Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal)

Impact Description	Impact Summary
To establish a dialogue between all stakeholders involved in the management of the natural resources of St-Brandon	From being limited, if not virtually nonexistent, at the beginning of the project, a dialogue has been established with open sharing of information. This is exemplified by the 'St Brandon Action Plan' and 'Stakeholder Mapping'.
Collect baseline data that will help in the formulation of an agreed 'Vision for St-Brandon' that will highlight the need for the sustainable management of natural resources	Baseline data has been collected during two scientific expeditions to St Brandon, in particular to assess the feasibility of eradication of invasive animals from the islands. Whilst a 'Vision' was written, it was not developed as envisaged, terrestrial data was presented to stakeholders and used in the 'St Brandon Action Plan' and 'Stakeholder Mapping'. These final documents support the sustainable management of St Brandon's natural resources.

b. Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal)

Impact Description	Impact Summary
1. Establish a positive and productive dialogue through a 'stakeholder consultative committee' which meets on a regular basis,	A 'stakeholder consultative committee' met twice during the project period, though there were dialogues in other formal and informal settings. There was also the suggestion to create a committee to manage the P & I Club insurance funds, which would meet at least once per year or as needed.
2. Identify baseline data required for the development of a 'Vision for St-Brandon' and long term scientific and monitoring studies to guide the sustainable management of the resources,	Marine and Terrestrial baseline data has been identified and collected during two scientific expeditions to St Brandon, in particular to assess the feasibility of eradication of invasive animals from the islands. Whilst a 'Vision' was written, it was not developed as envisaged, terrestrial data was presented to stakeholders and used in the 'St Brandon Action Plan' and 'Stakeholder Mapping'. These final documents support the sustainable management of St Brandon's natural resources.
3. Publish an acceptable 'Vision for St-Brandon' and action plan,	In lieu of the final 'Vision' document, the 'St Brandon Action Plan' and 'Stakeholder Mapping' were produced through a stakeholder participation

	process. The vision document drafted has been adapted in line with information gathered during the course of the project and used as an internal report for future reference.
4. Identify protocols and guidelines required to prevent further environmental degradation, restore ecosystems and monitor biodiversity indicators,	These have been identified and prioritized during the project and are summarized in the 'St Brandon Action Plan'. However, the development of these protocols and guidelines will take place after the project.
5. Identify protocols and guidelines required for sustainable fisheries and eco-tourism.	As for 4. Above.

4. Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impacts

Establishing dialogue with some government departments proved to be very difficult and the project was being strangled. Despite a strained relationship with the government over St Brandon, it was important to make a sustained effort to maintain dialogue and a spirit of cooperation. This has been achieved through active participation in Marine Spatial Planning for the Republic of Mauritius (including St Brandon), and provision of inputs to an EIA application for cruise liners to operate at St Brandon. The cruise liner was not given permission to operate at St Brandon and we were unofficially told that the views of the Mauritian Wildlife Foundation were significant in the decision. Due to such involvement, the tension over St Brandon eased and also some aspects of the 'Vision for St Brandon' advanced further. For example, we had obtained official permission to conduct an expedition from 19 November to 7 December 2018, there was a possibility of inclusion of a scientific staff of the Ministry of Ocean Economy, and confirmed participation of the Assistant Conservator of Forest. We were even asked by the Marine Spatial Planning to include sightings of marine mammals in our report. The above indicates that sustained effort and a non-conflictual and collaborative approach towards authorities may help to ease tensions. We are also offering our assistance and connections through BirdLife International to assist Mauritius in Marine Spatial Planning (in particular SDG 14), which we feel is appreciated by the government, as they appear to appreciate our genuine concern and honesty. Further proof of the improved relationship over St Brandon towards government was the highly successful workshop held on 23rd May 2019, where all but one government institution (Mauritius Oceanography Institute sent sincere apologies) attended. There was excellent participation from the non-state actors as well.

The use of the word 'Vision' being unacceptable to the government, we faced the challenge of changing the language of the project but still trying to achieve the similar objectives. This was successful in the end, with the production of the 'St Brandon Action Plan and Institutional Mapping'.

The field expeditions to collect baseline data had to be put on hold or rescheduled on several occasions due to climatic and sea factors, and more so, due to the 'political climate' surrounding the project. Thankfully due to creation of goodwill and some persistence, the expeditions have taken place, field data was collected and presented, and is supporting future planning.

5. Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

There was a strong objection from a particular government department to the development of a Vision, which we had not anticipated. This was resolved through the project by closely working with this department, taking care not to look as if the Mauritian Wildlife Foundation was taking on a role which was considered not appropriate and not using the word 'Vision', but producing a 'St Brandon Action Plan and Institutional Mapping' through stakeholder participation. The matter has been resolved satisfactorily.

The project allowed closer working with several government departments that we did not have close links with previously, including the Outer Islands Development Corporation, the Marine Spatial Planning and the Ministry of Fisheries.

PART II: Project Components and Products/Deliverables

6. Components (as stated in the approved proposal)

List each component and product/deliverable from your proposal

6. Describe the results for each deliverable:

Component		Deliverable		
#	Description	Sub-#	Description	Results for Deliverable
1	Meeting to agree on the Vision		Meeting to discuss the vision to major stakeholders	Two meetings were held, although the use of the word 'Vision' was dropped during the project.
2	Collect baseline data	(a)	Fact-Finding mission to St-Brandon that was organised 2nd - 11th March 2016	Scientific expedition successfully completed. Scientific report of Fact-Finding Mission produced.
		(b)	Following the expedition to conduct a feasibility study for invasive species eradications and collect other data on terrestrial and marine fauna and flora, and environment in general	Expedition held from 8th and 20th March 2019, some of the findings were presented at a stakeholder workshop on 23rd May 2019. Discussions also concerned the development of a mammalian eradication plan.
3	Communicating the Vision of St-Brandon		Sharing the vision to the public and invite comments.	A press conference was organised on 11th March 2016 to share the observations from the Fact-

				finding mission to St Brandon and to present the development of a Vision for St Brandon. A powerpoint was posted on the MWF Facebook page so that the public could view. Contributions to 13 newspaper articles and 1 facebook post. The project was also presented at a range of official meetings.
4	Consultation on the Vision for St Brandon		Updated Vision circulated to Stakeholders	Draft Vision document sent widely to stakeholders including members of the public. However, through this consultation we identified strong Government opposition. So we stayed quiet for a while and stopped using the word Vision. In its place, was developed the 'St Brandon Action Plan' and the 'Institutional Mapping'.

7. Please describe and submit any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.

The final project result was the production of a 'St Brandon Action Plan and Institutional Map'. Although the project did not produce a 'Vision', the above documents would have been in line with a 'Vision', if it had been produced. The end products have similarities to a 'Vision' document.

PART III: Lessons, Sustainability, Safeguards and Financing

Lessons Learned

8. Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building.

Consider lessons that would inform:

- Project Design Process (*aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)

- Project Implementation (*aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)
- Describe any other lessons learned relevant to the conservation community

A pre-feasibility study may have detected the resistance to the development of a Vision, or its acceptance. It was assumed that all the stakeholders would be favourable to a Vision.

Flexibility to modify the deliverable of the project, without losing its substance, needs to be investigated when there are obstacles during a project.

Various ways of engaging with the resistance such as diplomacy must be used and sincerity of purpose explained to the person or entity resisting the project. A build up of trust needs to be worked on.

Sustainability / Replication

9. Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated, including any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability.

One of the challenges in sustaining actions identified during the stakeholder process is funding. Actions will be costly, especially due to the distance of the Saint Brandon islands from Mauritius. However, application for grants is being considered so that actions can be implemented.

Discussions with the insurers of the wrecked Kha Yang ship continue, and if successful may provide a way to achieve some of the conservation objectives identified in the 'St Brandon Action Plan and Institutional Mapping'.

Safeguards

10. If not listed as a separate Project Component and described above, summarize the implementation of any required action related to social or environmental safeguards that your project may have triggered.

None

Additional Funding

11. Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of CEPF investment

a. Total additional funding (US\$)

b. Type of funding

Please provide a breakdown of additional funding (counterpart funding and in-kind) by source, categorizing each contribution into one of the following categories:

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
Mauritian Wildlife Foundation	Project Co-financing	446,800	
Raphael Fishing	Project Co-financing	808,500	
Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust	Project Co-financing	286,800	
Ministry of Fisheries, Government of Mauritius	Project Co-financing	25,500	

* Categorize the type of funding as:

- A Project Co-Financing (other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)
- B Grantee and Partner Leveraging (other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project)
- C Regional/Portfolio Leveraging (other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project)

Additional Comments/Recommendations

12. Use this space to provide any further comments or recommendations in relation to your project or CEPF.

Since the project has produced the 'St Brandon Action Plan and Institutional Mapping', and that some baseline studies and stakeholder consultations have been held, we feel that it is reinforcing to both MWF and CEPF to help us implement some of the key actions, by funding these.

PART IV: Impact at Portfolio and Global Level

CEPF requires that each grantee report on impact at the end of the project. The purpose of this report is to collect data that will contribute to CEPF's portfolio and global indicators. CEPF will aggregate the data that you submit with data from other grantees, to determine the overall impact of CEPF investment. CEPF's aggregated results will be reported on in our annual report and other communications materials.

Ensure that the information provided pertains to the entire project, from start date to project end date.

Contribution to Portfolio Indicators

13. If CEPF assigned one or more Portfolio Indicators to your project during the full proposal preparation phase, please list these below and report on the project's contribution(s) to them.

Indicator	Narrative

Not applicable.

Contribution to Global Indicators

Please report on all Global Indicators (sections 16 to 23 below) that pertain to your project.

14. Key Biodiversity Area Management

Number of hectares of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) with improved management

Please report on the number of hectares in KBAs with improved management, as a result of CEPF investment. Examples of improved management include, but are not restricted to: increased patrolling, reduced intensity of snaring, invasive species eradication, reduced incidence of fire, and introduction of sustainable agricultural/fisheries practices. Do not record the entire area covered by the project - only record the number of hectares that have improved management.

If you have recorded part or all of a KBA as newly protected for the indicator entitled “protected areas” (section 17 below), and you have also improved its management, you should record the relevant number of hectares for both this indicator and the “protected areas” indicator.

Name of KBA	# of Hectares with strengthened management *	Is the KBA Not protected, Partially protected or Fully protected? Please select one: NP/PP/FP
MUS-1 , Cargados Carajos Shoals	500 Ha of land 31200 of lagoon 130 km of reef	NP

* Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were improved due to implementation of a fire management regime in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were improved due to invasive species removal in the second year, the total number of hectares with improved management would be 500.

15. Protected Areas

15a. Number of hectares of protected areas created and/or expanded

Report on the number of hectares of protected areas that have been created or expanded as a result of CEPF investment.

Name of PA*	Country(s)	# of Hectares	Year of legal declaration or expansion	Longitude*	Latitude*

* If possible please provide a shape file of the protected area to CEPF.

** Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere

and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456).

None

15b. Protected area management

If you have been requested to submit a Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), please follow the instructions below. If you have not been requested to submit a METT, please go directly to section 16.

Should you want to know more about the monitoring of protected area management effectiveness and the tracking tool, please click [here](#).

Download the METT template which can be found on [this page](#) and then work with the protected area authorities to fill it out. Please go to the Protected Planet website [here](#) and search for your protected area in their database to record its associated WDPA ID. Then please fill in the following table:

WDPA ID	PA Official Name	Date of METT*	METT Total Score

** Please indicate when the METT was filled by the authorities of the park or provide a best estimate if the exact date is unknown. And please only provide METTs less than 12 months old.*

Please do not forget to submit the completed METT together with this report.

METT not requested.

16. Production landscape

Please report on the number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened management of biodiversity, as a result of CEPF investment. A production landscape is defined as a landscape where agriculture, forestry or natural product exploitation occurs. Production landscapes may include KBAs, and therefore hectares counted under the indicator entitled “KBA Management” may also be counted here. Examples of interventions include: best practices and guidelines implemented, incentive schemes introduced, sites/products certified and sustainable harvesting regulations introduced.

Number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened management of biodiversity.

Name of Production Landscape*	# of Hectares**	Latitude***	Longitude***	Description of Intervention

** If the production landscape does not have a name, provide a brief descriptive name for the landscape.*

***Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were strengthened due to certification in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were strengthened due to new harvesting regulations in the second year, the total number of hectares strengthened to date would be 500.*

**** Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456).*

Not applicable

17. Beneficiaries

CEPF wants to record two types of benefits that are likely to be received by individuals: structured training and increased income. Please report on the number of men and women that have benefited from structured training (such as financial management, beekeeping, horticulture) and/or increased income (such as from tourism, agriculture, medicinal plant harvest/production, fisheries, handicraft production) as a result of CEPF investment. Please provide results since the start of your project to project completion.

17a. Number of men and women receiving structured training.

# of men receiving structured training *	# of women receiving structured training *

**Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men received structured training in beekeeping, and 3 of these also received structured training in project management, the total number of men who benefited from structured training should be 5.*

17b. Number of men and women receiving cash benefits.

# of men receiving cash benefits*	# of women receiving cash benefits*

**Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men received cash benefits due to tourism, and 3 of these also received cash benefits from increased income due to handicrafts, the total number of men who received cash benefits should be 5.*

Not applicable

18. Benefits to Communities

CEPF wants to record the benefits received by communities, which can differ to those received by individuals because the benefits are available to a group. CEPF also wants to record, to the extent possible, the number of people within each community who are benefiting. Please report on the characteristics of the communities, the type of benefits that have been received during the project, and the number of men/boys and women/girls from these communities that have benefited, as a result of CEPF investment. If exact numbers are not known, please provide an estimate.

18a. Please provide information for all communities that have benefited from project start to project completion.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics (mark with x)							Type of Benefit (mark with x)								
	Subsistence economy	Small landowners	Indigenous / ethnic peoples	Pastoralists / nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Other*	Increased access to clean water	Increased food security	Increased access to energy	Increased access to public services (e.g. health care, education)	Increased resilience to climate change	Improved land tenure	Improved recognition of traditional knowledge	Improved representation and decision-making in governance forums/structures	Improved access to ecosystem services
St Brandon															X	

*If you marked "Other" to describe the community characteristic, please explain:

Note: St Brandon has a transient population of contractual fishermen, police officers and meteorological station staff on rotation, with around 25-35 persons in total at any one time, sometimes less. Through the improved management recommended in the 'St Brandon Action Plan and Institutional Mapping', we expect that the persons who or on rotation on the islands will be the first beneficiaries of actions. As new individuals work on these shifts, the impact of the project is expected to multiply in time.

Note: The ‘St Brandon Action Plan and Institutional Mapping’ has not been officialized or made an instrument of law. However, the recommendations from this exercise will support future planning, policies and legislation.

19b. For each law, policy or regulation listed above, please provide the requested information in accordance with its assigned number.

No.	Country(s)	Date enacted/ amended MM/DD/YYYY	Expected impact	Action that you p this
1				
2				
3				

Note: Not applicable, see note to 19a.

20. Sustainable Financing Mechanism

Sustainable financing mechanisms generate financial resources for the long-term (generally five or more years). Examples of sustainable financial mechanisms include conservation trust funds, debt-for-nature swaps, payment for ecosystem services (PES) schemes, and other revenue, fee or tax schemes that generate long-term funding for conservation.

All CEPF grantees (or sub-grantees) with project activities that pertain to the creation and/or the implementation of a sustainable financing mechanism are requested to provide information on the mechanism and the funds it delivered to conservation projects during the project timeframe, unless another grantee involved with the same mechanism has already been or is expected to be tasked with this.

CEPF requires that all sustainable financing mechanism projects to provide the necessary information at their completion.

20a. Details about the mechanism

Fill in this table for as many mechanisms you worked on during your project implementation as needed.

NO .	Name of financing mechanism	Purpose of the mechanism*	Date of Establishment**	Description***	Countries
1	'Kha Yang Insurance Fund' from PNI Fund	Compensation for environmental damage caused by wreck of Kha Yang vessel at St Brandon.	Discussions between Government of Mauritius, Raphael Fishing Ltd and PNI (insurers) on-going. Mauritian Wildlife Foundation has been identified as a 'custodian' of some of the funds that will be received.	Compensation will support a range of terrestrial and marine conservation projects	Mauritius

*Please provide a succinct description of the mission of the mechanism.

**Please indicate when the sustainable financing mechanism was officially created. If you do not know the exact date, provide a best estimate.

***Description, such as trust fund, endowment, PES scheme, incentive scheme, etc.

20b. Performance of the mechanism

For each Financing Mechanism listed previously, please provide the requested information in accordance with its assigned number.

NO .	Project intervention*	\$ Amount disbursed to conservation projects**	Period under Review (MM/YYYY -MM/YYYY)***
1			

2			
3			

**List whether the CEPF grant has helped to create a new mechanism (Created a mechanism) or helped to support an existing mechanism (Supported an existing mechanism) or helped to create and then support a new mechanism (Created and supported a new mechanism).*

***Please only indicate the USD amount disbursed to conservation projects during the period of implementation of your project and using, when needed, the exchange rate on the day of your report.*

****Please indicate the period of implementation of your project or the period considered for the amount you indicated.*

Please do not forget to submit any relevant document which could provide justification for the amount you stated above.

Note: see 20a above. Through the involvement of the Mauritian Wildlife Foundation at St Brandon (in great part due to the implementation of the CEPF project), and its track record, the organization was identified as a potential custodian for part of the funds that are expected to be received from the PNI Club in compensation for environmental damage due to the wreck of the 'Kha Yang' vessel. The amount of funds that could be made available is under negotiation.

21. Biodiversity-friendly Practices

Please describe any biodiversity-friendly practices that companies have adopted as a result of CEPF investment. A company is defined as a legal entity made up of an association of people, be they natural, legal, or a mixture of both, for carrying on a commercial or industrial enterprise. While companies take various forms, for the purposes of CEPF, a company is defined as a for-profit business entity. A biodiversity-friendly practice is one that conserves or uses biodiversity sustainably.

Number of companies that adopt biodiversity-friendly practices

No.	Name of company	Description of biodiversity-friendly practice adopted during the project
1	Raphael Fishing Co. Ltd	Some levels of biosecurity on board their vessels operating at St Brandon.

22. Networks & Partnerships

Please report on any new networks or partnerships between civil society groups and across to other sectors that you have established or strengthened as a result of CEPF investment.

Networks/partnerships should have some lasting benefit beyond immediate project implementation. Informal networks/partnerships are acceptable even if they do not have a Memorandum of Understanding or other type of validation. Examples of networks/partnerships include: an alliance of fisherfolk to promote sustainable fisheries practices, a network of environmental journalists, a partnership between one or more NGOs with one or more private sector partners to improve biodiversity management on private lands, a working group focusing on reptile conservation. Please do not use this tab to list the partners in your project, unless some or all of them are part of such a network / partnership described above.

Number of networks and/or partnerships created and/or strengthened

No.	Name of Network	Name of Partnership	Year established	Did your project establish this Network/ Partnership? Y/N	Country(s) covered	Purpose
1	-	Kha Yang Fund	2019	N	Mauritius	A structure proposed for the management of funds to be received from the PNI Fund to compensate for environmental damages due to the Kha Yang wreck. Fund will involve private sector (Raphael Fishing Ltd, Government of Mauritius and Mauritian Wildlife Foundation)

23. Gender

If you have been requested to submit a Gender Tracking Tool (GTT), please follow the instructions provided in the Excel GTT template. If you have not been requested to submit a GTT, please go directly to Part V.

Should you want to know more about CEPF Gender Policy, please click [here](#).

Download the GTT template which can be found on [this page](#) and then work with your team to fill it out. Please do not forget to submit the completed GTT together with this report.

GTT has been submitted.

Part V. Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

17. Name: Dr Vikash Tatayah

18. Organization: Mauritian Wildlife Foundation

19. Mailing address: Grannum Road, Vacoas, Mauritius

20. Telephone number: + 230 697 6117 / 6197

21. E-mail address: vtatayah@mauritian-wildlife.org