Reducing Single-use Plastics on Small-island Economies (RESPONSE - Plastic IP)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11185
Countries

Cook Islands
Project Name

Reducing Single-use Plastics on Small-island Economies (RESPONSE - Plastic IP)
Agencies

UNEP
Date received by PM

6/27/2024
Review completed by PM

8/20/2024
Program Manager

Evelyn Swain
Focal Area

Multi Focal Area
Project Type

FSP

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please correct the region.

Please removed mixed & other. This field is for CCM only.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 October 2024

Country is included for all national projects. Asia Pacific has been added for the region in the CEO ER in the road map. However, note that in the GEF portal the fields are no longer active and remain as per the concept stage.

Removed ?mixed & other?.

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

As Biodiversity doesn?t seem to be a Principal objective, please consider downgrading the Rio Marker used for Biodiversity from Principal to a lower marker.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 October 2024

Rio Marker for Biodiversity downgraded from Principal to Significant objective.

2. Project Summary.
a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?
b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The project summary far exceeds the length expected. It should be a short description of the project and not heavy on background information. Please revise the project summary. Please include the GEB estimates in the summary.

a) No. The project summary is extremely long and not at all concise. It appears to be a copy and paste of existing text with no effort made to summarize.
b) No. The project summary is over 3,000 words, many times over the 250 word limit.
c) No. The project summary provides no description for how it links with the overall Plastics IP at a programmatic level.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 October 2024

The Summary has been reduced (284 words) and also includes the linkages with the overall Plastics IP

3. Project Description Overview
a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?
c) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
e) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
f) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The Theory of Change diagram does not show up in the portal. Please upload the TOC so it is visible.

a) In the Overview, no project objective is provided, only a repeat of the project title.
b) No ToC provided in the Overview. A ToC is also missing later in the project.

c) The project components are clear and aligned with the overall IP, but the outcomes and outputs under Components 1-3 seem to lack sufficient detail. It may be helpful to have more descriptive outputs.
d) KM and M&E are included in the components but there is no mention of gender in the project Overview. Gender is also well integrated into the overall project design with specific gender focused activities.
e) Yes, the PMC cofinancing ratio is 1:9.3 and is higher than the overall project cofinancing ratio of 1:5.6.
f) The PMC is 3.56% of the project subtotal and 3.44% of the overall project total.

There is a two-dollar difference between the PMC in the child project description overview table and the PMC in the budget table. Please request the agency to amend.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 October 2024

The Theory of Change diagram shows up in the portal.

a) The Project Objective has been added to the Project Description Overview table.

b) The TOC is provided for in the Description section

c) This is a challenge to expand without making outputs read like paragraphs. Details about the Outputs under Component 1 ? 3 can be found under Project Description. The Project Description Overview is a synthetic summary of the project Components, Outcomes and Outputs.

d) Gender considerations have been strengthened for KM and M&E outputs in the Project Description Overview.

e) No action required

f) The PMC budget has now adjusted to 5% of the budget sub-total

2 $ difference - This has been corrected

4. Project Outline
A. Project Rationale
a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and

adequately addressed by the project design?
b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Global and Regional collaboration and knowledge sharing are limited.
As with climate change, tackling plastic pollution requires an urgent and coordinated global response that reflects the needs of countries most directly affected by it. This holds particularly true in the Pacific region, where only a coordinated regional (or global) action can prevent growing volumes of increasingly problematic types of plastics entering the Pacific countries. Regional coordination can help individual countries address the transboundary flow of marine plastic litter, develop harmonized standards for reporting and monitoring at national level, ensure the industry standards required to promote safe and truly sustainable alternative solutions to plastics. These responses sit outside the national jurisdiction of the individual state. So, cross-regional knowledge exchanges and collaborations are necessary to facilitate scientific, financial and technical exchanges, raise awareness, build capacities, promote regional participation and ways to harmonize policies and approaches to manage, control and reduce plastic pollution, and most importantly build the critical mass.
Given these requirements, could table 8 could include the ANZPAC The Australian, New Zealand and Pacific Islands Plastics Pact (ANZPAC) is delivered by APCO as part of the Ellen MacArthur Foundation?s global Plastics Pact Network.
Activity 3.1.1.3 could also include ANZPAC work and research across the region.
There is no private sector or philanthropic support listed in the co-finance tables. Is there expected to be private sector and philanthropic contributions over time? Linkage with key global partners that have investments in the Pacific could help increase the resources available.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 October 2024

Noted and further elaborated in the Project Rationale under 2.6 Barriers and Gaps to Effective Plastic Waste Prevention.

Noted and included in Table 8 in the Project Rationale.

Noted and included in Activity 3.1.1.3.

During the PPG phase, consultations were conducted with key private sector stakeholders (see Appendix 10). However, challenges were encountered in securing commitments for co-financing due to time constraints and the geographical distance of major organizations outside the Cook Islands.

The executing agency will continue to explore these avenues to enhance resource mobilization and aims to secure letters or emails of commitment from potential partners during the inception phase of the project. Given that many key private sector organizations are outside of the Cook Islands and multi-nationals, support from the GP would be of assistance.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?

d) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

e) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

f) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

g) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

h) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

j) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

k) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child

project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Component 5 is missing important coordination activities with the global project, including contributing data to the annual report ect. Please discuss with the lead agencies what should be included. There is a google doc check list available to inform child projects.
For component 5 the website and branding materials will come from the global project and this country project should not develop their own website and branding materials.
M&E looks like it is a separate component (which is expected), but it is missing the label ?Component 6?.
It is nice to see the partners included in the description of each of the components.

a) A ToC description is included but with no figure.
b) Yes, the child project ToC reflects similar Components and goals to the overall Program ToC.
c) No, there is no description of how the GEF alternative builds on baseline initiatives.
d) The proposed project components are well presented with sufficient detail but lack any presentation of assumptions made or presentation of alternative approaches.
e) No incremental cost reasoning has been provided. Given the long and impressive list of cofinancing partners, it is expected that such a baseline should be easily presented
f) Yes. The section on socioeconomic benefits is well presented.
g) Yes, the project financing is reasonable and PMC is appropriately budgeted. It is also noted that the GEF Agency, UNEP, is not providing any co-financing to the project.
h) Yes, there is a discussion on how the project was designed to ensure long-term sustainability in terms of impact and resilience to future changes.
i) Yes, stakeholders are noted and their roles are well identified in the components.
j) Yes, there are specific activities promoting gender mainstreaming and woman?s empowerment in the project?s design.
k) Yes, KM is prioritized under Component 5.
l) Partly, while there are no specific activities aimed at policy coherence, Component 1 aim to strengthen policies, including a gap analysis.
m) The proposal has prioritized innovation under Components 2 & 3, including piloting innovation in the F&B sector.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 October 2024

Outputs 5.1.5, 5.1.7, and M&E Output 3 were already developed specifically for the coordination with the global project. Text has now been replaced by standard text provided by the Global project, although very similar to original text.

Compt 5 - Noted and corrected.

According to the portal M&E cannot be labelled as a component which is why it is presented as such.

a) ToC figure is integrated in the text.

b) No action needed.

c) Please see new section on B 5 Coordination with ongoing initiatives and projects. Also additional text has been added at the beginning of each Component under the project description

d) Noted. The Project Rationale has been revised to strengthen the presentation of assumptions and better introduce the Project components in the Project Description.

e) Noted. Project Description strengthened to include a brief baseline each Component will build on.

f) No action needed

g) UNEP is not co-funding any of the UNEP Child Projects

h) No action needed.

i) No action needed.

j) No action needed.

k) No action needed.

l) Component 1 is designed to ensure a comprehensive mix of coherent policies are in place to reduce the volume of plastic waste at source. This will be achieved by running a Policy Gap analysis (Output 1.1.1) to identify policy gaps, by developing missing plastic prevention measures or updating/strengthening existing ones and by submitting them for approval (Output 1.1.1), and by developing a gender responsive National Plastic Strategy (Output 1.1.2) through an extensive consultation process.

m) No action needed.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project
a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?

b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?
c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).
d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please clarify where the National Environmental Service (NES) sits within the government.

a) Yes the institutional arrangements are presented, including a diagram.
b) The proposed executing agency will be the national government (NES)
c) Partly. A description of relevant projects is provided but it lacks any detail on how this child project has been designed to coordinate/leverage these initiatives.
d) Yes, there is a clearly presented framework for coordination with the GCP.

Infrastructure Cook Islands is mentioned as a co-executing partner, but it is not listed in the ?general child project information? section. Please amend if this is a co-executing partner.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 October 2024

The Environment Act 2003 (which repealed the Rarotonga Environment Act 1994/95 and the Conservation Act 1975 and 1987) formalised the establishment of the National Environment Service (NES) or *Tu?anga Taporoporo* (Cook Islands Maori name) as a statutory agency of the Crown and expanded the Permitting Authority to include the members of Parliament of the respective island, NGOs and Government Ministries. The NES is established to protect, conserve and ensure the Cook Islands environment is managed sustainably. The agency is headed by a Director with delegated powers to carry out the functions of the Environment Act 2003.

Text added to CEO document

a) No action needed.

b) No action needed.

C) Please see revised section in B5 to elaborates on how the project builds, coordinates, and seeks synergies with past and ongoing initiatives.

d) No action needed.

Infrastructure Cook Islands is identified as a potential key partner, but there is only 1 lead executing agency, which is why it is not included in the general child project information section. Their role along with other key partners will be formulized during Inception phase

5.3 Core indicators
a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?
b) Are the project?s targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Several of the core indicators are significantly reduced from PIF stage, but a justification has been provided. The project also only calculated GEBs during the life of the project but many of the benefits will come after the project is complete and the policies are enacted.

a) Partly. The MPA noted in CI-2.2 (Marae Moana Protected Area) should include an MPA identification such as the WDPA ID or IUCN Category. Participation in IW:LEARN (CI-7.4) should be removed.

The methodological approach used to estimate the project?s support to the Marae Moana Protected Area seems to infer the support will be only indirect. If correct, then no hectare should be counted under this indicator as ?Only direct outputs and outcomes are captured through Core and Sub-Indicators except for the climate change mitigation indicator on Greenhouse Gas emissions mitigated?, as per the GEF-8 RMF Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01). If direct support to the PA management is indeed provided, then please provide details on how this is taking place and indicate the METT Score at CEO Endorsement for the listed Protected Area.

ES, 11/10/24: This project should list a MPA under CI 7 and 7.3.

ES, 11/14/24: Comments addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 October 2024

During the concept phase a proxy methodology was used to calculate targets. During the PPG phase the Global project developed a more rigorous guidance and methodology that was used to recalculate indicator targets, results in a decrease in these targets.

The Core Indicators methodology has been revised and improved.

CI 2-2 and CI 7 have been removed. This is not a relevant indicator for the project as it is not focused on MPAs.

CI 2-2 and CI 7 have been removed.

Agency Response 13 November 2024

The portal does not allow to select an MPA per se as a transboundary system. We have however selected the Western Pacific Warm Pool LME within which the MPA and the Cook Islands fall. We have also added CI7.3 on reforms and IMCs at level 2. The Core indicator methodology has been revised accordingly too.

5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The risk table is blank. Please update this.

Under the Overall Risk category, please provide a summary that helps understand the identified rating.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 October 2024

Summary provided

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes, the project is well aligned.

Agency Response

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please identify GBF targets that this project aligns with. For example target 7 is specifically on plastics.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 October 2024

Targets 7 and 16 are already mentioned in the CEO Endorsement request

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

We note that the project?s overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and UNEP attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) (Annex F). SRIF said that the project triggers SS 2, 3, 7 and 8 and ?[?] appropriate safeguards assessment and development of safeguards management plans will be needed to mitigate E&S risks. Cook Islands is extremely vulnerable to climate change and thefore project activities will require climate vulnerability assessment and climate-proofing. Development of an Indigenous People Plan will guide the engagement process with this stakeholder group. Appropriate E&S mitigation measures will be needed once the exact interventions and their sites are clearly defined, the implementation of the ?Plastic Smart? program and the ?Short Food Supply Chains? programs. Attention to be paid to community safety, and poor working conditions.? However, it is not clear how and when the project will develop a climate vulnerability assessment, Indigenous People Plan, and E&S mitigation measures as stated in the SRIF.

a. Please provide a plan to prepare a climate vulnerability assessment, Indigenous People Plan, and ESMP including E&S mitigation measures with budget, timeline, and responsibility. In addition, the environmental and social risk section of the Key risk table in the Portal is low.

b. Please make this risk consistent with SRIF and revise.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 October 2024

An overall summary has been provided and alignment with the SRIF although approaches are not the same.

Safeguards assessment and development of safeguards management plans will be developed particularly for the Component 3 pilots during inception phase and part of the implementation plans.

These environmental and social risk management plans are now mentioned also in the M&E plan as a key step in the development of pilots.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that

apply):
STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)
a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
The amounts do not add up for each category. [Budgeted amount] = [Amount Spent To Date] + [Amount Committed]. Please request the agency to amend.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 October 2024

While the figures did add up, PPG amounts were updated in view of today situation.

8.3 Source of Funds
Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?
Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?
e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The "source of co-financing" is missing on one of the entries in the table.

Given the importance of the private sector in this project is there any opportunity for co-financing from the private sector?

a. The first entry for NES in the amount of USD 28,719,669, listed as in-kind on the GEF portal, should typically be categorized under Recurrent Expenditures rather than Investment Mobilized, in accordance with the GEF Co-financing Policy. Please review and update this categorization.

b. For the second entry for NES of Public Investment USD 5,918,425 on the GEF portal, please ensure that the source of co-financing is recorded as the Recipient Country Government. Currently, no data has been entered.

c. Please clarify the planned usage or activities per financial instrument. The current co-financing letter does not provide these details.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 October 2024

Confirmed co-financing is indicated for all three letters in the co-financing table in Annex A.

NES endeavours to consult further with the private sector during project execution to garner their further support in future engagements.

The NES is committed to engaging further with private sector stakeholders during project execution to enhance support and explore potential co-financing opportunities. While we have had constructive exchanges with key players, we did not receive any letters of commitment or formal co-financing offers from the private sector during our consultations. To address this, we expect to strengthen government-private sector relationships to garner greater support and co-financing throughout the project implementation.

We recognize that most significant private sector actors in the plastics industry are located outside the Cook Islands, which presents unique challenges. We will emphasize the need for global project coordination to effectively engage these multinational companies moving forward.

a) This has been corrected

b) This has been corrected

c) Noted and clarified.

The Cook Islands submits herewith, a single letter of co-finance which demonstrates that the entire co-finance amount of US$ 35,074,779 is directed through NES as the executing agency to the RESPONSE project. The consolidation of the entire co-finance amount through NES will result in efficient management and allocation of resources. This approach not only simplifies the administrative process but also reinforces accountability and transparency in the utilisation of the allocated funds. This central model of co-finance gives NES the ability to report and monitor effectively throughout the tenure of the RESPONSE project. NES endeavours to consult further with the private sector during project execution to garner their further support in future engagements.

Annex B: Endorsements
8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:
Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response
b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

a) Partly, the GEF CIs are included in a separate table that is not part of the project RF.

b) No, the project uses output level indicators, which are far too detailed and do not allow for sufficient adaptive management. The project should consider using only outcome level indicators, with any output level tracking happening as part of annual workplans and internal project management documentation. The outcome and GEF CI level indicators should be informed by this project management tracking. In other words, these lower-level indicators should roll up into outcome level indicators and the GEF CIs. Further, it is noted that many of the baselines in the RF are not defined or are qualitative narratives. This will make it difficult to measure progress against in the future.

c) Yes, where appropriate, the indicators are sex disaggregated.

d) Yes, the RF is included in the portal CEO End document.

e) Unclear. It would be helpful if the RF presented here has additional columns that identified which indicators are linked to the GCP.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 October 2024

a) The Results Framework has been revised and simplified

b) The Results Framework has been carefully edited to reduce redundant text, streamline baselines, and keep it to the Outcome level.

However it should be noted that UNEP require output level results frameworks for the monitoring and reporting of the project and so this has been retained in Appendix 11.

c) No action needed.

d) No action needed.

e) The Results Framework has been revised and simplified.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates
8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The GeoName IDs do not seem to be available under the correct format of the https://www.geonames.org/ platform. Please update as appropriate.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 October 2024

The GeoNames ID have been added

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating
8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template
8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?
b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?
c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The equipment budget item is high. What will this be used for?

Why is the travel for global project meetings so high in year 3 and 5?

Why is the travel for staff on official business so high in year 2?

a) Yes, a budget is included in the CEO End Doc

b) Partly. The $569k for travel to global project meetings seems excessive. Please also elaborate on what type of equipment is being costed for $117,000.

c) No TORs have been provided for key project staff in the CEO End Doc.

The way the budget is presented, in Annex G, is missing the responsible entity column. Please request the agency to use the budget template provided in the Guidelines on the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy (see screenshot below) that includes a column for the executing agency for each activity (if needed remove the ?Budget by Year? columns).

Please provide detailed descriptions for ?Other staff?. As is, it is not an eligible category.

Office furniture and communications must be charged to PMC, not to project components - please ask the Agency to amend.

As it is, Other operating costs is not an eligible category ? please ask the Agency to remove them.

Please request to the Agency details ?Sub-contract, NGO? (US$ 2,103,928) and ?Commercial Contract Company Services and Facilities? (UD$ 738,000 and US$ 60,300)

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 October 2024

Equipment required to establish and undertake inventory, audits and monitoring system incl. the Outer Islands (laptops, tablets, GPS, accessories, etc.); Tablets to support in-field M&E (3 x Y1, 3

x Y4); 6 Laptops (3 at Y1; 3 at Y4) (Activity 5.1.6.1); 6 Monitors (3 at Y1; 3 at Y4)(Activity 5.1.6.1); Misc (e.g. HDMI cables, keyboards, mouse, etc.) (3 at Y1; 3 at Y4)(Activity 5.1.6.1)

NES is planning to have 2 meetings for Regional exchange of the Pacific Islands, in Y3 and Y5

Travel (airfare) of regional participants to the Cook Islands to attend at least 2 national events on plastics (14 countries, 2 participants each plus relevant regional & international stakeholders = 40 pax x 2 events = 80) (Activity 4.1.3.2)

Travel (DSA) of regional participants to the Cook Islands to attend at least 2 national events on plastics (14 countries, 2 participants each plus relevant regional & international stakeholders = 40 pax x 2 events @ 7 days each = 560 DSA days) (Activity 4.1.3.2).

Note that travel to and from the Cook Islands is particularly expensive, even within the Outer Islands of Cook Islands as well as the other Pacific Islands.

a) Main contributors into high budget in Y2 is:

Outer islands accommodation for project personnel (x3) during outer islands SAP consultation meetings (10 islands, 4 nights each)

Boat hire within outer islands for consultation meetings

Travel (airfare) of project personnel to conduct trainings on and undertake plastic audits (2 staff, 10 islands, 2 visits each)

b) Travel within, from and to the Pacific Islands is very expensive, often incl. days of waiting for a boat or flight to the outer islands. However, the

$569K in Component 4 includes the 2 meetings for the regional exchange as explained above with details

Equipment:

answered above under 8.9 a) considering that we cover 12 inhabited islands, equipment for the activities explained is needed to carry out the monitoring activities as travel to and for to bring the equipment would be more expensive then getting the equipment into the designated stations (Islands)

Equipment broken down as follows

- Equipment required to establish and undertake inventory, audits and monitoring system (laptops, tablets, GPS, accessories, etc.)
- Tablets to support in-field M&E (3 x Y1, 3 x Y4)
- 6 Laptops (3 at Y1; 3 at Y4) (Activity 5.1.6.1)

- 6 Monitors (3 at Y1; 3 at Y4)(Activity 5.1.6.1)

- Misc (e.g. HDMI cables, keyboards, mouse, etc.) (3 at Y1; 3 at Y4)(Activity 5.1.6.1)

c) Not clear because ToR for all staff and consultants are in Appendix 3f

d) Entity Column added, reflecting NES (National Environment Service Infrastructure Cook Islands) as the sole Executing Agency.

e) Other staff is part of the standardized template for all UNEP Child Projects.

Under Other Staff we have Project Officers 1, 2 and 3 as described in Appendix 3f, all with details of budget per Officer and individual responsibilities

f) Furniture moved to PMC

Communication has to remain in the specific components. Justification:

Software subscriptions required to support data collection, recording, analysis efforts throughout the inventory, audits and monitoring systems (e.g drone deploy, etc.)

Under Activity.4.1.1. Software subscriptions required to undertake evaluation surveys under Activity 4.1.2. (e.g. Survey Monkey, etc.) (shared with Activity 5.1.3.)

KAP survey administration and analysis subscription costs (e.g. survey monkey) Under Activity 5.1.3.

g) Fuel cost for project staff to conduct at least 20 site visits for M&E activities

Project contribution to fuel for site visits and M&E activities

Project contribution to power outages

--->>> Now reflected under BL 5102 Equipment maintenance

h) Through a selected local NGO, subgrants will be administered & awarded via key criteria to local businesses, NGOs & communities to provide financial support to implement alternatives identified in Comp 2 through the Plastic Smart & Short Food Supply Chains programmes.

Commercial Contract for Services & Facilities:

the GEF summary budget does not break down each Commercial Contract Company Services and Facilities but these are fully detailed in the detailed budget, incl. service description and activity they relate to:

CODE	Budget line	Umoja class	Expenditure Cathegory	Object of Expenditure	Narrative	Unit	Unit quantity	Unit cost (USD)	Total GEF budget
1.	Component: 1. Enabling a Regulatory and Policy Environment								
1.1.1.	2301	120	Contract Services	Commercial Contract Company Services	Catering for stakeholder consultation & reporting meetings (5/10 meetings requiring formal catering, 20 pax per meeting)	per person	100	50	5,000
1.1.1.	2301	120	Contract Services	Commercial Contract Company Services	Catering for trainings of relevant stakeholders in policy instruments developed/updated (x2, 20 pax per training)	per person	40	50	2,000
1.1.2.	2301	120	Contract Services	Commercial Contract Company Services	Catering for SAP consultation meetings (15 meetings, 50 pax per meeting)	per person	750	50	37,500
1.1.2.	2301	120	Contract Services	Commercial Contract Company Services	Catering for SAP validation meeting (1 meeting, 50 pax)	per person	50	50	2,500
2.	Component: 2. Support in identifying suitable alternative products								
2.1.1.	2301	120	Contract Services	Commercial Contract Company Services	Catering for consultation meetings with key stakeholders to identify SUPs for intervention, viable solutions, etc (2 meetings, 30 pax per	per person	60	50	3,000
2.1.1.	2301	120	Contract Services	Commercial Contract Company	Catering for round table meetings (Activity	individual	90	50	4,500
2.1.1.	2301	120	Contract Services	Commercial Contract Company Services	Catering for trainings for the 'Plastic Smart' and 'Short Food Supply Chain' programmes (6	per person	120	50	6,000

Total for Catering Services amounts to: USD 137,000

Total for Graphic design, Printing and translation for stakeholder meetings & trainings and outer island dialects amounts to: USD 236,000

Total for Dissemination, Media releases, video production, platform host, website maintenance, marketing support to pilots, 'Plastic Smart' and 'Short Food Supply Chain' programmes, SAP interviews, videos etc amounts to: USD 365,000

The specific situation of the Cook Islands, the limited number of staff within the NES and project team explains why all services and facilities have to be outsourced.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Not at this time. Some issues remain.

ES, 11/10/24: Not at this time. Please correct Core Indicator 7.

ES, 11/14/24: Comments addressed. CEO Endorsement is recommended.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	**8/20/2024**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**11/10/2024**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**11/14/2024**	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		