

Enhancing biodiversity considerations and effective protected area management to safeguard the Cook Islands integrated ecosystems and species

Basic Information

GEF ID

10780

Countries

Cook Islands

Project Title

Enhancing biodiversity considerations and effective protected area management to safeguard the Cook Islands integrated ecosystems and species

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6565

GEF Focal Area(s)

Biodiversity

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

A note for CEO Endorsement – The GEF can support areas that effectively protect biodiversity for the long term regardless of official status or international classification (such as OECMs). This narrative seems to struggle with this issue a bit at points as some areas may not have international classifications. We can discuss further but we would not want this to be an issue that prevents supporting effective, long term measures, particularly those managed by communities and/or traditional authorities.

Agency Response

UNDP 23 April 2021

Thanks for the note, this will be duly considered during PPG.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes. The co-financing numbers are impressive and demonstrate the whole of government approach.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes. Cook Islands are fully flexible.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/2/2021

Yes.

During PPG, please consider if there may be some areas that are marine biodiversity mainstreaming that are being better managed as part of the project that could be included here. Depending on the status and prohibited activities, some areas listed as protected may better fit here (for example where restrictions are principally based on fisheries needs rather than biodiversity).

Agency Response

UNDP 23 April 2021

Thanks for the note, this will be duly considered during PPG.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

During PPG, the project could look at the approaches (including legal) neighboring countries have implemented to recognize community and traditional protected areas.

Agency Response

UNDP 23 April 2021

Thanks for the note, this will be duly considered during PPG.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes

res.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

During PPG, as the ToC is being developed please note that the assumed links (on page 18 of the PIF – the bullets starting with if) are the assumptions that we would like to see really thought through a broken down in the ToC.

The development of Island Environmental Management Plans are described as being “in consultation with island communities”. This may be an issue of semantics, but we would like to see that the plans are really driven by the communities rather than just in consultation with them.

Also during PPG, we would like the proponents to consider the challenges of enforcement in a small country where many people are related. How will the project work to address these issues? Small size presents both advantages and disadvantages; however, there may be particular reluctance to enforce against friends and family. The project should consider various behavior change pathways to achieve the goal.

Agency Response

UNDP 23 April 2021

Thanks for the notes, this will be duly considered during PPG

Thanks for the notes, this will be duly considered during PPG.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

During PPG, please include sustainability as a key piece of any IAS work. It will also be important to examine and include prevention strategies.

Agency Response

UNDP 23 April 2021

Thanks for the note, this will be duly considered during PPG.

5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/programs intended location:

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/3/2021

Yes, thank you for including the maps in the portal.

4/6/2021

No, please include a map in the Portal documentation.

Agency Response

UNDP 23 April 2021

Project site maps, originally annexed to the PIF, have been uploaded to the portal.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/3/2021

Yes, thank you for the additions and we look forward to learning lessons and sharing approaches for effective and efficient implementation.

4/6/2021

Yes, thank you for the information on climate risks in CI. However, noting the many challenges in the implementation and relatively poor evaluations of CI's GEF-5 project, it would be good to discuss here or elsewhere lessons learned and how this project (which is similar in types of activities as opposed to the GEF-6 project) will avoid these issues.

At CEO Endorsement, please include more information on the lessons learned in the structure and approach for implementation. It will be important to consider how to include flexibility and adaptive management in light of COVID.

Agency Response

UNDP 23 April 2021

Thanks for this sensitive, yet essential comment. Kindly note that the shortcomings of the CI's GEF-5 are fully recognized and acknowledged, together with its successes and good practices. As a matter of fact, these were central to the consultations and discussions that shaped the CI GEF-7 PIF even before the TE process began.

The current draft CI GEF-5 TE report echoes some of these lessons identified earlier and also provides additional perspectives and recommendations that demand careful consideration. The TE report, once finalized, will be utilized during PPG as a key input to enhance the project design, including adaptive management mindful of COVID related risks and opportunities.

As mentioned above, most of the lessons from the CI GEF-5 project have already been addressed through the design of the CI GEF-7 PIF, notably in terms of the level of ambition and complexity of the project scope, and the inclusion of key areas of work, for example institutional capacities, community involvement in planning and governance mechanisms (i.e., PA community co-management schemes), and inter-agency collaboration and communication.

Furthermore, as suggested, two additional risks have been included in the risk section of the PIF to account for potential : a) implementation delays caused by use of project personnel for other priorities different from the GEF project, and; b) de-prioritization of project activities due to a misalignment of the project with the annual government work program cycle. Other lessons identified in the draft CI GEF-5 TE report are already included in the original PIF risk matrix.

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/3/2021

Yes, thank you.

4/6/2021

No, the title in the Portal does not match the title in the LoE. Please either change the title in the Portal or get a new LoE. The title can also be changed during PPG with the PM's approval.

Agency Response

UNDP 23 April 2021

The project title in the portal has been adjusted to match the project title in the LoE.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/3/2021

Yes, thank you for the changes.

4/6/2021

No, there are a few small changes or additions needed.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/6/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/3/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

