

Reduce marine plastics and plastic pollution in Latin American and Caribbean cities through a circular economy approach

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10547

Countries

Regional (Colombia, Jamaica, Panama)

Project Name

Reduce marine plastics and plastic pollution in Latin American and Caribbean cities through a circular economy approach

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

12/3/2021

Review completed by PM

3/28/2022

Program Manager

Leah Karrer

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, Jan 4, 2022). Yes.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, March 28 2022). Yes.

(Karrer & Sookdeo, Jan 4 2022). No. See following comments organized by section:

Table B

Please reinsert the indicators into Table B.

2.3 Overview of situation in the 6 project cities

The city-specific information in Table 6 is also focused on plastic waste, which also needs to be expanded to include a review of the state of upstream measures. This assessment is important to inform project plans to address gaps. Table 7 lists priority actions, including related to upstream actions, but without a review of existing upstream actions it's unclear how these priorities were determined.

Project Framework (Table B & Alternative Scenario)

In general there continues to be a downstream focus. Throughout the sections there is a lack of consideration for upstream solutions, including alternative materials, reuse, rent, resale, repair, etc. 3. Specific comments follow; however, the framework as a whole needs to be reviewed to ensure the full lifecycle of plastics is addressed. Further, in the sections on innovation there is no consideration of alternatives that are not plastic-based. Please include activities that focus on non-plastic alternatives and not for like alternatives included better practices and provision of services etc.

Component 1

Outcome 1.1 has been softened from "adopted policies" in the PIF to "developed or adopted". Yet that the GEB sections notes significant reductions in marine litter during the 4 years of the project, which depends on policy changes during the project. Therefore, the explanation that there is insufficient time for adoption noted in Table 1 Changes between PIF and PPG versions is inconsistent with the GEB targets. 4 years is sufficient to have adopted and adoption should be the goal. Please reconsider as it is important to ensure this project leads to actual change.

In terms of government policies and incentives, has consideration been given to government procurement policies that would require reusable or at least recyclable products to help create a market?

Also, has consideration been given to the government establishing infrastructure (which would likely be beyond the scope of GEF funding, but could be part of the financing discussions) that would foster circular systems, such as bulk dispensers for shampoo and soap distribution at pharmacies and refill container systems for food and other products (including collection, commercial-grade cleaning and return), and other systems? Such infrastructure would be similar to city government investments in recycling facilities.

Activity 1.2.2 indicates only one policy topic will be tested per city. This seems quite limited. Please reconsider to address more than one.

Activity 1.2.2 and 1.3.2 narratives end by noting experiences and success cases will be summarized, which is important. Please add that they will be shared with colleagues as

described in Output 4.1 as knowledge sharing is a critical aspect to ensure the lessons are adopted elsewhere.

Activity 1.3.1 lists financial instruments with emphasis on penalties (e.g. taxes, fees). Please include positive financial instruments, such as tax incentives, subsidies, and grants. For example, Washington, DC city government is now providing grants to businesses to purchase reusable dishware for sit-down service and to join reusable to-go/delivery dishware systems.

Component 2

Outcome 2 second paragraph ends with ??to develop effective recycling systems and markets for recycled materials?, which implies a recycling focus. Please revise to reflect measures to address the entire lifecycle as indicated in the rest of the narrative.

Output 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 lost the specificity of the PIF to priority plastics frequently found in the marine environment and priority business sectors, respectively. Please reinsert into the CER Output 2.1.

The business assessment in Activity 2.1.2 needs to include not only plastic producers, users, etc but also businesses that are already creating or adopting circular solutions, such as developing alternative materials, providing bulk food distribution, providing reusable/refillable services, etc.

Components 3 & 4

Please explain collaboration with the Latin America Circular Economy Network.

Please clarify the target audiences for knowledge dissemination in the region, including the relevant fora for reaching them, such as associations and networks.

Outcome 4 notes improved regional awareness and capacity, yet the platforms noted in Activity 4.1.3 are global (IWLEARN, GGKP and GPML). Please revise to indicate regional mechanisms some of which are noted in the baseline section.

Also regarding Outcome 4, it is important that the project share experience region-wide not only with peers (i.e. colleagues working on plastic pollution initiatives), but also with the major stakeholder groups whose practices and policies need to change to reduce plastic pollution. These groups include policy-makers from relevant agencies (e.g. urban planning, health & food, etc) and from the private sector (e.g. food service, retail, etc). It is important to determine the best ways of engaging these groups. For example, if urban planners are a priority then are there regional urban planning meetings, events? Given the importance of innovation, entrepreneurial events likely need to be targeted. One-on-one discussions with top priority audiences should also be planned.

The Outcome 3 inter-city network plans seem highly relevant to Outcome 4 capacity building and knowledge sharing. It seems the inter-city network will be an important means of achieving Outcome 4. Please explain how these outcomes will be coordinated.

Agency Response

Response February 2022:

Re Table B: Indicators have been inserted in Table B.

Re the state of upstream measures in cities: Existing initiatives and actions on upstream of circular economy has been added in Table 4 rather than table 6 give the many existing initiatives are more at the national level.

Re reviewing the framework to ensure the full lifecycle of plastics is addressed: the majority of the project interventions and GEBs focus on upstream interventions, complemented by downstream actions. Additional clarification on upstream policies (such as waste reduction, sustainable consumption and production, reuse etc.) have been added in Component 1, activities 1.2.1 and 1.2.2. The focus on upstream intervention in business innovation has been highlighted in Component 2, output 2.1 and activity 2.1.2.

Re adding activities that focus on non-plastic alternatives: This will be tackled under activity 1.2.1 where the project will identify best global practices and tailor them to the LAC context. Non-plastic alternatives will be explored within the framework of searching for better alternatives. This will be further supplemented by working with a number of companies as listed in the project document interested in alternative materials and solutions other than plastics.

Component 1

Re Outcome 1.1: Outcome 1.1 has been adjusted from ? developed or improved? to ?adopted or improved?

Re considering government procurement policies: Due consideration is now given to this within activities 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 where the project aspires to support the implementation of selected policies within cities. Sustainable procurement is included as a policy instrument to create market for more circular products and service system

Re government establishing infrastructure as part of financing discussion: This is now considered under activity 1.2.2 with the new text highlighted. The project will use its policy influencing strategy to help guide actions towards consolidated circular systems and upstream policy intervention.

Re Activity 1.2.2 indicating one policy topic tested per city: Clarification is now provided in activity 1.2.2. While the project will pilot one primary policy per city, technical support will be provided to additional 2 policies per city implemented with substantial co-financing from the city governments. In so doing, the project will focus its resources on the most critical policies while empowering other initiatives through targeted technical support.

Re Activity 1.2.2 expanding to include knowledge sharing: Texts added to highlight those experiences from Activity 1.2.2 and 1.3.2 will be shared with colleagues in line with Output 4.1 as suggested.

Re Activity 1.3.1 including positive financial instruments: Texts added in Activity 1.3.1 to include the positive financial instruments such as subsidy and tax reduction.

Component 2

Re Outcome 2 text revise to reflect measures to address the entire lifecycle: The intervention in this project contains both upstream and downstream actions, with a

priority given to upstream actions. This has been clarified in the project document, as well as in Outcome 2

Re Output 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 addressing priority plastics: The reference to the priority plastics that are directly relevant for GEBs on climate, marine litter and POPs has been added in Output 2.1

Re expanding business assessment in Activity 2.1.2 to include businesses that are already creating or adopting circular solutions: New texts added to include a broader range of businesses along the plastic value chain

Components 3 & 4

Re collaboration with the Latin America Circular Economy Network: Texts on collaboration with the Latin America Circular Economy Network has been added in Activity 3.2.1 and in the knowledge section

Re the targeted audience knowledge dissemination in the region: Targeted audience for knowledge dissemination in the region has been clarified in Outcome 4 and Activity 4.1.3. Elaboration on relevant fora is captured in the new diagram added in in the knowledge section

Re integration of regional mechanism in Activity 4.1.3: Regional and global mechanisms to support awareness raising and capacity have been added in Activity 4.1.3

Re sharing experiences region-wide not only with peers: This is now addressed in the description of Outcome 4 with explicit reference to a wider group of stakeholders and expanding on what was mentioned already.

Re the relevance of inter-city network plans in outcome 3 to capacity building under Outcome 4: The description of Outcome 3 and Activity 3.1.2 has been adjusted to emphasize the expected role if inter-city networks for capacity building and knowledge generation.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer & Yoon, April 5, 2022). No. The additional co-financing is very welcome; however, the following points need to be addressed.

General comment: There is a lack of distinction between *grant*, *in-kind*, *investment mobilized*, & *recurrent expenditures* as shown in majority of co-financing letters mixing

these terms. Please note that, in majority cases, "in-kind" is categorized as "recurrent expenditures"; and "grant" is categorized as "investment mobilized". In general, for co-financing to be defined as investment mobilized, the co-financing fund must be "available" (in cash, loan or equity) to be disbursed to the GEF project component(s) during the GEF project implementation and to be used as part of the GEF project budget. Written summary of each reported investment mobilized item need to be provided in the description section.

In this case, while It is not necessary to revise any of the submitted co-financing letters, please revisit all co-financing item and split amount between in-kind & grant. Below step-by-step guidance may be useful when revising the entries.

Investment mobilized (could be grant (cash), loan or equity) ? "baseline" projects/activities

1. Is the co-financier who issued a co-financing letter the original source of the funding *and* the funding is coming from their own budget?
2. Does the reported amount reflect the proportional to the scope of baseline activities which will be supporting the GEF project? The "baseline" projects/activities and the GEF project will go hand in hand to create higher GEBs and sustainable outcome.
3. Will the full reported amount be available for disbursement during the GEF project implementation? Will there be time overlap in both "baseline" projects/activities and the GEF project?

- If yes to all, please report the amount as Investment mobilized, and describe the baseline project/activities in the description section.
- If the Gov't entity received/or secured funding and issued a co-financing letter confirming their pledge to utilize the funding in support of the GEF project; and meet (2) & (3), please report as Investment mobilized & Public Investment, and describe the baseline project/activities in the description section.
- If (2) & (3) are met, but it's not feasible to obtain a co-financing letter from the original source of the fund, one option is the intermediary (e.g., GEF agency) issues a co-financing letter and reports as "in-kind" and "recurrent expenditures" (please send justification in writing if this needs to be reported as Investment mobilized, and GEFSEC will review on a case by case basis)
- If none of above, in most cases "In-kind" and "recurrent expenditures" have to be the appropriate categories to report the amount as co-financing provided that there is reasonable linkage between the parallel projects (planned or completed) and the GEF project. (e.g., A system established out of another project will be used to store GEF project data)

Additionally, please address the below comments.

Waste Agency of Panama 4M in-kind: while the letter states 40M (entire budget for this gov't entity for 4 years), please confirm if the reported amount (4M) reflects the reasonable proportion of the gov't budget which will be contributing to the GEF project.

-
- Alliance to End Plastic Waste 4.1M grant: the co-financing letter refers to the projects in Argentina and Brazil (who are not in the GEF program). The UNEP response regarding the regional relevance does not justify inclusion of the \$4.1M which is for activities in countries different than this project. Please remove or include a much smaller amount related to knowledge sharing.
-
- Acoplasticos \$16,890 grant: according to the co-financing letter, the grant has been already disbursed to other initiatives. Please explain how this amount (in cash) will be available to support the GEF project implementation in that case.
- BRS \$463,230 in-kind: 3 SGP are listed in the co-financing letter. Other GEF project fund can't be counted as co-financing for another GEF project. Please remove.

(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). No. The co-financing from the private sector and other partners is highly impressive. It is also good to see co-financing from Panama and Colombia governments. However, there does not seem to be co-financing from the Jamaica government. Please revisit as co-financing reflects commitment.

Agency Response

Response April 2022:

Re revisiting all co-financing items and splitting the amount between in-kind & grant:

The following changes have been made regarding the categorization of co-finance in table C:

? The type of co-financing for ?Investment Mobilized? under ?Recipient Country Government? has been changed from ?Grant? to ?Public Investment?.

? The type of co-financing for ?Investment Mobilized? under ?Other? sources of co-finance has been changed from ?Grant? to ?Other?.

Table C and the Appendix 3 (co-finance budget) have been updated according to these new categorizations.

Re Waste Agency of Panama 4M in-kind: We can confirm that the reported amount (4M) reflects the reasonable proportion of the government budget which will be contributing to the GEF project.

Re Alliance to End Plastic Waste 4.1M grant: An amount of 820,000 USD of co-financing, representing the Alliance's knowledge production costs, is placed under component 4 (improved regional and global awareness, knowledge and capacity applied, to reduce marine plastics and plastic pollution). The knowledge, best practices and collaborative experience from these projects will feed into the knowledge management and capacity development activities in Outcome 4.

Table A, B, and C, and the Appendix 3 (co-finance budget) have been updated according to the new co-finance amount.

Re Acoplasticos \$16,890 grant: This has been removed. Table A, B, and C, and the Appendix 3 (co-finance budget) have been updated according to removal.

Re BRS \$463,230 in-kind: These are projects that fall under the Small Grants Programme on Plastic waste funded by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad). The co-finance letter provides an overview of the SGPs and their donor.

Response February 2022:

Re the missing co-financing: The cofinancing from Jamaican government was uploaded with a number of others including: The Environment Ministries from Colombia, Panama and Jamaica, National Environment and Planning Agency Jamaica, as well as from the private sector (Ancon) and BRS Secretariat.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer and Yoon, April 5 2022). No.

In Table B: kindly include the expected outcomes and outputs for the M&E component ? also the totals in the M&E budget of \$267,500 (please include the totals in the last line) don't match the totals of M&E in Table B of \$307,500.

On the Budget: Procurement Specialist is an execution function eligible to be charged to the GEF Portion of the PMC (please see table B below). It has been charged across the components. Please request the agency to amend

(Sookdeo, Jan 4 2022). No.

The budget as presented has resources targeted to consultants that do not seem to be necessary, for example a consultant to calculate chemicals in plastics is un-necessary as levels of chemicals etc are known and in published literature and the BRS Secretariat can provide advice on this. In this regard please provide TORs for the consultants for further consideration.

Agency Response

Response April 2022:

Re M&E Table B: Outcomes and outputs were included in the M&E component in Table B and Annex A (Project Results Framework). The total M&E budget was added in section 9 on Monitoring and Evaluation (Table 27) and the budget for the Terminal Closing Meeting was added line with the budget (Appendix 2A). Table 27, Table B and the budget are now all aligned.

Re the procurement expert: The initial ToR for the procurement expert included management of relevant procurement processes together with technical work to advise cities on sustainable procurement.

The scope concerning project procurement has been fully charged to the PMC under budgetline 1207 ?Project Procurement Consultant? as per the GEF review. The technical work needed to support cities on sustainable procurement policies, ecolabels, standards and financial instruments was kept under the components in a new budgetline 1208 ?Cities sustainable procurement expert?. The deliverables would include working with city officials and other stakeholders on best procurement approaches to create the market for more circular products and service system, and better collection and recycling. Both conventional and Public Private Partnerships.

These changes are reflected in Appendix 2A (budget) and Appendix 12 (Staff, consultants and subcontracts for the project using GEF resource).

Response February 2022:

Re requested ToRs for consultants: Appendix 12 has been supplemented with the requested ToRs for the chemicals consultant, the procurement expert, and the project coordinator.

Re the chemicals consultant: Collecting actual data from the targeted cities on chemical content is part of the overall monitoring aspect of the project, and within its objective to reduce the chemicals in plastics and deliver the GEBs on POPs in plastics. While the literature is rich with extensive academic research, the data on chemical content in plastics is mostly derived from other regions, with the concentration data usually provided with large intervals between upper and lower bounds.

Therefore, the consultant will support the project implementation and the achievement of GEBs on chemicals by collecting such real-life data of chemicals in relevant industry, sectors and products.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer and Yoon, April 5 2022). No.

On the utilization of PPG:

(i) There are payments to the Implementing Agency (UNEP RMB and UNEP ROLAC) which are ineligible expenditures ? the payments incurred so far (\$49,129 and \$38,712) have to be returned while the committed amounts (\$55,871 and \$26,288) cannot be utilized (see table 2).

(ii) Please request the agency to provide details on what the sub-contracts to support (a) technical design, and (b) country liaison and consultation entail in order to make sure that these do not include any ineligible expenditures (see table 2)

(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). Yes.

Agency Response

Response April 2022:

Re Utilization of the PPG:

i) In alignment with the Guidelines on the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy, the following activities were carried out by a Circular Economy Expert and a LAC Technical expert for the LAC region baseline as follows. to:

? Circular Economy expert: coordination of the project document, annexes and appendices development; development of quantitative baselines for the 6 project cities; and gender mainstreaming of the project.

? Technical expert LAC region baseline: provision of regional coordination on policy and stakeholder engagement; project writing support; coordination, support and hiring of national consultants; and organization of inception and validation workshops.

The same breakdown has been presented in Annex C in the project document. The amounts spent have increased after the submission (at the start of December 2021) as some expenditures were not yet recorded in the system by that time.

ii) The consultants on technical and country liaison provided the following support:

? Project document development (incl. alignment with GEF Focal Area, Incremental cost reasoning, institutional arrangements, M&E)

? Country consultation and liaison (Inc. translation of national reports, compilation of country data, and engagement of national stakeholders including possible co-finance partners)

These above clarifications have been added in Annex C.

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, March 28 2022). Yes.

(Sookdeo & Karrer, Jan 4 2022). No. Please clarify the low level of GEBs for CW and for the chemicals identified and please confirm that these are included as priority chemicals in the NIPs or NIP updates of the countries engaged in the project.

What is the basis for assuming a 9% reduction in marine plastics for each city due to the project? And what is the timeline for that assumption (start, end years)?

Agency Response

Response February 2022:

Re the low level of GEBs for CW: The concentration of POPs in chemical products is in general very low, as chemicals of concern are used as additives (not as the main ingredients). In the meantime, the POPs related GEBs of this project mainly come from the 6 targeted cities, which have lower potential of GEBs compared to work at national level. Compared to other GEF plastic projects (such as GEF ID 10546 in Indonesia, GEF ID 10628 in Asia-Pacific, and GEF ID 10401 in Ghana), the project has GEBs on indicator 9.1. on the reduction of POPs. The POPs related to GEB calculation of this project include HBCD (found in vehicle, EPS packaging etc.), and PBDE (found in vehicles, cables, furniture and building materials etc.).

Re NIP/NIP Update priority chemicals: The selection of HBCD and PBDE corresponds to the NIPs of Colombia and Panama, while there is no NIPs data for Jamaica as the country does not possess an industry of plastic resins production.

Re the basis for 9% city reduction in marine plastics assumption: For the baseline, we have collected data for production, use, and end-of-life of different plastic products. The average ratio of plastic packaging and single-use plastic products that ends up as marine litter (compared to the amount of waste generation) is 9 percent in the six project cities. This is why the assumption has been made that if the project aims to reduce 1,600 tonnes of single-use plastic products from source, then it leads to the reduction of marine litter 144 tonnes (9% of 1,600 tonnes). Explanation has been provided in the GEBs section. The timeline for this GEB reductions is the project lifetime (four years., which has been indicated in section 6 on GEB in the CEO endorsement document

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, March 28 2022). Yes.

(Karrer & Sookdeo, Jan 4 2022). No. Please see following comments by section:

1.1.2 The problem in LAC cities

Figure 1. Problem Tree of the Project is clear and useful.

As requested in the PIF review, please explain how the cities were selected.

2.1 Global and Regional Baseline Scenario

The list of ?Existing actions on reducing marine plastics and plastic pollution at the LAC regional level? includes the AEPW, which is global. Please remove, indicate LAC activities related to AEPW, or move to the global section (if moved to global section, then be sure to note other global efforts e.g. GPAP, BFFP, etc). Please add GPAP, which is expanding into LAC (Mexico, Colombia), is an important GEF partner, and is listed as a co-financier. Please consult with Circulate Capital and the Circulate Initiative, which I believe are expanding into LAC, regarding their efforts and collaboration.

Please include the ISLANDS program child projects in the Caribbean which are targeting over 100,000 metric tons of plastic waste in the Caribbean.

2.2 National Baseline Scenarios

This section is intended to discuss the plastic pollution problem in LAC countries; however it focuses on the state of waste management. Tables 4 and 5 and Figure 2 focus on waste management. Please also describe the state of the upstream solutions for plastic pollution? what alternative materials are available, reuse and refill systems, resale, repair, rent, etc.? Also, what is the state of public behavior and awareness WRT plastic pollution? Since the project will address the full lifecycle of plastics, it is important to understand the status of upstream measures and public perceptions.

This information was specifically requested during the PIF Review - and the Agency agreed - that a full plastic chain analysis would be conducted during the PPG.

Agency Response

Response February 2022:

The problem in LAC cities:

Re how the cities were selected: Section 2.3 under the baseline section was expanded on to include criteria used to select the cities.

Global and Regional Baseline Scenario

Re AEPW: AEPW was moved to the global level under section 2.1. As mentioned in the co-finance letter of AEPW, the majority of their co-finance comes from two national projects in LAC, so the collaboration is also targeted at the regional level.

Re including other global efforts: GPAP and BFFP, the circulate initiative, and circulate capital have been added to the initiatives at global level. GPAP is both a global partner on knowledge sharing, as well as a regional partner to deepen the development of reuse system in LAC, and this has been edited in the stakeholder table.

Re Circulate Capital and the Circulate Initiative: Capital and other development banks have been added into the stakeholder list under a new category ?finance?.

Re ISLANDS program child projects: The ISLANDS programme has been added together with other GEF financed projects under a new section titled ?Existing GEF projects on reducing marine plastics and plastic pollution?. The ISLANDS three relevant projects in the Caribbean region have been elaborated on accordingly and additional information can be found in section 6 on institutional arrangements and coordination and the related appendix 4.

National Baseline Scenarios

Re the state of the upstream solutions for plastic pollution: Requested info is now incorporated within Tables 4 (initiatives) and 5 (policies). The national plans, programmes and policy, as well as companies working specifically in upstream

activities and co-finance partners (LeadSync, Trashforma, Xiclo, etc.), have been added related to upstream measures

Re the state of public behavior and awareness. It is indicated in Appendix 11 that the project communication strategy will be developed at the early stages of implementation together with key target audience. Behavioral change campaigns will require carrying out consumer testing and collecting data on the general perception towards specific topics. This will be part of the knowledge that this project will produce upon which practical policies will be recommended.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). Yes.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, March 28 2022). Yes.

(Sookdeo, Jan 4 2022). No.

As a multi-focal area project, under 4.2 GEF Focal Area, please include alignment with the CW focal area.

Agency Response

Response February 2022:

Re alignment with CW Focal Area: More explanation on the alignment with CW focal area has been added in section 4.2 GEF Focal Area under section 4 on ?Alignment with GEF focal area and/or impact program strategies?

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, March 28 2022). Yes.

(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). No.

Please explain what the ?XICLO system service in all the restaurants of Grupo Takami? is.

The co-financing attributed to AEPW is related to projects in Argentina and Brazil, which are not part of this UNEP project. While knowledge sharing may be conducted and is encouraged, attributing \$4.1M as co-financing to this project seems a stretch.

Please explain the contributions of the Mayors, EPA Cartagena, and SENA Regional Bolivar, and Waste Agency of Panama.

Agency Response

Response February 2022:

Re XICLO: A more detailed explanation on XICLO's activity has been added in Activity 2.1.3 and the investment mobilized section. Essentially, the company XICLO will invest in the development and implementation of a reusable solution system in several cities of Colombia to provide co-finance to this project.

Re AEPW co-financing: AEPW cofinancing derives from two technical projects adopting community-based approaches for increased efficiency in collection, sorting, recycling and recovery of plastics wastes within the LAC context. Several rounds of discussion and meeting with AEPW were concluded acknowledging the need for regional synergies and highlighting the significant role their two projects can play in support of Outcome 4 where the project aspires for increased regional awareness and capacity.

Re the different contributions: Additional text has been added below the cofinancing table on the respective contributions of Mayors, EPA Cartagena, and SENA Regional Bolivar, and Waste Agency of Panama.

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). Yes.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, March 28 2022). Yes.

(Karrer & Sookdeo, Jan 4 2022). No. Please see previous comments regarding need to address full lifecycle of plastics, which includes innovations in alternative materials.

Agency Response

Response February 2022:

Re addressing full lifecycle of plastics including innovations: Previous comments have been considered and necessary edits are now made throughout the document. The pathways to achieve the GEBs is now more explicit together with the alternative scenario. The work of innovations in alternative materials and reuse/refill have been highlighted as well. The overall design of the project follows the principle of circular

economy, and it combines both upstream and downstream intervention, while a priority is given to upstream actions.

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). Yes.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, March 28 2022). Yes.

(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). No.

The list of regional-level companies in Table 16 is comprehensive for companies that create or use plastics. It is important to also include the companies that are the solutions ? e.g. repair, rental and resale companies as well as reuse and refill systems. It is critical that these companies are part of the engagement, particularly so that their practices can be scaled-up.

Also, please ensure the companies providing co-financing are included in the stakeholder engagement plans.

Agency Response
Response February 2022:

Re the expansion of Table 16 to include companies that are the solutions: Table 16 has been re-organized to classify organizations and companies across the value chain: Production, use, logistic, consumption, collection & recycling, and reuse.

Re adding cofinancing companies to Table 16: This is now reflected in the project document noting that the addition of following companies:

- ? Logistic companies for reverse and take back schemes
- ? eCommerce
- ? Companies offering Reuse schemes (refill solutions, reusable products)
- ? Repurpose and upcycling companies

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). Yes.

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, March 28 2022). Yes.

(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). No. Following the previous comment, please ensure the list of private sector companies noted in 4. Private sector engagement includes companies that are creating circular solutions by purpose e.g. resale, repair, rental companies and reuse and refill systems. The current list is all companies that produce or use plastics except for one bullet ?? Design and innovation companies for products and business models?. Given the importance of scaling existing circular companies, they should be much more than one bullet.

Agency Response
Response February 2022:

Re inclusion of companies creating circular solutions by purpose: Table 16 has been re-organized to classify organizations and companies across the value chain: Production, use, logistic, consumption, collection & recycling, and reuse.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). Yes.

Agency Response
Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, March 28 2022). Yes.

(Karrer & Sookdeo, Jan 4 2022). No.

GPAP is noted as a co-financier that will ?? invest in the development and deployment of a modelling tool for plastic flow assessment and scenario building; the development and utilization of the UpLink platform; the development of a Reuse portal and scaling reuse work; financing innovation work by the dissemination of GPAP and its partners? insights; and support for convening and capacity building across 6 cities and the wider network of Latin American cities.? However, these activities are not reflected in the project description. There is only brief mention of GPAP in (?)? in activity 3.2.1 and in activity 4.3.1. Coordination with GPAP should particularly be noted in knowledge sharing and capacity building plans in components 3 and 4.

As noted by the STAP review, coordination with other GEF plastic projects is important. Given the GEF is relatively new to directly investing in plastic pollution projects, it is particularly important to share experiences. The Agency response in Annex B indicates that the Indonesia Plastik Sulit project is not sufficiently developed,

but the PIF was approved a year ago. Please incorporate plans for knowledge sharing with the most relevant GEF plastic projects, which are the Ghana (GEF #10401), Indonesia (GEF #10546) and Southeast Asia (GEF #10628) projects and the ISLANDS program. Note the agency leads for the most relevant GEF plastic projects are Akos Koeszegvary (A.KOESZEGVARY@unido.org) of UNIDO for Ghana project and Arun Abraham (aabraham.consultant@adb.org), for the Indonesia and SEAsia projects.

Please specifically include text in the project on how alignment and cooperation with the ISLANDS program child projects being implemented in the Caribbean is being done to ensure mutual learning and sharing of efforts, particularly since the ISLANDS projects in the Caribbean works with both the cruise ship industry and the hotel industry on issues specific to the elimination of plastic and plastic waste. Further the IDB child project works with the private sector that can be used to amplify work being proposed in this project.

Agency Response

Response February 2022:

Re GPAP: The role of different co-financing partners has been clarified in the investment mobilized section under the co-financing table, by specifying the relevant activities and linkage to different project components. GPAP's work has been highlighted in the relevant activities, including under activity 2.1.3 where cooperation on reuse is discussed, under activity 3.2.1 on networking, and knowledge sharing under activity 4.1.3.

Re incorporating plans for knowledge sharing with the most relevant GEF plastic projects: The overview of existing GEF projects on plastics has been further elaborated on. The baseline now includes a section on those relevant GEF projects as well as the knowledge section and appendix 4 discussing agreed on implementation arrangement. Please refer to a new diagram on the knowledge section illustrating global and cross agency synergies.

Interagency meetings have been arranged with ADB and UNIDO to discuss concrete collaboration, and agencies agreed on a clear way forwarded which is elaborated on in the project document.

Re alignment with ISLANDS Programme: the connection to the ISLANDS programme has been added in Section 6 Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). Yes.

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, March 28 2022). Yes.

(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). No. The knowledge management section should include plans under components 4 and to some extent 3. Please see previous comments related to components 3 and 4.

Agency Response
Response February 2022:

Re knowledge management approach: Coordination with the Latin America Circular Economy Network, GPAP, and other relevant GEF plastics projects has been added and the role of the inter-city network established under the project has been highlighted. Approaches to engage with target stakeholders via relevant networks were also highlighted in the CEO document in a new illustration added in the knowledge section.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). Yes.

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). Yes.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). Yes.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). Yes.

Agency Response
Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer and Yoon, April 5 2022). No.

In Annex B (responses to comments): responses to comments provided by Council Members from US, Germany, Norway and Canada were not found ? please include answers.

Agency Response
Response April 2022:

Re missing responses to council comments: Responses to council comments are provided in Annex B within the consolidated project document and as a stand-alone document in the roadmap.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, March 28 2022). No. Please address above comments.

(Karrer, Jan 4 2022). No. Please see above comments.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/4/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/28/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/5/2022	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations