

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

**Review PIF 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**

3/23/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/23/2020

**Program Manager**

Leah Karrer

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## PIF

### Part I – Project Information

#### 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

(Karrer, March 2020). No.

Funding will be provided ½ by IW and ½ by CW. Please revise accordingly.

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). Yes.

(Karrer, April 24, 2020). Final comments:

1- Participating countries should be included in the Information section of the PIF.

2- Co-financing: The proposal includes substantial in-kind financing from the private sector that has been identified as investment mobilized.

Please confirm and provide more details on how this was identified. Please note that where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized".

### **Agency Response**

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

The above has been reflected in the updated portal entry of the PIF.

Agency Response – April 24th, 2020

1. The participating countries have been added to the information section of the PIF.

2. Addressed, please refer to the revised explanation under Table C for how the investment mobilized was identified.

### **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**

(Karrer and Sookdeo, March 2020). No.

Please reconsider the title, which is more of a long statement than a descriptive title.

Honduras and Brazil were originally part of the project plans. Will cities in these or other countries be pursued to add to this project during PPG? If so, how will the funding be shifted?

The proposal to work at city level, particularly in development of laws/policy/regulations will not work the way the project proposes in Jamaica since the municipalities have very limited rule making authority. In the English-Speaking Caribbean, the central government holds rule making power. The project's proponents should clarify how this project will work at the municipal level in all three countries particularly in relation to the introduction of the economy policies and regulations.

The project framework is very action oriented, which is much appreciated. The structure by government and private sector actions is also useful. Please indicate plans for cross-collaboration between the government and private sector plans. There are three aspects that need more emphasis: 1) city-specific analyses of the plastics value chain to determine the barriers to a circular plastic cycle, including the most problematic plastic products, key leverage points, priority actions (i.e. components 1 and 2) to address those barriers and the key actors in the life cycle who need to be engaged (e.g. are plastic product importers or producers more critical?); 2) establishment of collaborative governance bodies, such as cross-sector, multi-agency, private-public task forces to tackle this issue in each city, which are being established in many other countries to tackle plastic; and 3) creation of financing mechanisms. The first two aspects are briefly noted in Output 1.1.1 to support creating the action plans, but these are too limited for such critical tasks. The global environmental problems section even notes “there is limited data to guide interventions” indicating the need for lifecycle analyses. This need is confirmed in the description of the countries and cities, which do not reference plastic life cycle analyses having been conducted. Similarly, financing is hidden within Output 1.1.4. These three aspects are important tasks that warrant at least their own output(s) if not component.

Upstream actions are a top priority for the GEF. Therefore, measures that reduce production are important. With that in mind, shifting from plastic to sustainable materials is a top priority. The PIF notes plans for alternative materials, but does not specify what is envisioned here. As far as I’m aware (please correct me if I’m wrong) there are efforts to create but currently no available plastic-replacing materials that degrade in seawater. Given this project is designed for ocean conservation, ensuring the replacement materials are ocean-friendly is a priority. Therefore, the references in the PIF to “environmentally acceptable” plastic products needs to clarify this means developing materials that will degrade in the ocean without creating microplastics or other harmful residuals. Similarly, there are references to shifting to “compostable” materials. “Compostable materials” require the materials degrade in a commercial compost facility, which are not common. This proposal, therefore, also needs rethinking to include plans to create such infrastructure. Please note that the GEF has a proposal for the June WP that looks at green chemistry incubators which could be useful for this plastics project. Please clarify what is meant by “alternative materials” to ensure ocean-friendly and consider working with the green chemistry project.

When noting “reuse” options, please also include “refill” to ensure this approach is included (e.g. groceries installing bulk dispensers instead of selling individually wrapped food items and containers).

Component 1 Output 1.1.3 blithely includes “establishing...treatment infrastructure to recycle”. This activity is a major undertaking and costly. The GEF does not fund such infrastructure. How is this activity going to be funded?

Component 2 is important in bringing in the private sector; however, it is unclear how this will actually be undertaken. How will the GEF funding be used to, for example, to develop and test sustainable consumption solutions (Output 2.1.2)? Is the idea to create an incubator/accelerator program in each city? How will such a program work – will it provide grants, mentoring, business training, pitch opportunities to investors? This is an area in which Scale360 may be able to assist. Please clarify plans.

Please clarify the purpose of Output 2.1.4, A series of industry roundtables. Is this to bring together key stakeholders to develop strategies to address plastics, which would be very useful? If so, it would seem this would be more appropriate in the governance bodies output (currently in Output 1.1.1 although I suggested to create a separate output or component for governance bodies), especially as it notes links with municipalities. Please also clarify that the brainstorming will be to consider circularity along the entire lifecycle so that, for example, product manufacturers are communicating with retailers to create reuse and refill systems and also communicating with waste managers to design products and source materials that will be recyclable.

Component 2, *Outcome indicator* section notes that the actors along the value chain will be included in discussions, which is important. Assuming that many plastic products are imported, how will those manufacturers be included? Please be sure to include the agencies and private sector actors that are engaged in importing plastic products.

Output 2.1.2 is important for linking the private sector actors along the value chain. These actors need to include the importers and they all need to be tied to the recycling and waste management stakeholders so that the plastic product manufacturers can understand what is required for their products to be recycled. As noted before, the preference is for the companies to switch to reuse and refill systems, so guidance and support to companies on how to do so also needs to be provided not only how to be recyclable.

For component 3, the paragraph starting with “Activities in this component” notes the “engagement of targeted LAC cities”. Is that referring only to the project cities or other cities as well?

Output 4.1.5, A regional inter-city dialogue platform, is an important activity, but seems more relevant to component 3, specifically Output 3.1.2 Documented and established collaboration between the LAC inter-city network.

(Karrer and Sookdeo, April 20, 2020).

The following remaining issues need to be addressed:

- a) The Theory of Change as written is weak reflecting only the project framework. The ToFC does not reflect the core concept of how this project will address the fundamental drivers causing marine plastic pollution, particularly the needs for circular solutions. This section needs much greater thought and might benefit from looking to the Indonesia and Ghana plastics as examples (see Indonesia PIF and Ghana attached ToFC). Both the diagram needs editing and text needs to be provided.
- b) We do not agree with the proposal to work at the city level in Jamaica where national support is required to affect change. Either Jamaica needs to be removed or plans need to be revised to work at the national policy level with pilots in the cities.
- c) The PIF needs to provide an explanation of how the CW GEBs will be assessed during PPG.
- d) The PIF document needs to include the Theory of Change and the Taxonomy. These can't be separate documents.

Also please address the following during PPG:

- e) Provide clarification as to criteria for city selection and any additional cities that will be considered, including in Brazil and in Honduras.
- f) Plans to conduct a plastics value chain analysis have been incorporated into the PPG phase. The agency response indicated a more thorough value chain analysis will be conducted during project implementation; however, such an activity is not indicated in the project framework. Please add this activity in the Pro Doc/CER. Similarly, the agency response indicated that an interagency working group will be established presumably for each city; however, this significant task is not reflected in the project framework. Please include this important activity as an output in the project framework in the Pro Doc/CER. During PPG please ensure the full lifecycle of plastic actors is engaged, from designers to importers to recyclers.

(Karrer and Sookdeo, April 23, 2020). Yes.

## Agency Response

### Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

1. The title has been revised to a more concise statement “ *Reduce marine plastics and plastic pollution in Latin American and Caribbean cities through a circular economy approach*”.
2. Yes, as rightly stated, both Honduras and Brazil were part of the original concept but due to the COVID 19 situation. Alas, despite definite interest at the city level in both countries, the consultation process at the government level remained largely incomplete. Securing endorsement letters in due time was therefore not possible. During PPG, further consultation will be held including with central governments for buy-in and, definition of activities and co-financing opportunities. Belem, as the most developed city in the lower Amazon basin, is actively involved in the land-based source of pollution activities in the Amazon SAP implementation project. Belem is also one of the key cities in the Cities Impact Program. Synergies will thus be thought to maximize opportunities. The reduced level of funding will however make it a bit more challenging to reshuffle resources. During PPG though we will refine the list of selection criteria including leveraging opportunities with ongoing activities and programmes in the countries. Interested cities will definitely be invited to join the inter-city network.
3. In Jamaica, there is certain degree of devolution of authority to Parish level in this case the Parishes of Saint Andrew and, Kingston which includes the largest urbanized area - city of Kingston where the largest amount of solid waste is generated. The proposed project does not intend to work in Jamaica as an island site but rather with a focus on high priority urbanized areas. While policies, economic instruments etc national in nature and there is a centralized collection and disposal system through the national solid waste management authority, the collection and management is based on zones and done in close collaboration with local parish councils. Many local parishes have their own local development plan etc. and so while there is still Central Government - Jamaica has perhaps the most developed local parish councils in the English-Speaking Caribbean.
4. Please refer to language added in the description of component 1 as well as in the stakeholder section. Multi-stakeholder dialogues and engagement mechanism will be established to ensure that the public sector, private sector, NGOs and academia can work together at the city level, in an orchestrated manner to test and implement innovative and sustainable solutions developed in this project. This will be done in Component 1 of the project.
  - 1) In terms of city specific analysis of the plastics value chain – an initial snapshot analysis will be conducted **during PPG**. This will be done both in-situ and towards the overview of the plastics value chain in the target cities of the project, in order to determine the barriers to a circular plastic approach, the most problematic plastic products, key leverage points, and priority actions to address those barriers and the key actors in the life cycle who need to be engaged. Such assessments can be based on the existing methodologies and tools developed by UNEP, GPAP, SystemIQ/Pew and other global organisations. Relevant reference, data and studies will be compiled and analyzed to establish a city baseline during the PPG to be further fleshed out during project execution with a focus on the following.: the production and consumption of plastic products; situation of waste management system; material flow analysis and life cycle assessment of plastics products; key activities, processes, sectors and actors causing the leakage and impacts of the most problematic plastic products and polymers found in the marine environment; and key geographical locations for marine litter and plastic

pollution. **In the first 6 months of project implementation**, a detailed brand-audit will be done to identify key sectors and companies from the private sector to engage with, a short list of key actions will be further discussed and developed with the municipalities and local authorities of the target cities, in the form of city-level action plans. The action plans will be the basis for a policy agenda and define priority actions for implementation through city-level governance structure. This city level actions plans will facilitate the implementation of regional and national action plans on marine litter. They will have a specific focus on demonstrating relevant circularity approaches for the relevant products. Please refer to description of component 1 for more details.

- 2) An inter-agency working group will be set up to enable different municipal agencies and offices to collaborate (city council, strategic planning office, environment and waste management office, procurement office, finance and tax office at the city level).
- 3) We agree, financing mechanisms are an important part of the puzzle. The output title itself has been revised and additional information has been added to the description of output 1.1.4.
5. During the lifetime of this project, we don't believe it is feasible to test and use **alternative materials** considering that we may need to do a more thorough process (often time consuming) to understand and figure out the benefits and side-effects from the new materials. This type of work is best carried out at the national level and international levels, with better framework and scale regarding testing, evaluation, assessment among professional researchers and authorized institutes to reach consensus. However, we will focus more on innovative business models and solutions, beyond introducing alternative materials or new plastic and polymers. Accordingly, all references to alternative materials and compostable have been taken out. During PPG, we will ensure coordination with the forthcoming green chemistry project.
6. Agreed, language on "**refill**" has been added throughout the document, especially, in output 2.1.1. "*develop and introduce package-less products or refillable containers to deliver the same function and service) to shift from single-use to reusable plastic packaging and products*" and 2.1.4.
7. **Output 1.1.3** has been revised and a reference to establishing treatment infrastructure has been removed. There is anticipated Co-financing from the private sector that will support activities on recycling, but through the proposed concept we will provide policy standards, technical support on material feed and destinations, and training of workers and managers. We hope to facilitate the establishment of the public-private infrastructure for this type of work.
8. **Component 2** sets up private sector focused dialogues and mechanisms to act as a catalyzing incubator to stimulate business innovation and cooperation. This incubator ensures there is pre-competitive collaboration for a group of competing companies and value chain stakeholders to come together to develop a solution for the shared problem on plastic pollution, so that the involving companies would gain a competitive advantage. Industrial stakeholders can include plastic producers and importers, logistics and distribution companies, consumer goods companies (using plastics as packaging), innovation companies and start-ups for eco-design and new business models, retailers, business associations, waste collectors and recyclers, and waste importers and exporters. In this incubator, new technologies, solutions and, academic and community ideas can converge together to induce radical innovation, and industrial players can collectively reach common vision and targets through scalable actions to reduce plastic pollution. Examples of topics and activities carried out in the incubators can include:

- Share common understanding of the issues and identify key gaps for industrial players to address plastic pollution;
- Generate and share information and data on the types, applications, quantities, compositions, leakage and impacts of different packaging and plastics products at the city level;
- Exchange new ideas and solutions on alternative materials (such as seaweeds based materials), eco-design (such as refill bottles from Coca-Cola), new technologies (such as water purification system from Unilever), new business models (such as reuse model from Loop, or leasing system) to stimulate testing and adoption in the companies in the target cities, and prepare for scale-up rollouts.
- Provide a central place to SMEs, start-ups, micro business and innovation workshops to flourish and collaborate to develop new solutions;
- Enable the development of entrepreneurship and provide meaningful, safe and future jobs for designers, researchers, engineers and artists, especially for female experts and partners;

- Provide basic funding or connect with funding agencies to facilitate the development and implementation of new ideas and innovation;
  - Reflect the learning and successful cases to other stakeholders (such as policy makers, governments, NGOs, consumers and academic at city and national levels) to seek collaboration and support for scale-up actions.
9. **Component 1 brings together the governing bodies** it will feed into the larger **multi-stakeholder dialogues** that consists of public sector, private sector, NGOs and academia. The discussions held amongst the key stakeholders in the wider group will consider circularity along the entire life cycle. **Component 2 set up private sector focused dialogues** and mechanisms to ensure there is pre-competitive collaboration for a group of competing companies and value chain stakeholders to come together to develop a solution for the shared problem on plastic pollution, so that the involving companies would gain a competitive advantage. Industrial stakeholders can include plastic producers and importers, logistics and distribution companies, consumer goods companies (using plastics as packaging), innovation companies and start-ups for eco-design and new business models, retailers, business associations, waste collectors and recyclers, and waste importers and exporters. The **multi-stakeholder dialogues** will facilitate implementation of policies and other enabling conditions with all relevant stakeholders. While the **business dialogue** focuses on innovation within the private sector with the learning feeding into the multi-stakeholder dialogue, to ensure that business innovations align with the developed policy framework and instruments and, receives support from all stakeholders to facilitate the uptake of the developed business solutions by the private sector.
  10. Relevant language pertaining to the inclusion of plastic producers and importers and, waste importers and exporters has been added to the description of outcome 2, especially, output 2.1.4.
  11. Same as #10. Please refer to revised language in component 2. A further analysis will be carried out during PPG on who the key importers/exporters to engage with are.
  12. Yes, it refers to the targeted LAC cities in this project. This has been clarified in the text. Additional cities from Brazil and Honduras might be considered during PPG, for participation *inter alia* in component 3 (inter-city network).
  13. Output 4.1.5, A regional inter-city dialogue platform, is more of an actual web-based platform. This online space is to stimulate virtual debates, discussions, problem solving and communication. Webinars and virtual events will also be held through this platform. Therefore, we feel it is best suited within the knowledge management activities of component 4.

#### Agency Response – April 22nd, 2020

- a) Noting GEF Sec's clearance from an IW standpoint as per Question 3 dated 20 April, the ToC has been further refined (page 33) and a problem tree (page 21) has been added for clarity. The matching text is shown on page 20 for the Problem Tree and on page 32 for the Toc itself. The ToC will be further adjusted during the PPG as we formulate the FSP.
- b) It should be noted that the project intends to facilitate Jamaica's transition to a circular economy with pilots in two cities. For clarity, in response to the review sheet concerns, the text in the PIF has been strengthened accordingly. Please see the added paragraph on page 29 in the section introducing the project scope. Also note the added text in the coordination section 6 on page 53. Jamaica has a devolved governance system hence any national directive seamlessly translates/is applied automatically at city level. Jamaica is also quite advanced in tackling plastics through its trade and environment acts. They have initiated a plastic ban in January 2019 which is upgraded with new problem plastics every year. They have an advanced recycling programme. They view this project as a great opportunity (1) to advance their Plastic policies further and (2) to share their experience with the ISLANDS Program even though they are not part of it. They therefore appear like an ideal candidate to show transformation given that project will facilitate country's transition to a circular economy model learning from city experience allowing upscaling of the enabling environment for a circular economy from city to national level.

- c) The GEB for the Chemicals and Waste area will be evaluated during the PPG phase through a plastic waste characterisation. The project will contribute to Core Indicator 10 as improved plastic life cycle will reduce the portion of plastic waste ending up in landfill where they do burn. The PPG will evaluate the portion of plastics currently ending up in landfills and therefore emitting uPOPs, the gTEQ will be evaluated and compared with the NIP and NIP update data in the 3 countries. The text in section 6 has been adjusted accordingly.
- d) While it was in Section G, the PIF document is now also including the Taxonomy in Annex. The revised ToC is in the core text on page 33.
- e) The points to be addressed at PPG have been duly noted.

#### **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**

(Karrer, March 2020). No.

GRID-Arendal is noted as a significant source of co-financing; yet, they are not noted elsewhere in the PIF. Please clarify their role.

The co-financing ratio of 3:1 is low. In particular the government contributions is quite low (\$630K). We would expect a higher estimated contribution. We understand the COVID19 situation has made commitments difficult, but these are indicative amounts that do not require letters of commitment. Please investigate contributions from the national and city governments. These contributions are important to demonstrate commitment to address this issue during the course of the project and to ensure long-term efforts beyond the GEF funding.

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). No. Since there is no co-financing from PACE and GPAP at this time, please remove this row.

As COVID19 has limited discussions to secure government co-financing, the PPG phase will be a critical time to ensure higher government co-financing to demonstrate a commitment to the project and commitment to long-term efforts post-project.

(Karrer, April 23, 2020). Yes.

## Agency Response

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

GRID – Arendal will be a global partner similar to GPAP, PACE etc., especially, for component 3 and 4. Their relevant work has been added in the baseline section (especially covering the projects that provide parallel CF).

The government co-financing contributions have been increased by 300k. As noted in terms of COVID 19, it has been difficult to solicit numbers, however, in addition to the GPAP letter we have also managed to secure a support letter from PACE and further discussions with other stakeholders both in terms of collaboration to ensure sustainability and co-financing will be carried out during PPG. Collaboration with the ISLANDS programme inception will also help identify additional co-financing sources during the PPG.

Agency Response – April 22nd, 2020

PACE and GPAP have been removed from the co-financing table.

## 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

(Karrer, March 2020). No.

The funds exceed the GEF expectation of \$7M for the project.

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). No. Tables D and E need to break down the funding from CW. We recommend consulting with your CW colleagues for advice on this point.

(Karrer and Sookdeo, April 23, 2020). Yes.

**Agency Response**

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

Relevant budget adjustments have been made to all the tables including table D.

**Agency Response – April 22nd, 2020**

POPs has now been selected in the drop down menu in Table D&E.

**The STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA**

**Agency Response**

**The focal area allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, March 2020). No.

The funds exceed the GEF expectation of \$7M for the project split between IW and CW.

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). Yes.

**Agency Response**

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

Relevant budget adjustments have been made to all the tables including table D.  
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**

(Karrer, March 2020). Yes.

## **Agency Response**

### **Core indicators**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, March 2020). Yes.

The GEBs for marine litter is modest. Please note that CW indicators are not required even with the request for CW funding; however, there may be opportunities for CW benefits in indicator 10, reduction, avoidance of emissions of POPs to air from point and non-point sources, which the project may consider.

## **Agency Response**

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

The GEBs of avoiding 5,000 metric ton of marine litter has been captured, and a complementary indicator capturing the consequent emissions avoided in terms of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent of 3,000 metric tons has also been added. Assessment of the contribution to indicator 10 will be done during PPG at this stage, the proportion of chlorinated plastic ending up in landfill (with the risk of open-burning and emissions to dioxins and furans) vs ending up as marine litter.

Relevant language on alignment with objective 1 of the chemicals and waste strategy has been added in section 4.

Agency Response – April 22nd, 2020

The points to be further developed during PPG are duly noted.

### **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**

(Karrer, March 2020). Yes.

**Agency Response**

**Part 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**

(Karrer, March 2020). No.

For the MSW Management in LAC section, please include a comparison with Asia, particularly SEAsia, given it has the highest levels of marine plastic pollution.

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). Yes.

**Agency Response**

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

A table comparing MSW management between LAC and ASEAN countries has been added in the first section.

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, March 2020). Yes.

### **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**

(Karrer & Sookdeo, March 2020). Yes.

Comments to address are noted in #2 in Part I questions.

In addition please clarify the theory of change, specifically how the proposed activities lead to a circular plastics economy.

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). Yes.

### **Agency Response**

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

A revised theory of change has been uploaded in the roadmap section.

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, March 2020). No.

Please include information on alignment with CW given funding will come from IW and CW.

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). Yes.

## **Agency Response**

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

Relevant language capturing s has been added in Section 4.

The project is aligned with the GEF-7 Strategy for IW Objective 1 (Strengthening National Blue Economy Opportunities) through addressing pollution reduction in the marine environment. The project is also aligned with the GEF-7 Strategy for C&W program 1 on industrial chemicals that aims to support investments promoting circular economy approaches. Within program 1 and through tackling the Chemicals and Waste at end of life, the project will also ‘prevent waste/products containing persistent organic pollutants from entering material recovery supply chains (including e-waste management with the aim of preventing e-waste from entering solid waste). The project is also directly relevant to the Basel Convention Technical Guidelines on the Identification and Environmentally Sound Management of Plastic Wastes and their Disposal. It will contribute to the implementation of legally-binding framework for plastic waste of the Basel Convention (introduced in May 2019) in the LAC region, to ensure global and regional trade in plastic waste more transparent and better regulated, whilst also ensuring that its management is safer for human health and the environment.

**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**

(Karrer, March 2020). No.

The project is intended to benefit not only the Caribbean, but Latin America more broadly (i.e. South American mainland countries). The statement in the *Without the GEF Grant* section “Together, these isolated actions... in the Caribbean” implies you are focused on the Caribbean when we expect this project to benefit South American countries as well. Please revise to note Latin America and the Caribbean.

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). Yes.

## **Agency Response**

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

This section has been amended accordingly to clarify the above-mentioned comment.

**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**

(Karrer, March 2020). Yes.

However, during PPG please elaborate on the benefit of addressing plastics as a means to address unsustainable production and consumption more broadly. Addressing the lifecycle of plastics is an example of how to shift more broadly from a linear take-make-waste economy to a circular economy.

### **Agency Response**

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

Noted.

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, March 2020). Yes.

This project will play an important role in the region by bringing in the private sector with the public sector to address plastic pollution through a circular economy approach. New business innovations throughout the plastic life cycle from materials to design to consumer practices to recycling will also be addressed focused on eliminating problematic plastics, creating circular systems and innovating to address residual plastics. Further, the selected cities will be learning centers for scaling up in the region. The previous GEF comments stressed the importance of creating governance bodies and financial mechanisms, which will help ensure long-term sustainability of the project activities.

### **Agency Response**

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

Noted, additional language pertaining to this, especially on ensuring enhanced governance through inter-city networks, round-table discussions and strengthening inter-sectoral/inter-ministerial co-ordination committees etc., has been reflected in the sustainability section.

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). Yes.

### **Agency Response**

**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**

(Karrer, March 2020). No.

The Stakeholder section table is incomplete. It needs to be completed to note how each stakeholder group is expected to be engaged during PPG and also during the project. There are different roles for different types of stakeholders (govt, NGOs, community groups) for each city or at least by country, which need to be reflected in the table realizing this will be further fleshed out during PPG. It seems few have been consulted, which we understand is due to the short turnaround time for this PIF development and further hampered by COVID19. Please at least note in the column heading “Unless noted otherwise, this stakeholder group was not consulted during PIF development” so that it’s clear. Please ensure the relevant stakeholders noted in previous comments are included, including importers and related government agencies, associations and CSOs.

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). Yes.

### **Agency Response**

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

The stakeholder section has been updated to include additional stakeholders and to clarify their roles both at PPG and during execution. Yes, as noted, due to the current circumstances it wasn’t fully feasible to interact extensively with all stakeholders. However, it should be noted that initial contact was made, and extensive discussions have been conducted with global players such as GPAP and PACE.

**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**

(Karrer, March 2020). No.

The *Gender Equality*... section implies one city specific gender analysis will be conducted. Please clarify if the GAP planned will be for each city or overall.

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). Yes.

**Agency Response**

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

The GAP is intended for each city. The project will conduct city-specific gender analysis of the roles of women and men in the plastic production and waste management sectors within the first three months of the project start. During the PPG phase, a model for undertaking the assessment will be developed and tested in one city, this approach will be then rolled-out across all cities involved in this project at the start of project execution.

**Private Sector Engagement**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, March 2020). NO.

The *Private sector engagement* section suggests that the PPG consultations will only be with municipal governments. Please ensure discussions will also take place with the private sector, particularly associations. In addition to working with national companies, it is also important to work with foreign companies importing products to the 3 countries. Please discuss how national as well as foreign resident companies, such as those whose products are imported into the cities (e.g. Nestle, Coca-Cola), will be engaged. The project collaboration with GPAP and NPE Global Commitment initiative, which have ties to the large corporations, are important in

this regard. One of the advantages of this multi-city project with ties to GPAP and NPE is that together and through these initiatives the cities can discuss circularity concerns regarding products with these committed companies.

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). Yes. Private sector engagement is a priority during PPG planning.

## **Agency Response**

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

Private sector organisations (large industries, SMEs, informal sector, retailer, tourism, etc.) will be key partners at the city level for this project and the specific organisations and their roles will be confirmed in detailed discussions with the municipality authorities in each city during the PPG phase. By partnering with the Global commitment, the project will take advantage of its business network, which connects large global consumer goods producers and retailers that are operational in the LAC region and target cities of the project (e.g. Nestle, Coca-Cola). Global companies will be engaged where relevant in the industry roundtable and intercity network to be established under the project, and in the activities on piloting and scaling up upstream solutions. The nature of the partnerships with GPAP and PACE has also been added in this section. Please refer to the section on private sector engagement for detailed information.

## **Risks**

**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**

(Karrer, March 2020). Yes.

## **Agency Response**

**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

(Karrer and Sookdeo, March 2020). No.

With regard to the executing agency plans, please explain the relationship of the Cartagena Convention to UNEP. Please recall that GEF implementing agencies can not be executing agencies too, according to GEF policies.

Please see comment in Part I Components section which requests more attention to establishment of cross-sectoral governance bodies.

The plans for global coordination and knowledge sharing, which are under Output 4.1.6 , are focused on IWLEARN. While IWLEARN is an important means of sharing insights with GEF partners and projects, it is not enough for global engagement. There are several priority global initiatives that need to be engaged in this project.

Several global and regional initiatives are listed in the baseline information; however, they are not reference in the project framework suggesting they will not be part of the project. Please reconsider engaging these initiatives in both city-specific project activities as well as in knowledge sharing between the project activities and the work of these initiatives in other geographies. During PPG it is very important that discussions be held to determine how they could be engaged not only in sharing experiences globally but also to see how they might be part of the city specific actions. These global projects include in particular GPAP, which is working with GEF plastic projects in Ghana and Indonesia and planning to expand to Latin America. They are a key partner both for working with the project cities as well as for sharing experiences and resources need to be allocated to those plans. The GPAP ED has expressed interest in applying their plastic lifecycle analysis (GPAP in a Box) to one or more of the project cities. There are several other global organizations noted in the document under the *Global efforts* section, which need to be considered. Other key organizations that are missing from the document and need to be consulted for global sharing and/or working together Scale360, which is fostering innovations in cities by providing tools and resources, the WEF Consumers Beyond Disposability, which is rolling out refill systems such as Loop and may be interested to expand to Latin America, and Circulate Capital, which is expanding to Latin America.

Relatedly, the section *Global efforts to tackle plastic pollution* needs to note these global initiatives and the description of GPAP needs significant strengthening.

Regarding GEF projects in particular, the GEF is funding the ISLANDS program which covers the Caribbean, the Indian Ocean and the Pacific countries. This program takes a holistic approach to addressing materials and products in the SIDS that can lead to the buildup of harmful chemicals and waste in the environment, including plastics. This project does not mention either coordination of cooperation with ISLANDS which also has significant impact on the prevention of marine litter and the project proponents are requested to clarify why coordination with the ISLANDS program is not being considered or to include cooperation with the ISLANDS program.

The discussion of coordination also needs to consider regional initiatives. For example the Climate Technology Centre and Network is planning circular economy work in the region (see: <https://www.ctc-n.org/news/ctcn-latin-america-and-caribbean-establishing-regional-coalition-circular-economy>).

The section 6. *Coordination* is highly inconsistent in plans from the project framework. Under GEF coordination this section emphasizes IWLEARN and then notes collaboration with the Sustainable Cities, ASL and the LME projects which are not noted previously and frankly don't seem a priority. For this section and non-GEF projects, please rewrite to be consistent with project activities and the points noted above, such as noting EMF/NPE, Scale360, Circulate Capital and Consumers Beyond Disposability.

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). Yes.

During PPG please ensure coordination opportunities are pursued and mechanisms are established as noted above to ensure such coordination occurs during the project with the relevant GEF projects, including the ISLANDs, green chemistry, Indonesia plastics, and Ghana plastics projects, and the relevant global initiatives, including GPAP, New Plastic Economy, Scale360, Circulate Capital and Consumers Beyond Disposability.

## **Agency Response**

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

1. The Secretariat to the Cartagena Convention is a Regional Seas Body that is responsible for (1) ensuring synergies with the obligations of Regional Governments that are its Contracting Parties and (2) supporting the implementation of the Land-Based Sources of Marine Pollution (LBS) Protocol and the [Caribbean Regional Action Plan for Marine Litter \(RAPMaLI\)](#). This includes support for national and regional marine litter projects as well as promoting national policy and legal reforms. These activities are implemented through technical and high-level meetings, a dedicated webpage, social media platforms, the creation of information materials, development and implementation of solid waste and marine litter related projects and sharing of information on new grant opportunities. Like other Regional Seas bodies, such as the Coordinating Unit for the Mediterranean Action Plan (Secretariat to the Barcelona Convention and its Protocol) that executes the MedProgramme approved in GEF-6, the Secretariat to the Cartagena Convention is currently involved in the execution of several IW funded projects such as CReW+ and IWECO.

In sum, while administered through UNEP (that is using UNEP's administrative platforms), Regional Seas Programs under Convention are considered independent from UNEP given their separate governance mechanisms henceforth not considered as an internal execution model. Indeed, Regional Seas Programs hold periodic (yearly) COPs aka board or steering mechanism where priorities are decided and work progress is reviewed.

2. Noted, and addressed as detailed in the response to the initial comments.
3. In relation to coordination, the proposed concept always envisioned working closely with the leading global and regional efforts on the topic of circulatory especially when it comes to awareness raising and knowledge management. This will more specifically be achieved through output 3.1.2 where explicit references have been made to collaborate with GPAP, PACE, etc. In addition to the letter from GPAP, a support letter from PACE has been uploaded in the

roadmap section. The above-mentioned actors, such as Scale360, Consumers Beyond Disposability, circulate capital, and CTCN have been added in the coordination section as well as in the stakeholder table. References to liaise with innovative initiatives such “Loop” have also been added in the narrative.

4. Same as response #3, and as requested, the description of GPAP has been strengthened.
5. Reference to ensure coordination with the GEF Islands programme has been captured under the “Coordination with other GEF projects”.
6. As mentioned above, references to coordinate better with the non-GEF initiatives such as GPAP, circulate capital etc. has been articulated.

#### Agency Response – April 22nd, 2020

Points to be considered at PPG are duly noted.

#### **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**

(Karrer, March 2020). No.

The section *Country-level efforts*... provides a brief statement on the state of each country with regard to plastic plans. These statements need to clarify what governance bodies have been established to address plastics, which will be critical for collaboration.

The section *Rationale for the city-level*... needs to clarify the criteria for city selection. The expectation for each criteria needs to be clear. For example what does “population and density” mean – do you mean “population over X and density greater than Y”? The establishment of an inter-agency governance body to address plastic would also seem to be a useful criteria as well as indication of private sector commitment to addressing this issue (e.g. establishment of a private sector association to address plastics akin to PRAISE in Indonesia or GRIPE in Ghana).

In the same section the descriptions of each city need to explain the status of each city with regard to the criteria. Instead the descriptions provide information on the first two criteria (population and adjacency to water bodies), but not the other criteria which are tied to plastic consumption and pollution efforts as well as strategies and governance bodies.

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). Yes. As noted previously, during PPG the criteria for city selection will be articulated and additional cities considered.

## **Agency Response**

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

An additional table capturing the national/sub-national/city level action plans on waste management and marine litter with regards to the project cities and actors involved has been added to the baseline section. The rest will be addressed during PPG.

### **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**

(Karrer, March 2020). No.

Please see points under Part I, Components question comments and the relevant global initiatives in the Coordination section.

While this project is not expected to be integrated into the LMEs, the Caribbean and Pacific LMEs are important means of knowledge sharing and given they are part of IWLEARN should be relatively straightforward to orchestrate. Please include plans to do so in the component plans on KM in the PIF.

Please ensure section 8. *Knowledge Management* is consistent with the rest of the document with relevant global, regional and national partners.

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). Yes. During PPG please ensure the project is designed to share experiences and learn from relevant projects previously noted.

## **Agency Response**

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

References to coordinate and share lessons learned with the Regional Seas (including the ones that focus on both the Caribbean and the Pacific LMEs), the international initiatives such as GPAP, and with GEF Islands programme have been added to the KM section. Additional language regarding the Lima convention and the South-East Pacific Action plan was also added under the baseline section to appropriately show linkages to the work ongoing in the Pacific LMEs. Coordination with the CLME+ SAP project and other regional Caribbean LME efforts has already been captured throughout the document.

### Part 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

(Karrer, March 2020). No. Only Panama's LOE is provided and it is signed by the GEF Political Focal Point (see: [https://www.thegef.org/focal\\_points\\_list/P](https://www.thegef.org/focal_points_list/P)). It needs to be signed by the GEF Operational Focal Point.

(Karrer, April 15, 2020). No. The LOEs need to be resubmitted reflecting IW and CW funding.

(Karrer April 23, 2020). No. Expecting shortly.

(Karrer April 24, 2020). Yes.

#### Agency Response

Agency Response – April 10th, 2020

The remaining LOEs from Colombia and Jamaica, and an updated one from Panama has been added to the portal.

Agency Response – April 22nd, 2020

In view of the GEF Sec split funding request, a request has been made to countries for re-issuing new letters. To date we have received only Panama revised LoE . It is anticipated that both Colombia and Jamaica's new LoE will come in latest by 24 April 2020.

Agency Response - 24 April 2020

New letters of endorsement were obtained for all participating countries and uploaded into the 'Documents' section of the Portal.

**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**

**GEFSEC 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**

(Karrer, March 2020). No. Please see the previous points to be addressed.

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). No. Please see above points to be addressed.

(Karrer and Sookdeo, April 23, 2020). Yes .

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, April 20, 2020). Please see points related to PPG noted in comments.

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

Plastic pollution is indicative of global unsustainable production and consumption. Shifting from a take-make-waste linear economy to a closed loop circular economy is fundamental to the future of our economy, our society and our planet. Latin America with its expanding population and economic development is at a critical point to ensure the sustainability of its emerging economies, which includes ensuring sustainable production and consumption through such measures as mitigating plastic pollution.

This project is designed to catalyze action in the region by focusing on major cities in Panama, Jamaica and Colombia, which will demonstrate to the region and to the world the feasibility of mitigating plastic pollution. This project pursues circular solutions through government policies and regulations as well as private sector innovations. Public-private partnerships, including an incubator program, are critical to the success of this project. The emphasis on knowledge sharing of experience and expertise will ensure these insights foster further action throughout the region and globally through partnerships with the Global Plastic Action Partnership and other global initiatives.

The objective of this project is to reduce marine plastics and plastic pollution in Latin American and Caribbean cities through a circular economy approach. The project components focus on: 1) municipal governments enacting circular economy approaches to reduce plastic pollution; 2) private sector led interventions to strengthen markets for investments in innovative, scalable upstream actions, waste management and recycling solutions to reduce marine plastics and plastic pollution; 3) development of an inter-city plastics circular economy engagement network; and, 4) capacity development, visibility improvement, knowledge management, and communications.