



# Circular Solutions to Plastic Pollution in Peru

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11191

**Countries**

Peru

**Project Name**

Circular Solutions to Plastic Pollution in Peru

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

6/27/2024

**Review completed by PM**

11/15/2024

**Program Manager**

Evelyn Swain

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## CEO

### Part I - General Project Information

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please change Region from ?Peru? to ?LAC?

Please remove ?Mixed & Others? from Project Sector. CCM Only.

ES, 11/10/24: There are several Annexes (including the TORs) that are not part of the Project Document ? please include those Annexes that are relevant in the Project Document for the Council to have access to the relevant information.

Please select "public" when uploading the Project Document.

ES, 11/26/24: New project document uploaded. Comment addressed.

#### Agency Response

Agency response 17 October 2024

Country is included for all national projects. LAC has been added for region in CEO ER in road map. However, note that in the GEF portal only country or region can be included. The fields are not active and remain as per the concept stage.

This has been addressed

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1. As Biodiversity doesn't seem to be a Principal objective, please consider downgrading the Rio Marker used for Biodiversity from Principal to a lower marker.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

#### Agency Response

Agency response 17 October 2024

Biodiversity changed to Significant Objective

## 2. Project Summary.

- a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?
- b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?
- c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The summary is mostly background information and exceeds the word limit. Please redo the summary to focus on summary of the project, not the problem, and also remove the SDG info. Please include Core Indicator targets in the summary.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

## Agency Response

Agency response 17 October 2024

The summary was modified, and the 250-word limit was respected

## 3. Project Description Overview

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

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Project financing and co-financing to PMC are not proportional. Please revise. The co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC - if the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$57,374,152 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$2,868,707 instead of \$400,000 (which is 0.69%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

On gender: Please ensure that the outputs and activities developed in the GAP are also integrated into the project components, outcomes, and outputs. For example, guidelines and frameworks should be gender-responsive (Outputs 2.2.2 and 3.2.1); KM and communications products should feature good practices and lessons learned on gender mainstreaming, advancing gender equality and women's empowerment, and that these are widely disseminated. During project implementation, please ensure that the PIRs, the MTE and the TE include a review and reporting of the GAP and relevant gender dimensions of the project.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

## Agency Response

Agency response 17 October 2024

Co-financing has been distributed proportionally.

The gender perspective has been integrated across all project outputs, including but not limited to Outputs 2.2.2 and 3.2.1, ensuring they are gender-responsive. We also agree that during the project implementation, the reviews and reporting of the GAP, along with the relevant gender dimensions, will be addressed in the PIRs, MTE, and TE as suggested.

Gender mainstreaming has been integrated across all project results and outputs wherever technically possible.

Regarding output 2.2.2. in the guidelines for the design of beverage bottles and food packaging it has not been identify elements of gender-differentiated intervention, and therefore no specific indicator has been established. However, in the composition of the WG (as well as of the participants in training sessions and focus groups throughout the project), there is an indicator of participation of at least 40% women.

In output 3.2.1. it has been integrated a gender sensitive campaign as in the other outputs that will include the design of a promotional campaign and communication materials focused on target audiences.

The project includes a project communication and knowledge management strategy with a gender equality approach (inclusive language, examples, data), as well as to document lessons regarding gender and behavior change in the food and beverage sector.

We agree that during the project execution, the reviews and reporting of the GAP, along with the relevant gender dimensions, will be addressed in the PIRs, MTE, and TE as suggested. It is understood that the format of the reports includes specific sections for reporting gender aspects derived from the GAP.

#### 4. Project Outline

##### A. Project Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Encouraging to see the design, regulatory and data management / information system approach. As the project evolves, the scope for private sector engagement will increase beyond the supermarkets and into larger value chain initiatives. This needs to be considered.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

#### Agency Response

Agency response 17 October 2024

This has been considered and included in Output 1.1.2.

#### 5 B. Project Description

- 5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?
- b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?
- c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?
- d) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?
- e) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?
- f) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?
- g) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective

approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

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

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

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

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

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

**m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Component 4 on coordination with the global project should be strengthened. Please work with the lead agencies and use the google doc checklist.

Component 4 - This project should not budget towards IWLEARN. Engagement with IWLEARN is on a voluntary basis and mainly be done through the global project.

The Theory of Change and other figures are confusing because the title is below the figure. Please correct the figure labels.

The document includes ?World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)? what is this? Do you mean World Wildlife Fund?

Please label M&E as Component 5, as outcomes and outputs are labeled as such

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

#### Agency Response

Agency response 17 October 2024

- Coordination with the global project was already reflected in outputs 4.1.2, 4.2.2 and M&E output 3. Text has been adjusted to reflect standard text provided by the global project although changes are minor.

- Budget for contribution to IW:LEARN has been removed, although it is expected that reporting to the global project can also contribute to IW:LEARN.

- The necessary adjustments have been made to the Theory of Change and other figures, with the titles now correctly placed above the figures for clarity.

- It should be noted that the GEF Portal does not allow in the description table for M&E to be given a Component Number, which is why this was not done in the submitted version

## **5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project**

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**
- d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?**

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The EA is listed as ?World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)? what is this? Do you mean World Wildlife Fund?

Executing Entity name in the project information section is listed as World Wildlife Fund, Inc. (WWF) while under the Institutional arrangement section, it is World Wide Fund for Nature. Please correct Portal entry to make them match, and change Executing Type to GEF Agency if indeed World Wildlife Fund (WWF) is the executing entity for this project:

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

### Agency Response

Agency response 17 October 2024

Corrected in the CEO document and portal.

Appendix 5 (Implementation Arrangements) corrected.

## **5.3 Core indicators**

- a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?**
- b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional**

listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please explain how this project targets Core Indicator 7, as it is not a multi-country IW project with countries working together to improve the management of a shared water ecosystem.

ES, 11/10/24: Please include core indicator 7 and 7.3 as a target.

ES, 11/15/24: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Agency response 17 October 2024

Whilst Core Indicator 7 was included at the concept phase, it was agreed to remove it from the CEO documents.

Agency response 13 November 2024

Core indicator 7 has been reinserted and corresponds to the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem. The target for core sub-indicator 7.3 is 2 as it is expected that the Inter-ministerial Coordination mechanism dealing with plastic pollution will be operating during the first year of the project however but national and local reforms will only be at the preparation level by the end of the year (see outputs 2.2.4 and 3.2.1).

#### 5.4 Risks

- a) **Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) **Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) **Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The risk table is not filled out. Please add the risk table.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response

Agency response 17 October 2024

Risk table is in the CEO document and portal, so unclear why there is this comment.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

**7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

**7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

**7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

**8 Annexes**

**Annex A: Financing Tables**

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

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response  
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
While it is understood that PPG design experts are consultants, it is unclear the need of having National Coordinators for a national project on top of the PPG design experts. Please clarify.

ES, 11/10/24: Comments addressed

Agency Response  
**Agency response 17 October 2024 .**

The National Coordinator coordinated securing inputs from different national stakeholders and all consultations. The PPG design experts prepared the CEO ER documentation and annexes.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

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

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Outside the large public investment from MINAM, all co-financing is in-kind/recurrent expenditures. Please explain why there is no investment mobilized from the private sector for this project?

Please spell out acronyms in co-financing table.

Many of the co-financing letters on the GEF Portal show confusion between co-financing and parallel financing. For example, the letters from USAID Peru and MINAM specify parallel financing, instead of co-financing. Please note the distinction: Co-financing involves multiple financiers pooling resources for a single project, sharing risks, benefits, and responsibilities. Parallel Financing means multiple financiers contribute to the same project but manage separate components independently, without sharing risks or benefits. Kindly review and adjust Annex A's co-financing section and the related letters accordingly.

ES, 11/10/24: Please explain why investment mobilized co-financing from private sector was not secured during PPG and will only be potentially secured during inception. What is the specific plan for securing private sector co-financing?

There are still acronyms in the co-financing table. Please correct this.

Please revise investment mobilized field, which still notes parallel financing.

ES, 11/15/24: Comments addressed.

## Agency Response

### Agency response 17 October 2024

Private sector was engaged during the PPG phase and it is envisioned that investments and co-financing will be secured during the Inception Phase.

The acronyms in the co-financing table have been spelled out for clarity.

The USAID co-funding has been removed as it was indicated as parallel funding. CEO ER and Annex A have been updated accordingly.

### Agency response 13 November 2024

At inception, the identified private sector funding will shift from parallel financing to co-financing but for now the annual operating plans of these companies are still pending approval. Indeed, since the implementation of the GEF has not yet come into effect, it was challenging to secure co-financing from the private sector. Companies usually manage their budgets through annual plans that

must be approved by their boards of directors. This timing misalignment prevented the consolidation of co-financing during the PPG phase. However, we have observed genuine interest from the private sector in meetings held during the PPG, with a clear willingness to incorporate project-related activities into their annual plans. This inclination is expected to materialize in the project's start-up phase, when it will be more feasible to align their annual budgets with the project's activities.

In terms of a plan to ensure private sector co-financing, please note that currently, there is an active commitment with the private sector through the National Plastic Action Platform (NPAP), which will serve as the main link for involving them in the project. Through NPAP, efforts to engage with private companies will be strengthened.

Moreover, GEF implementation includes the promotion of Clean Production Agreements (APL), under which the Ministry of the Environment recognizes private companies that implement actions fostering circular economy processes, facilitating their integration into the companies' operational activities.

Additionally, the proposed Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) framework includes mandatory activities for the private sector, especially in areas such as awareness-raising and eco-design, which are directly aligned with the objectives of our project. This synergy will facilitate private sector participation as co-financers, as these activities already meet their regulatory commitments and further strengthen the GEF's objectives.

All acronyms in the co-financing table are spelled out. REICLAME and Grupo GEA are not acronyms but the NGO's names. MINAM's parallel financing's has been renamed as investment mobilized.

#### **Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:**

**Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

#### **Agency Response**

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

## Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

## Agency Response

### Annex C: Project Results Framework

**8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?**

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

**c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?**

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

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

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

CI have been included but Core Indicator 7 is not included under objective level indicators.

Please revise. But please more strongly justify targeting CI7, as targeting this CI requires shared interventions in shared water ecosystems.

ES, 11/10/24: Please add core indicator 7 and 7.3.

ES, 11/15/24: Comment addressed.

## Agency Response

Agency response 17 October 2024

Core Indicator 7 has been removed throughout

### Annex E: Project map and coordinates

**8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?**

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Map is missing. Please provide.

ES, 11/10/24: Comment addressed.

Agency Response Maps are included in Annex E. GEF to confirm why they are no visible  
**Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating**  
**8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

**Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?**

**b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?**

**c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Comms, KM and data management staff and stakeholder engagement, capacity building and private sector staff and other staff have lines but no funding. Are these positions funded? If not, please remove lines.

A project manager cannot manage the project with only \$10,080 over four years. The PMC contribution to senior project management must be much higher.

\$70,416 is allocated to ?operating costs? under PMC. What are these costs? This is likely an ineligible PMC expenditure.

What is ?office premises?? Does this refer to rents? Why are these costs not absorbed through co-financing?

What is ?Other project consultants/experts? under M&E? What are the tasks assigned to these experts?

There are financial mechanism and sustainable financing expert and circular economy expert lines that are not populated in the budget table. Are these expected roles or should these lines be removed?

Is \$124,000 for travel to global project meetings an appropriate/good use of project resources? This seems excessive.

Cumulative travel of \$120,000 per year x 4 (\$475,000) seems excessive. Why are these costs necessary?

ES, 11/10/24: Not addresses. Please explain in the agency comments.

What is ?commercial contract company services for \$537,000? Are these costs justified?

Please explain \$460,000 for materials. What are these and are the costs justified?

ES, 11/10/24: Not addresses. Please explain in the agency comments.

The TORs do not match the positions listed in the budget table. Please revise. Technical Officer, Behavior Change Officer not listed.

ES, 11/10/24: Not addressed

National Project Coordinator / Senior Technical Advisor is being charged to both project components and PMC, should be 100% charged to PMC.

Please clarify what ?Technical and Scientific Staff? (US\$ 336,000) and ?Commercial Contract Company Services? entail to determine the eligibility.

Unspecified ?Other Operating Costs? (US\$ 70,416) is not an eligible category ? please ask the Agency to remove this category.

ES, 11/10/24

National Coordinator salary allocated to PMC over four years is still only \$50,400, which is less than the admin staff position. Can the National Coordinator actually fulfil the roles and responsibilities of a project manager at \$12,600 per year of the project? Please explain, as nearly all ToR responsibilities for this position are managerial.

The ?Operating Cost? has been reduced to \$46,000. Please explain why these ?Operating Costs? relating to the WWF Peru office (utilities, security) are not being provided through co-financing. ?Operating Cost? is not an eligible category. Please remove this line item from the budget.

"Office premises" is still not clear. Does this refer to office space and conference room facilities at the WWF Peru office? Please explain why co-financing is not covering these costs.

ES, 11/18/24:

?Following the IA?s budget categories, the positions of Technical Officer and Behavior Change Officer mentioned in the Terms of Reference are included under the Technical and Scientific Staff category in the budget table..?

When reviewing the TORs (see attached document), we observe the uniqueness of the deliverables for the Behavior Change Officer. However, those deliverables of the Technical Officer (US\$ 168,000) aim to help the National Project Coordinator / Senior Technical Advisor to do his/her job. We don?t see the added value of this position, when already exists an Administrative Assistant that is helping the National Project Coordinator / Senior Technical Advisor with duties pertaining the management of the project. Please ask the Agency to revise the need of having a Technical Officer. With this comment we aim for a reasonable use of GEF resources, avoiding duplications, looking for efficiencies (one position working in different issues ? delivering multiple deliverables, etc.).

ES, 11/26/24: The budget has been updated. Comment addressed.

Agency Response

## Agency response 17 October 2024

1. Standardized template was used for all UNEP child projects, therefore blank rows appear when not used.

**Gender, and M&E** are reflected as Part-time Experts under Consultants; they are GEF funded.

One **Communication** and one KM expert are also consultants and under ?Other project consultants/experts? inline with the ToR show in Appendix 3 E

Budget format adjusted.

2. The budget has been revised and it should be noted that the cost is spread across all components as he/she is also responsible for technical inputs.

The technical input to the different components is reflect in the TOR Appendix 3E.

3. The budget has been revised to clarify that this relates to WWF Peru office direct cost of utilities, water electricity security and software.

4. This relates to Office space, and conference room facilities for high end technical/policy meetings with ministerial representatives.

5. This is for a consultant(s) for the data gathering to report on the measurement of project outcome indicators and GEF Core indicators for the inception, mid-term and final reporting of GEBs.

6. This was due to the standard template for all UNEP projects and these lines have now been removed.

7. International travel to exchange experience and present knowledge in meetings organised by the Global Project or international events and fora. Two trips per year. Six-days trip (two days for travel). Cost per person = USD3,000/ticket + 6 days x 300 DSA/day + 300 various expenses (e.g., visa). Particular attention will be given to motivate the participation of women delegates (Gender)

International travel of PMU members and partners to participate in annual meetings of the Global Project. 5 persons per trip.

8. All travel and reference to activities are reflected in in the road map attachment for BL 1601

9. All service companies and actual services for the specific activities are reflected in the road map attachment for BL 2301

10. All planned materials for specific activities are reflected in in the road map attachment for BL 4102

11. The Budget line technical and scientific staff includes two staff positions: Behavior Change Officer and the Technical Officer, together summing up 336,000 USD, reflected in ToR Appendix 3E.

12. As clarified above: The technical and scientific staff are a Behaviour change Officer and a technical officer USD 168,000 each.

As clarified above: ?Commercial Contract Company Services? listed and explained in BL 2301.

13. This comment is repeated, explained above and has been removed

#### Agency response 13 November 2024

Building on the responses to points 7, 10 above and the attachment added to the road map, please note the below additional breakdown/explanations.

1. **The travel budget** is justified by the fact that the project will be implemented in three target cities: San Mart?n de Porres, Cayma, and Tarapoto. Since San Mart?n de Porres is located in Lima, for the other two cities, it will be necessary to travel from Lima to the implementation city (Cayma and Tarapoto). These travel costs cover the need for frequent trips and accommodation for teams in these cities to supervise, implement and evaluate specific activities at each location.

For Travel of Staff on Official Business under Component 1: Stimulate circularity, reduction, and reuse of single-use plastics, a total of 48 trips per city (Cayma and Tarapoto) are planned for three people per trip, resulting in a total of 288 trips, plus 17 trips under components 4 and 5 for the project team along with stakeholders identified during implementation. Each trip has been detailed with an approximate calculation of travel and DSA costs.

Additionally, the budget includes travel for 5 PMU members and partners to participate in the annual meetings of the Global Project, as well as international travels for experience exchange and knowledge presentation at meetings organized by the Global Project or at international events and forums.

2. The amount of \$460,000 is justified by the need to fund essential materials for the pilot programs in the three prioritized cities and communication campaigns (e.g., infographics, videos, newsletters, audiovisual material, among others) aligned with the project objectives.

This amount is distributed as follows: 46% is allocated to materials for the pilots in San Mart?n, Tarapoto, and Cayma; 39% is assigned to communication materials on EPR, results on the SIGERSOL platform, and campaigns on reducing the use of plastic bags; the remaining 15% is dedicated to materials and actions to implement the project?s communication strategy.

3. Following the IA's budget categories, the positions of Technical Officer and Behavior Change Officer mentioned in the Terms of Reference are included under the Technical and Scientific Staff category in the budget table.
4. The salary of the National Coordinator is distributed as follows: 25% is allocated to Project Management Costs (PMC), while the remaining 75% is charged to each of the project components based on the months of implementation. This results in a total annual budget of \$50,400 and a grand total of \$201,600 for the four years of the project. The reason for distributing the amount in this way, rather than assigning it entirely to PMC, is that the person in this position is not exclusively dedicated to project management. The National Coordinator also contributes his/her expertise to other project components, as detailed in Appendix 3E of the Terms of Reference for key project staff.

**Agency response 20 November 2024**

In response to the request for further clarification dated 18 November, please note the following points.

1. Appendix 3e with the TORs has been adjusted and strictly contains TORs for project Personnel as per the GEF policy which are summarized as follows. As described in the chapeau of Appendix 3E, the posts labelling is standardized across all CPs and was reflected as such in the budget template provided to each CP. The TORs however provide detailed explanation on the nature of the jobs.

<b>Expenditure Category</b>	<b>Detailed Description (as per budget)</b>	<b>Posts as per TORs</b>	<b>Total budget (USD)</b>
Administrative Support	Admin / Finance Support Staff	Administration/ Finance Assistant	74,235
Project Personnel	National Project Coordinator / Senior Technical Advisor	National Project Coordinator / Senior Technical Advisor	201,600
Project Personnel	Technical and scientific staff	Plastics and private sector engagement Specialist	168,000
		Behaviour change officer	168,000

2. Consequently, the National Project Coordinator / Senior Technical Advisor (NPC) will be strictly responsible for the overall management of the project, including the mobilisation of all project inputs and supervision over project staff, consultants, and contractors and service providers. This person will direct the Project Management Unit and will execute the daily tasks following directions by the Project Steering Committee, to ensure that the project generates the outputs and outcomes set in the CEO ER. While the NPC will need to have technical expertise in plastic matters in addition to his project management expertise, the project will require specific

expertise on plastics and private sector engagement and, on behavior change. As highlighted in the ToRs of those 2 specialists, the nature of the expertise provided is very specific and one cannot pretend to find a single person who could act as Project Coordinator, be a behavior change specialist and a private sector one too. The posts were thus kept as such.

3. 3. The Admin/Finance support staff typically provides administrative, logistic, and financial support for project execution but is not a technical expert. We therefore reckon that the 4 posts as highlighted in the summary table above and described in Appendix 3E are required to ensure successful project execution.
4. 4. All TORs were however refined and cleaned from inconsistencies and a new Appendix 3E can be found in the road map.



#### **Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes**

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

**Additional Annexes**

**9. GEFSEC DECISION**

**9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the project recommended for approval**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Not at this time. Some issues remain.

ES, 11/10/24: Not at this time. Some issues remain.

ES, 11/18/24: Not at this time. There are comments remaining.

ES, 11/26/24: Comments addressed. CEO Endorsement recommended.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

### 9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>	<b>8/20/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/15/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/18/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/26/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		