

TERMINAL EVALUATION

Project ID:	9681
Project Name:	Addressing Marine Plastics - A Systemic Approach
Countr(ies):	Global
Implementing Agency:	UNEP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW	3
A. Description	3
B. Key Dates	3
C. Disbursements	4
II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES	4
A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings	4
B. Stakeholder Engagement	5
C. Gender Equality	6
D. Knowledge Management	6
III. CORE INDICATORS	7
IV: CO FINANCING	8
V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS	9
VI. ANNEX	9

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name

Addressing Marine Plastics - A Systemic Approach

Country

Global

GEF ID

9681

Implementing Agency

UNEP

Executing Entity

Ellen MacArthur Foundation (EMF)

Ocean Conservancy (OC), UN Environment through its Global Partnership on Marine Litter (GPML) and its Responsible Industry and Value Chain (RIVU) Unit within its Sustainable Lifestyles, Cities and Industry (SLCI) Branch.

Trust Fund

GET

Project Type

MSP

Objective

The project aims to capitalize on a growing baseline of knowledge on marine plastics sources, pathways and environmental impacts to inform the development of the GEF 7 Strategy and the application of a systemic approach to global plastic issues

B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval

6/1/2017

Agency Approval

10/23/2017

Implementation Start

10/23/2017

First Disbursement

11/1/2017

Expected MTR

MTR Submission

5/15/2025

Actual MTR

Expected Completion

7/31/2020

Actual Completion

7/31/2020

Actual TE

6/28/2024

TE Submission

5/15/2025

Final Disbursement

C. Disbursements

Project Financing 2,190,000.00	Cumulative Disbursement 1,778,669.00
-----------------------------------	---

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings

The project is strongly aligned with the subprogrammes and Expected Accomplishments of UNEP 2014-2017 Medium Term Strategy and biennial Programme of Work 2016-2017 (specifically subprogramme 3 on Ecosystem management; subprogramme 4 on Environmental governance; and subprogramme 5 on Chemicals and waste). In addition, it explicitly supports the United Nations Environment Assembly Resolutions on marine plastic litter and microplastics. Further, the project is consistent with GEF 6 International Waters Strategy Objective 3 (specifically reducing pollution of coasts and large marine ecosystems) and its Strategic Program 6 (Preventing the loss and degradation of coastal habitats). The project is fully aligned with Sustainable Development Goal 14, specifically the Target ‘Reduce Marine Pollution’. Both marine debris and improved waste management are relevant to priorities for APEC economies including the three participating countries. 6. Project design strengths include its flexibility; an adequate problem and situation analysis; a comprehensive results framework; appropriate governance and supervision arrangements; capitalizing on the work and expertise of partner agencies; and engagement of key stakeholders across the entire plastic value chain. On the other hand, weaknesses in the original design include its complexity with three independent technical components and many diverse outputs for the short duration and limited budget; non-alignment of several outputs and outcomes with UNEP’s definition; lack of assumptions and impact drivers in the theory of change; cursory consideration of gender/minority/vulnerable groups; and no time and budget allocation for a synthesis phase to produce a roadmap, which was critical to attainment of the project objective. 7. The project achieved all the planned outputs and outcomes and exceeded expectations with over 90% of end-of-project targets exceeded/fully achieved. Among the notable achievements are the mobilization of unprecedented levels of commitment from stakeholders across the plastics value chain to the New Global Plastics Commitment with its time-bound targets; a public-private sector blended finance partnership and Ocean Fund with more than USD 100 million for financing of waste management and circular economy start-ups in South and Southeast Asia; strategic recommendations and innovative solutions; and strengthened knowledge including on the role of gender in waste management in India, Indonesia, The Philippines, and Vietnam. The component results provided the building blocks for a strategic roadmap—Addressing Marine Plastics - A Roadmap to a Circular Economy— to be used by the GEF, UNEP, and others in prioritizing their investments and interventions to address marine plastics. This attests to the successful attainment of the project’s ultimate objective. 8. Although significant effort was required to build a true partnership among the project partners, the project effectively capitalized on their work and expertise, enhancing efficiency. While the project was completed within budget, three budget revisions were necessary due to factors such as a slow start up phase (preparation and readiness), necessary modifications to the results framework and retrofitting of workplans, and the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite time saving measures implemented by the Project Coordinating Unit, two no-cost extensions were unavoidable. 9. Monitoring and reporting of project implementation were fully compliant with UNEP and GEF requirements. Nevertheless, the study noted some areas that could be improved such as reporting of the end-of-project targets only for outcomes but not for outputs; reporting of expenditures according to UNEP budget line rather than by outputs; and unavailability of official reports of

some of the Project Steering Committee/Component Leaders meetings. 10. The project established a strong foundation for socio-political sustainability particularly through endorsement of the Global Plastics Commitment by countries, the private sector, and other stakeholders along the plastics value chain. However, some signatories have fallen short of meeting the Commitment targets, jeopardizing socio-political sustainability. GEF, private sector, and others have committed substantial financial resources to addressing marine plastics, enhancing financial sustainability. There is strong institutional support by GEF, UNEP, and the executing partners for building on and sustaining the project results. The study identified three causal pathways towards the intermediate states and the long-term impact, with impact drivers generally in place and assumptions partially holding. 11. Factors such as the high quality of management and supervision by UNEP and the executing partners as well as effective stakeholder engagement and communication also contributed to the project's overall good performance.

B. Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder participation and cooperation were central to the project design. The three technical project Components engaged extensively with stakeholders across the plastics value chain, a requisite in delivering systemic solutions for marine plastics. UNEP was mainly responsible for the government-side of the Global Commitment (onboarding of and annual reporting by government signatories while EMF (through its NPEC) mobilized businesses including global brands and OC engaged with CSOs, local leaders and APEC governments. Component 1 with its Global Plastics Declaration; Component 2 with APEC, G7 and Joint Investment Venture; Component 3 with GPA/GPML networks and technical consultation workshops, are testaments of substantial and effective stakeholder engagement in forging inclusive and systemic solutions and actions to address marine plastics.

Through a blended finance partnership, USAID will provide up to a \$35 million, 50% loanportfolio guarantee through the Development Credit Authority to incentivize private capital investment and new business development in the recycling value chain in the region. The public sector support from the USAID partnership enhances the private sector support that Circulate Capital has received and which amounts to more than \$100 million from global brands including PepsiCo, Procter & Gamble, Danone, Unilever and Coca-Cola Co.

Stakeholder participation and cooperation was instrumental in the successful delivery of several of the project's outputs and outcomes. For example, establishment of a global Alliance of major plastic-producing and plastic-using corporations as well as governments and others, overwhelming endorsement of the Global Plastics Commitment, and more than 12 meetings with policy makers with a report summarising the policy/public-private engagement efforts, lessons and recommendations for policy makers and other stakeholders (Component 1); a blended finance partnership between USAID and Circulate Capital; engagement of national, regional and global stakeholders (APEC countries, NGOs, CSOs, G7 and G20 members) to develop recommendations and conduct assessments, and engagement of global corporations such as PepsiCo, Procter & Gamble, Unilever and Coca-Cola Co, which helped to leverage significant investments to reduce ocean plastic pollution (Component 2). Component 3 benefited from baseline information on marine plastics analyzed and collected by UNEP's GPA and GPML as well as its North America Office.

In other cases, stakeholder engagement included the participation of technical personnel and scientists at workshops, for example, multi-stakeholder consultation workshops convened in 2018 and 2019 by UNEP Economy Division to develop the Roadmap (Component 3), and dialogue workshops with leading researchers in the marine debris field (Component 4). Rating for Stakeholder Participation and Cooperation: Highly Satisfactory

C. Gender Equality

The ProDoc includes completed ESS checklists (as Appendices) for Indonesia, the Philippines, Vietnam as well as the project level. Questions and responses in the ESS checklist that are relevant to this criterion include:

- Does the project respect internationally proclaimed human rights including dignity, cultural property and uniqueness and rights of indigenous people? Response: Yes, In exploring dimensions of waste management sector reform, the project will consider human rights, labour rights and gender dimensions of waste pickers and their role in a reorganized sector;
- Will the project cause disproportionate impact to women or other disadvantaged or vulnerable groups? Response: No, It is the hypothesis of this project that improvements to waste management infrastructure will ultimately improve outcomes for women and other vulnerable groups, but it is a dimension that we will explore in further detail through one of our project outputs.

OC conducted a significant study on the role of gender in waste management in selected APEC countries (Component 2, Output 2.1.1). The study⁵⁰ provides important insights into the role of women and men along the waste value chain, their perceptions and functions, and resulting social and economic impacts. Moreover, it shows that engaging women in South and Southeast Asia may be critical in reducing mismanaged plastic waste in the region - a key contributor to the ocean plastic crisis. In addition, the Surabaya (Indonesia) Women's local waste collection, sorting and recycling communities were recipients of Circulate Capital investment funds. The project also looked at implications to waste pickers in the context of waste management sector reform and made recommendations for ensuring that any such reforms support their livelihoods.

The gender study is referenced in the Roadmap, which states that 'In developing countries where over half of the world's plastic waste originate, a large portion of the recovery and recycling of plastic waste are done by waste pickers, sorters and community-based recycling enterprises without formal oversight for just compensation or environmental protection. Formal recognition and full support of this labor sector, including promotion of gender parity, are essential in improving waste-based livelihoods and reducing leakage of plastics in developing economies and globally.' In addition, the Roadmap includes the following Key Action: 'Develop and implement policy to incentivize the organization of informal waste collectors and sorters that can operate with independent financing with fair wage and thus not vulnerable to unscrupulous middlemen waste collectors.' Other than the above statements, the Roadmap does not explicitly address gender or human rights issues, or provide any insights on socio/economic or cultural impacts in developing countries. It is important that GEF and UNEP encourage explicit activities related to gender/minority/disadvantaged/vulnerable groups in the development of marine plastics projects.

No information was available to the desk study on the application of a 'Gender Score' during review of the project design within UNEP, nor on the participation of women in the execution of project activities. The relevant category for the Gender Scoring is: 1: gender partially mainstreamed: Gender is reflected in the context, implementation, logframe, or the budget. Gender is mentioned in the ProDoc including in relation to the study on the role of gender under Component 2, and as mentioned above, in the ESS checklists. Progress reporting did not disaggregate data according to gender. Rating for Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equality: Moderately Satisfactory

D. Knowledge Management

The project results framework consisted of four components comprised of six outcomes and 17 outputs. Of the latter, 15 are considered by the desk study to be technical outputs and are the focus of this section. The two non-technical outputs are the communications strategy (Output 4.1.2) and Effective coordination and monitoring and reporting (Output 4.2.3). The assessment of Effectiveness is based on a review of the quarterly progress reports, the annual PIRs, the final project synthesis report and PSC meeting reports as well as other project documentation including the technical reports produced. Particular attention was paid to the level of achievement of the end of project (EoP) targets as described in the results framework. The study noted that progress towards the EoP targets is reported only for the outcomes in the PIRs, but not for the outputs. Further, within each Component many of the EoP targets for the outcomes and outputs are similar (i.e., a general compilation of the outputs EoP targets for outcomes). (See Section 5.7 on Monitoring and Reporting)

A review of the level of achievement of the EoP targets under each component and at the project level is presented in Figure 4 and in Annex V. According to the 2020 PIR and final project report, all the planned outputs were 100% completed. Based on the analysis conducted by this study, of the total of 43 EoP targets, 65% have been fully achieved, 26% exceeded, 7% partially achieved, and 2% (one target) not explicitly reported and unable to be verified by the study (one Output 2.1.4 target - % companies engaged actively considering mechanisms to reduce marine plastics). Most of the technical outputs were produced using bottom-up approaches via workshops and multi-stakeholder meetings convened by Components 1, 2, and 3. For Components 1 (EMF), 2 (OC) and 3 (UNEP Economy Division), the outputs included technical/ workshop reports and journal publications, a plastics declaration, and a blended finance partnership as well as pioneer projects. The review process for the technical/ workshop reports was coordinated by each EA using their own respective networks (since the published outputs were multi-funded), while the journal publications went through the conventional review process. The PCU was involved in editing/ reviewing formally the following component outputs prior to their release: OC report on The Role of Gender in Waste Management (as requested by OC); Component 3 Workshop Reports (February 2018, January-February 2019) and the Strategic Roadmap (led by Component 3 and co-facilitated by the PCU). The development of the Roadmap had a bottom-up approach across all Components, based on workshops held in October 2018 and January 2019. It was finalized in May 2020 after all the deliverables were completed. No further review was conducted as the technical portion of the project was completed by June. The Roadmap was circulated to invitees to the webinar held in November 2020, but no impact statistics were collected post-webinar.

The technical products consisting of reports and publications are available on the project website (https://gefmarineplastics.org/publication_list_by_project_component). The Roadmap is also available on UNEP's and GRIDA websites. Based on feedback from project personnel interviewed and the study's assessment, the quality of the technical reports is deemed high.

III. Core Indicators

Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female				0
Male				0
Total	0	0	0	0

IV: Co Financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Anticipated at CEO(\$)	Materialized at MTR(\$)	Materialized at TE(\$)
GEF Agency	UN Environment Economy Division	In-kind		700,000.00		
GEF Agency	UN Environment Global Programme of Action (GPA)	In-kind		630,000.00		
GEF Agency	UN Environment North America Office	In-kind		151,500.00		
Other	Ocean Conservancy	In-kind		5,047,030.00		
Other	Ellen MacArthur Foundation	Grant		3,624,515.00		
Other	National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)	Grant		400,000.00		
Other	Recycling and EDI of South Africa	Grant		150,000.00		
GEF Agency	World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	In-kind		109,600.00		
Other	Consumer Goods Forum (CFG)	Grant		120,000.00		
Total Co-financing				10,932,645.00	0.00	0.00

Comments

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
			Low

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category	Title
M and E Document	9681_2024_te_unep_gef_sphpe_sphpeg_spcwaq_Marine Plastics (1)