



# Circular Solutions to Plastic Pollution: Global Platform

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11197

**Countries**

Global

**Project Name**

Circular Solutions to Plastic Pollution: Global Platform

**Agencies**

UNEP, WWF-US

**Date received by PM**

5/23/2024

**Review completed by PM**

6/26/2024

**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 spell out CDP.

ES, 7/16/24: Comment Cleared

#### Agency Response

Agency Response 12 July 2024

CDP is the organization's full name. The letters are not an acronym and therefore cannot be spelled out. Please see this explanation for CDP's website:

#### Why 'CDP'?

CDP was established as the 'Carbon Disclosure Project' in 2000, asking companies to disclose their climate impact. Since then, we have broadened the scope of environmental disclosure, to incorporate deforestation and water security, while also building our reach to support cities, states and regions. By shortening our name to 'CDP' (in 2013) we have been able to both preserve the global brand we were known for and address the necessity of understanding wider environmental impact.

<https://www.cdp.net/en/info/about-us>

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
Rio markers are not filled out.

ES, 7/16/24: Comment cleared.

#### Agency Response

Agency Response 12 July 2024

The markers were filled out. We had not check a contribution to these in the Global Project, to align with GEBs, but the national projects will indicate contributions.

Rio Markers		
- Climate Change Mitigation		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Contribution (0) <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Objective (1) <input type="checkbox"/> Principal Objective (2)
- Climate Change Adaptation		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Contribution (0) <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Objective (1) <input type="checkbox"/> Principal Objective (2)
- Biodiversity		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Contribution (0) <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Objective (1) <input type="checkbox"/> Principal Objective (2)
- Land Degradation		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Contribution (0) <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Objective (1) <input type="checkbox"/> Principal Objective (2)

**Rio Markers**

**Climate Change Mitigation\***

No Contribution 0

**Climate Change Adaptation\***

No Contribution 0

**Biodiversity\***

No Contribution 0

**Land Degradation\***

No Contribution 0

**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 project summary (and all of the sections) exceeds the word limit and is very lengthy on the background information.

What is the GPML mentioned in the project summary? It is the only time that this organization is mentioned. Why is this organization highlighted?

Access to financing is missing in the project summary.

Overall the summary should be strengthened to better explain the project and focus less on background information.

ES, 7/16/24: The project summary have been adjusted. Comment cleared.

### Agency Response

Agency Response 12 July 2024

The project summary in the CEO ER has been shortened and refocused on the program and global project, removing background information. A mention of financing has been added. The reference to GPML has been removed.

#### 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

The project components are missing how they will link to the technical advisory committee and technical working groups. The Private sector collaboration group link is somewhat explained in the components.

Please clarify if output 1.1.5 will only consider alternative materials or also alternative practices and technologies that can replace the functions of plastic.

ES, 7/16/24: Comments addressed.

### Agency Response

Agency Response 15 July 2024

The relationship between the project components and the advisory committee and technical working groups has been further explained, with text added on pages 22, 29, and 41. The Private sector collaboration group link to the components has also been strengthened (page 41).

The advisory committee will bring together trusted external voices as well as representatives from within the Program's working groups, to facilitate sharing and collaboration on challenges and successes with the Steering Committee. Working group leads will participate in the advisory committee to ensure flow of information all the way from the steering committee into each working group and its relevant project component. This will facilitate collaboration and issue resolution, and ensure there is a designated time and place for leads working across topics and components in the IP to connect with each other and also access key external expertise.

Output 1.1.5 is specifically about alternative materials, as this is a complex topic that is indicated as priority by many National Projects and requires dedicated support. This is addressing the upstream 'substitution' intervention for plastic pollution. Alternative practices are important as well, and are addressed in the project through other outputs, including the policy (including incentives), finance, private sector engagement, and reuse outputs (1.1.4, 1.1.6, 1.1.7, 1.2.1, and 2.2.1).

#### **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

Please remove speculation about the endorsement of the legally binding treaty (page 15 should be "if" not "once").

ES, 7/16/24: Comment addressed.

#### Agency Response

Agency Response 15 July 2024

"once" was replaced by "if" about the endorsement of the legally binding treaty (p.14).

##### **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

The theory of change and project description is well elaborated. Communications and KM is a key aspect of this program and is well developed.

#### Gender comments:

●As per GEF guidance, please ensure that the outputs and activities developed in the gender action plan are also integrated in the project components, outcomes and outputs. In this regard, the Agency is requested to:

(i) all KM and communications products feature good practices and lessons learned on gender mainstreaming/women's empowerment, in Outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 3.1.1, 3.2.1, 3.2.2

(ii) it addresses how the projects will tackle financial illiteracy, especially among women, and how activities will support and train women and women-led organizations in this regard, in Output 2.2.1.

●under M&E, gender dimension are integrated, monitored and reported on, and the gender action plan is accordingly budgeted.

ES, 7/16/24: Comments addressed.

#### Agency Response

Agency Response 15 July 2024

The gender comments were addressed. Please note changes in highlighted text in section B ?Child Project Description?, under the respective components (p.22, 27, 28, and 30) .

Attachment 5a in Appendix 5 has been updated to cross-link to these references.

#### 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 Institutional arrangements and are well elaborated. There is a good description of coordination with ongoing projects and other IPs.

#### Agency Response

Agency Response 01 July 2024

Noted.

#### 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 LDCE and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

#### Agency Response

#### 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 Yes.

Agency Response

**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 Request NA

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 Request Yes, the program is well aligned with the GEF-8 FAs and programming directions.

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 Request Yes.

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 Request Yes, the links to the GBF are well elaborated.

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 RequestYes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

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 RequestYes.

Agency Response

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

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

Please report in detail using the eligible categories included in Guidelines.

ES, 7/16/24: PPG modified. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

**Agency Response 15 July 2024**

Annex D (p.66) was further refined providing a greater cost breakdown on the PPG use.

**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 RequestNA

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

Significant co-financing from the private sector is expected for this type of program, however not provided. Please provide an explanation of private sector co-financing.

ES, 7/16/24: Explanation and documents provided. Comment cleared.

## Agency Response

Agency Response 15 July 2024

The Global Project has significant activities planned on private sector engagement, and several consultations and engagements with the private sector were undertaken during PPG development. Two cofinance letters from the private sector are included, Circulate Capital at \$15,000,000, and Nestle, which expresses support without an amount specified, due to internal policy constraints. The Letter from Nestle was uploaded to the portal under the name ?partnership letter? to avoid confusion. The nature of the Global Project is such that it is difficult for the private sector to provide specific cofinance, many of the companies engaged during the PPG phase have chosen to pursue collaboration (including cofinance) with the National Projects of the IP, as these projects match geographically with their priorities and offer more concrete cofinance opportunities. Furthermore, as the private sector engagement activities of the Global Project advance we will continue to seek cofinance from the private sector.

### 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 RequestNA

### 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 RequestNA

### 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 RequestNA

### 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 RequestYes.

Agency Response

**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 RequestNA

Agency Response

**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 RequestYes.

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

The budget for staff and travel accounts for a significant portion of the budget. How are these costs being translated into achieving results of the program.

Please explain the "transfers and grants issued to implementing partner" budget line.

Budget for Global / Regional coordination child projects are not scrutinized as it is the case for all other projects ? however, per the below (screenshot below at the left-hand side), this table lacks the column ?Responsible Executing Partner?, which presumably should include ?besides UNEP and WWF-US, the other executing entities included in the

General Child Project Information Table (screenshot below at the right-hand side) ? please ask the Agency to amend. (Please see email for screenshots)

ES, 7/16/24: Budget justification provided. Comment cleared.

## Agency Response

### Agency Response 15 July 2024

The global project is providing knowledge and technical support to all child projects, which relies on the technical expertise in two lead agencies (UNEP and WWF). UNEP and WWF possess sophisticated knowledge and experience on the topic from both governmental process/policies and private sector engagement angles. The TORs for staff to be involved in the project implementation were compiled on **Attachment 5e of the Appendix 5** (page 44), which specifies the roles and responsibilities of all staff under the project. Furthermore, a significant portion of the budget is designated for executing partners on specific topics, as explained further below.

For budget for travel: UNEP envisages the following travels to key project meetings/selected child project countries, assuming 5000 USD per person per time on average, including i) 6 annual conferences, 3 staff per time (18 travels), ii) 3 UNEP-WWF in person meetings, 3 staff per time (9), iii) key project capacity buildings or meetings organised by key partners: 4 times per year, 1 staff each time (28); iv) missions to provide technical support to the implementation of project activities (16). WWF envisages the following travels: i) travel for project personnel, 2571 per trip for 7 years (28) ; ii) annual conferences and other events, assumes 12,857/year for 7 years (14); iii) Under activity 3.2.1, travel for project personnel, assumes 30-50k/year for staff to travel to 1-2 convenings for 6 years; iv) annual conferences and other events, assumes 3 workshops, each workshop has 125k/workshop event space, materials, supplies, catering, 100k for translation consultants, 12-27k travel for partners and 15k/workshop for event planning support; v) travel for project personnel, 12,857k/year for 3 people to travel to collaboration projects with UNEP. Calculation for the travel budget could be found in the ?detailed costed budget? tab from Appendix 4a.

Transfers and grants to implementing partners/ Executing Partners will be done following UNEP and WWF procurement process. The category "Transfers and Grants Issued to Implementing Partner (IP)" is a category for the budget to be transferred to non-for-profit organisations to support the relevant work under the project. During the PPG phase, an Expression of Interest process was conducted to collect and select the best suited organisations to support the delivery of the technical work. WRAP, RSB and Perpetual have been technically pre-selected through the process for respective activities, by assessing the existing initiatives on the topic with the highest potential for scaling impact and taking a targeted approach to engage the partner. The Implementing Partners for Extended Producer Responsibility, financing innovation and business plastic footprint have been further technically pre-selected (the Global Action Partnership for EPR, the Circulate Initiative, CDP respectively), by considering the existing and limited number of organisations with strong expertise on this topic. Following the procurement process of the IAs, those non-for-profit organisations to support the work on government plastic footprint will be selected during the project implementation phase. An extra tab to Annex G has been added.

### 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 RequestNot at this time. Some issues remain.

**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**

	<b>CEO Approval</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>6/25/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>7/16/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		