



Circular and POPs-free Plastics in Africa

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11049

Countries

Regional (Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa, Uganda, Zimbabwe)

Project Name

Circular and POPs-free Plastics in Africa

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

12/1/2023

Review completed by PM

1/9/2024

Program Manager

Ibrahima Sow

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

FSP

PIF
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

BCCC Nigeria is selected as the Regional Executing Agency. However, the project has identified National Executing Agencies in the project countries. Please indicate these EAs in this section.

Agency Response

Response January 2023:

The national executing agencies have been added to the Project Information table.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Under the project summary, the priority sector for Uganda is not specified, as done for other participating countries!

Please clarify.

Agency Response

Response January 2023:

In the Project Summary, Uganda has been added next to its priority sector.

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) 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?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) 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

a): yes

b): yes

Agency Response

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

a): yes

Agency Response

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) 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?
- c) 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?
- d) 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?

e) **Other Benefits:** Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

f) 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?

g) 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)?

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

i) **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?

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

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

l) **Transformation and/or innovation:** Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

yes

Agency Response

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.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

yes

Agency Response

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)?
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

On Core Indicators: Please include the GEO core indicators and targets entirely and explicitly in the results framework (annex c). There are inconsistencies in reporting targets (i.e., CI,6 and 11) in the results framework from what is reported in the core indicator table.

Agency Response

Response January 2023:

Clarification:

Under the Core Indicators table in the CEO Endorsement Request, the GEB calculation methodology is visualized (figure 5). Targets related to core indicators 6.8, 9.1 and 10 are calculated based on the number of POPs- containing plastics in products avoided (core indicator 9.8). Project components 1 and 2 will directly contribute to the avoidance of POPs- containing plastics in products (core indicator 9.8). Therefore, indicator 9.8 (as a direct outcome of components 1 and 2) is integrated in the lower levels of the results framework, while core indicators 6.8, 9.1 and 10 are placed at objective level in the results framework. The same applies for core indicators 9.4 and 11, which are direct outputs of lower levels in the results framework.

References to GEBs for the targets and indicators can be found in the footnotes.

This approach of integrating GEBs are project outcome/output levels is assumed to facilitate GEB reporting during the project lifetime.

Please find a complete overview below:

GEB	Target (core indicator table)	Framework reference
6.8	39,213 metric tons of CO2e	Objective: 39,213 tonnes of CO2e mitigated
9.1	38.61 metric tons of POPs avoided	Objective: 38.6 tonnes of POPs reduced
9.4	5 countries	Outcome 1: 5 countries implementing new policies/strategies related to POPs in plastics
9.8	63,234 tons of POPs- containing plastics in products avoided (9.8)	Outcome 1: 53,894 tonnes of contaminated plastics avoided Outcome 2: 9,340 tonnes of contaminated plastics avoided
10	36.16gTEQ	Objective: 36.16 gTEQ POPs from air avoided
11	9,630 (4599 F 5031 M)	Output 1.3: 285 government officials trained (50% women) Output 2.1: 10 women receiving funds for research projects on POPs in plastics Output 2.2: At least 10 students (6 women) receiving bursaries for masters; 10 pilots (assuming at least 210 beneficiaries per pilot; 35% women); 25 women trained for management Output 3.2: 600 recyclers, collectors, and waste shredder personnel (60% women) Output 4.1: 3600 beneficiaries (50% women) Output 4.2: 3000 global and regional beneficiaries (50% women)

5.4 Risks

- a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the project identified and adequately described (e.g. including these related to work in fragile locations and/or countries)? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?
- b) Are the key risks that might affect implementation assessed and adequately rated?
- 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 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and 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?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

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

NA

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1. Most of the activities target only about 30% of women beneficiaries but there are activities that are key to address gender inequalities in the sector. The Agency is requested to increase women beneficiaries closer to parity in the following: i) Activity 2.2.2, Activities under Output 3.1, including on increasing knowledge and capacity of women recyclers regarding POPs containing plastics, Activity 3.2.1 and Output 4.1.
2. Agency is also requested to ensure the incorporation of gender perspectives in Activity 4.2.3 and women's representation in 4.2.4. Please ensure that the Gender Action Plan is monitored and reported on and reflect this under Monitoring and Reporting component/section.

Agency Response

Response January 2023:

1. The women beneficiary targets are based on the baseline of women employment in the selected sectors (see a summary taken from the gender action plan (appendix 5) below).

Country	Sector	Baseline percentage of women participation in sector
Kenya	Automotives manufacturing	11% of the workforce
	Plastics manufacturing	15% of the workforce

	Waste management	35.5% of the workforce
Nigeria	Electricity sector	0% of the workforce
	Waste management	22% of the workforce
	Recycling	23.3% of the workforce in formal recycling; informal recycling: 8%
South Africa	Automotives industry	41% of the workforce
	Waste pickers	Women are dominant group
Uganda	Electronics	Not available
	Waste pickers	78% of pickers
Zimbabwe	Construction	9% of the workforce
	Waste management	24% of the workforce
	Waste pickers	Women dominated

Based on these numbers, realistic targets that prioritize women in training and awareness activities were set.

Under outputs 1.3, 2.2, 3.2, and 4.1, women participation targets have been increased. Output 3.1 focusses on characterizing the plastic sector waste streams, while under output 3.2, women recyclers will be targeted for increasing knowledge and capacity regarding POPs containing plastics (increased from 35% to 60%).

Additionally, some activities targeting primarily women have been added:

- Activity 2.1.5: Support for research on POPs in plastics (only women students will be targeted)
- Activity 2.2.1: Allocation of postgraduate study bursaries for a Masters in Chemicals Risk Management at the University of Cape Town (at least 2/3 of the students will be women)
- Under Activity 2.2.3: Implement company pilot projects, women will be trained for managerial positions
- Under Activity 3.2.2: Identify and sensitize investors regarding opportunities around ESM in Africa, (business-owing) women interested in this training will be identified and prioritized. The CEO Endorsement request, Appendix 3, Appendix 5, and Appendix 14 have been updated accordingly.

2. Gender perspectives have been incorporated in Activities 4.2.3 and 4.2.4 and the gender plan (Appendix 5) has been updated accordingly. The Gender Action Plan has been added into the M&E action plan (Appendix 8).

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

On Stakeholder Engagement : The project incorporates important roles of key stakeholders in relevant project component. A detailed stakeholder engagement plan for the project as well as information on consultation in project design seem not to have been included in the submission.

Agency Response

Response January 2023:

As the portal has no specific section for the stakeholder annex to be uploaded, it was only included in the project package (11049 - Africa Plastics - Full CEO Endorsement Package). The Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Appendix 6) has been uploaded separately into the portal (just as all other annexes and appendices).

7.4 Have required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

On Environmental and Social Safeguards : We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as low, and UNEP attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form. However, the environment and social section of the Risk to project implementation in the Portal states risk rating as moderate. Please make these risk rating consistent with ESS risk and revise.

Agency Response

Response January 2023:

The environment and social section of the Risk to project implementation has been updated to low in the CEO Endorsement Request document.

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

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

Status of Utilization of PPG:

- Please specify what 'Contractual Component' entails.
- Miscellaneous Component is not an eligible activity.

Agency Response

Response January 2023:

1. The 'Contractual Component' includes one budget line on sample analysis.
2. The miscellaneous component has been updated to its underlying budget lines (bank fees and admin costs & final audit).

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 Request

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

On Co-financing : Please include the letters of co-financing support for ?UNEP resources and markets branch?.

Agency Response

Response January 2023:

Additional letters of co-financing support were received by the following entities:

- ? - Kenya Bureau of Standards (Kenya)
- ? - Customs Service (Nigeria)
- ? - Gentex Enterprises Ltd (Uganda)
- ? - Ministry of Finance (Uganda)
- ? - National Association of Automotive Component and Allied Manufacturers (NAACAM) (South Africa)
- Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (South Africa)
- ? - UNEP Resources and Markets Branch (UNEP)

The CEO Endorsement Request document, Appendix 2 and 4b were updated accordingly.

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

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

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

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?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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 Request

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 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

On the budget:

- The way the budget is presented (several columns, in three pages) makes it difficult to read and comprehend ? please present it per component + M&E + PMC and in one table.
- Logistic support for country offices under PMC (\$100,000) is not an eligible activity.
- Please provide details on the Countries? contracts (Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa, Uganda and Zimbabwe) which amount to nearly US\$ 3 million. Same with BCCC (EA) contracts.
- Technical Lead (\$435,000) is part of the PMU ? this should be changed to the GEF portion and co-financing portion allocated to PMC.
- please request the agency to use a budget that includes a column with the responsible entity for executing each activity. A budget template is available in the [Guidelines on the Project Cycle](#)

Agency Response

Response January 2023:

1. The budget presentation has been updated to only present the budget per component + M&E + PMC (Appendix 4a)
2. Logistics support has been removed from the project and country budgets. Operational costs (to support project management) and financial audits have been added (Appendix 4a).
3. A breakdown of the country contracts has been provided under the country budgets and the BCCC contracts line has been replaced by a more specific breakdown (Appendix 4a and Appendix 7).
4. The PMU is comprised of the regional team which will be based in the BCCC. The PMU includes both project management and administration staff charged to PMC (Project Manager and Finance & Admin Assistant). A number of technical and cross cutting supporting staff has been charged to components (M&E officer, Regional Technical Coordinator, Regional Communications, Regional technical experts) and will also be hired by BCCC at regional level. The Regional Technical Coordinator will not be part of PMU. The institutional arrangements diagram (CEO Endorsement Request document and Appendix 9), the budget (Appendix 4a), and Project Personnel ToRs (Appendix 7) have been updated to clarify accordingly.

5. A column with clarifying the responsible unit for each has been added for each budget line (Appendix 4a).

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 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 Request

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The project is being recommended for CEO approval.

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
First Review	1/16/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/7/2024	

**CEO
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)