



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	9681		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Addressing Marine Plastics – A Systemic Approach		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-3 Program 6;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$2,000,000
Co-financing:	\$10,932,645	Total Project Cost:	\$12,932,645
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Leah Karrer	Agency Contact Person:	Isabelle Van der Beck

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	December 12, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes. It is aligned with a number of GEF Focal Areas such as CW, BD, CCM and IW.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	December 12, 2016 (lkarrer): No. The following comments need to be addressed: 1. Project Objective: Please revise the project objective to something along the following lines: "The project aims to capitalize on a growing baseline of knowledge on marine plastics sources, pathways and	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>environmental impacts to inform the GEF and the application of a systemic approach to global plastic issues."</p> <p>2. Clarification on guidance to GEF: Please remove all references to GEF-7 and specifically references to potential IAPs.</p> <p>With regard to the description of the components, in the descriptions of Components 1 and 2 there is mention of specific reports from OC and EMF to inform the GEF due in June, 2017. Please revise so clear guidance will be provided throughout the project (not only in June) and working with Component 3. Consequently the text needs to be revised to clarify that the reports will feed into recommendations provided through Component 3 throughout the course of the project. For example, Output 1.1.5 could be revised as: "Synthesize the learnings of the NPEC and feed into coherent guidance to the GEF through Component 3, including (but not limited to) the June concept note." For the concept note, the suggested focus is on: 1) the relevance of this issue to the GEF; 2) relevance to existing global and national GEF, agency and other major marine plastic initiatives; and 2) initial guidance on how the GEF, agencies and countries could engage on this issue.</p> <p>3. Discussion of existing global and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>country initiatives, particularly in Baseline section</p> <p>Given the intent of this project is to develop a global alliance and to assess strategic needs in the 3 countries, it is important that current global and national initiatives are understood. While many of the global players are noted in the Stakeholders section, the Baseline section does not reflect existing work. Instead there is great detail on UNEP activities (3 pages), OC and EMF and then a short bulleted list with varying levels of detail of efforts that does not include many major global efforts, such as those led by STAP, WB, UNIDO, NOAA and major NGOs working on marine plastics (e.g. Plastic Soup, 5 Gyres, GAIA, Marine Plastics Pooled Fund). Further, existing country initiatives in the 3 countries are not discussed, such as extensive investments by World Bank, ADB and others as well as work underway by international as well as national and local CSOs. The resulting impression is that this project is a UNEP centric effort and that there is a lack of awareness of what is occurring in the 3 countries already.</p> <p>At a minimum a list and brief statement regarding the major existing efforts needs to be provided in the Baseline section. This summary is not expected to have great detail since it's understood that one of the tasks in Component 3 will be to examine these efforts to identify gaps and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>determine how the GEF can contribute to this work; however, there needs to be some brief description of the major efforts.</p> <p>4. Component 3 (C3) Assessment of key players and initiatives and plans for consultants</p> <p>Related to the previous point, two important activities in C3 are: 1) assessing existing global initiatives and initiatives in the 3 countries, including those funded by the GEF as well as those noted in point 2 (plans to do such an assessment is currently one short bullet, which needs to be expanded and discussed in terms of how it will contribute to advising the GEF; and 2) seeking input from key players, including agencies, the 3 countries and other partners (this is currently a short bullet, which also needs to be expanded substantially with an explanation of how these will be conducted. If possible, this would include a consultation with agencies prior to June, 2017).</p> <p>5. Explanation of institutional design</p> <p>In terms of how the project will be run - the explanations in the Pro Doc, particularly Appendices 8 and 10, indicate that there will be a PCU based in the UNEP-DC office to oversee overall execution and then EMF will be the executing agency for component 1 and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>TOC for component 2. Component 4 is covering the PCU costs. Is that correct? Who then will execute component 3 – it is understood that this will be led by a consultant – is that correct? Please note the importance of C3 being an objective assessment of players and initiatives to advise the GEF on how it can engage.</p> <p>6. A neutral assessment The documents continue to have a heavy UNEP focus, particularly in C3. The first paragraph description of C3 notes that the work will draw on C1 and C2 and then from other global initiatives, but only notes UNEP initiatives indicating a heavy UNEP bias. C3 is intended to be an objective assessment with facilitated dialogues with GEF agencies and others, which necessitates an objective perspective. Also, there is mention throughout the document of "marine litter" instead of "marine plastic" indicating a UNEP lens – please edit.</p> <p>7. Realignment of Component 4 activities and budget allocations The main focus of activities is intended to be in Components 1 and 2 with additional work in Component 3. Component 4 is intended to be for overall coordination across these 3 components. In considering the activities in Component 4, there are new plans for Outcome 4.1, which were not in the upstream submission. These include a dialogue for leading researchers and the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>development and implementation of a high media profile communications strategy. Relatedly, the budget for Component 2 has declined substantially while Component 4 has tripled. Please explain the justification for adding these two new items within an already tight budget of activities that are intended to primarily focus on Components 1 and 2.</p> <p>Note that the Budget per Component Summary Table indicates Component 4 will be budgeted \$578,339 (which calculates to the total) while Table B notes \$378,330 – please ensure consistency.</p> <p>8. Clarification of components</p> <p>To clarify the components, it is suggested that these be revised to be: 1) Global Alliance Platform to reconsider the design, use, reuse and disposal of plastics; 2) Country-level Assessments and Solutions in selected Asian countries to advance waste management solutions; 3) GEF and Partners Strategy development; 4) Knowledge sharing and project Coordination.</p> <p>9. Description of assessments</p> <p>In analyzing solutions in C1 and C2, the potential negative environmental trade-offs need to be assessed.</p> <p>For example, it is well known that poorly</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>managed waste-to-fuel operations can generate significant toxic air pollution. Discussion of the appropriate technologies and economics of advanced waste-to-fuel should be part of the analysis.</p> <p>Further, proposals for "renewable sourced" plastics feedstocks need to analyze the potential environmental damage of using renewable resources as plastic feedstocks. For example, the use of renewable resources for fuel feedstock has already created concerns about competition for land for "food or fuel." The analysis needs to be conducted very carefully, assessing the volume of renewable resources needed to make a significant reduction in use of fossil fuels as plastics feedstocks, and whether the location of plastics manufacturing would be a factor in access to those renewable resources. This issue also argues for careful alliance building. For example, some large products manufacturers may be diversified "making plastics and paper/wood products.</p> <p>Please edit C1 and C2 to note that the analyses will address potential negative environmental trade-offs, including but not limited to these examples.</p> <p>10. Scope of Project The statement under Barriers. Improving Waste Management Infrastructure, "This project would aim to remove the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>barriersâ€ inhibiting investment, build political will and develop a true investment coalitionâ€ needs to be softened as these aims are considered beyond what this \$2M project can achieve.</p> <p>11. Root Causes: Page 13: Asia is the region where some of the symptoms of the current dysfunctional solid waste management practices surface and for this reason Asia has already been the focus for a variety of crucial leakage mitigation efforts aimed at improving basic collection infrastructure.</p> <p>12. Global Issue Please edit to reflect "global" not only "transboundary" issue given the nature of the plastic value chain. (see page 11) "Beyond this approach, it reflects our failure to put in place frameworks addressing the entire value chain of plastics in order to close the material loop. Indeed, marine plastics is a GLOBAL, complex, social, economic and environmental problem that requires holistic solutions.)</p> <p>13. IWLEARN Please reference not only IW Conferences, but also contributions to website, other relevant regional IW conferences, production of 1 Results Notes, at least 2 Experience Notes (1% for IW:LEARN)</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>14. Executing Partners UN Environment GPML is listed as an Executing Partner, but does not have a noted role in the project. GPML is noted in the description of C3; however, as noted above, all relevant initiatives need to be assessed through an objective analysis, not focused only on UNEP efforts. Please clarify the role of GPML.</p> <p>February 22, 2017 (lkarrer): No. The document still refers to plans for a GEF-7 IAP in Appendix 5, Component 3. Please edit. And please clarify in the main text that there will be strategic advice provided to the GEF throughout the course of the project, not only in June. This applies particularly to Component 3, but also Components 1 and 2 to ensure advice is provided throughout.</p> <p>March 8, 2017 (lkarrer): Addressed.</p>	
	<p>3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>December 12, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes. This is a global project and the importance of consulting with the countries is noted in #13 below</p>	
	<p>4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>December 12, 2016 (lkarrer): No. Please ensure the description of root causes is more explicit regarding need for political momentum in countries to address solid waste management, which relates to the planned work in Component 2, particularly with regard to Asia.</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Design		February 22, 2017 (lkarrer): Yes. Addressed.	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	December 12, 2016 (lkarrer): No. Under the Proposed Alternative Scenario section, the incremental reasoning needs to be sharpened. It is not clear when reading this, what the increment is of the GEF investment. February 22, 2017 (lkarrer): Yes. Addressed.	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBS?	December 12, 2016 (lkarrer): No. The GEBS section is considered vague. Please provide a clear articulation of the environmental harm caused by plastics and the GEBS of reducing marine plastics. Please include concrete IW, BD, CCM, CW benefits in this section drawing on previous discussions with GEF Sec. February 22, 2017 (lkarrer): Yes. Addressed.	
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	December 12, 2016 (lkarrer): No. On gender, please incorporate a gender-sensitive approach in the future strategy development (i.e. not for research and for this project per se). Although marine plastics may not be a topic that has been studied much on gender, there are quite a bit of work done on gender and waste management. Lessons learned from related activities need to be reflected in the project approach. February 22, 2017 (lkarrer): Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		Addressed.	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	December 12, 2016 (lkarrer): No. The EU countries are investing massively in solid waste management, among others through the EIB. Has consideration been given to EU investment in this initiative? February 22, 2017 (lkarrer): Yes. Addressed.	
	9. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	December 12, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes.	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	December 12, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes.	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	December 12, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes.	
	12. <i>Only for Non-grant Instrument</i> : Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	December 12, 2016 (lkarrer): No. It is important that the three countries are aware of the MSP and have had an opportunity for input even though we do not require their endorsement for a global project. Please give a brief summary of how the governments, including the OFPs and which ministries, have been engaged, including their indication of support for the project.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>March 8, 2017 (lkarrer): To ensure the three countries approve the project, please write to the Vietnam, Philippines and Indonesia focal points describing what is intended with the marine plastics MSP project for them to approve on a no-objection basis with a two week deadline for a response after which, if they do not respond, it will be assumed they are approving.</p> <p>April 26, 2017 (lkarrer): Addressed.</p>	
	<p>14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
	<p>15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?</p>	<p>December 12, 2016 (lkarrer): No. Please clarify if there will be a website as part of C1 and C2 to share information to the public, which could help with serve as coordination platforms for learning and showcasing among national to global activities related to marine plastics. The C4 website is expected to be limited to the project; whereas, it is suggested to have broader websites that would facilitate coordination and knowledge sharing more broadly. Perhaps such websites would be linked to the existing OC and EMF websites.</p> <p>February 22, 2017 (lkarrer): Yes.</p>	
<p>Availability of</p>	<p>16. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee)</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Resources	within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	December 12, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	December 12, 2016 (lkarrer): No. Please address comments. February 22, 2017 (lkarrer): No. Please address comments. March 8, 2017 (lkarrer): No. Please address final comment. April 26, 2017 (lkarrer): Addressed.	
	First Review	December 12, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 08, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 26, 2017	