



---

## Establishing a circular economy framework for the plastics sector in Ghana

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10401

**Countries**

Ghana

**Project Title**

Establishing a circular economy framework for the plastics sector in Ghana

**GEF Agency(ies)**

UNIDO

**Agency ID**

UNIDO: 190244

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Multi Focal Area

**Program Manager**

Leah Karrer

## PIF

### Part I – Project Informatic

#### Focal area elements

#### 1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

Yes, this plastics project is appropriately aligned with IW and CW.

##### Agency Response

#### Indicative project/program description summary

#### 2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

No, the following concerns need to be addressed in the description of components, outcomes and outputs in Table B as well as in the description of the proposed alternative scenario (PAS) starting on p20.

- GPAP added in their edits that for Component 1 there would be a “Situational analysis: plastic flows Community-level archetypes”. If they are planning to do this, then please include in Table B and the PAS.
- Component 2 includes technology transfer and public-private partnerships, but these aren’t reflected in the subsequent outcomes or outputs, which focus only on capacities and pilots. Please revise Component 2 or include outcomes and outputs to address these aspects.
- Component 2 seems to cover too much. It might best be split into 2 outcomes of 2.1 capacity building and 2.2 demo activities or into 2 Components.
- Output 2.1.3 (Sustainable financing and business models developed and applied in the pilots) seems more appropriate in Output 2.2 on pilots.
- Component 3 needs to reflect not only communication and knowledge management, but also coordination between various actors. It seems that what’s noted as 3.1 on coordination should be reflected in Component 3 and that then there should be Outcomes 3.1 on communication, 3.2 on KM and 3.3 on coordination. These three outcomes would then lead into the outputs.
- GPAP proposed Output 3.1.2 (enhance continuity of GPAP Secretariat in Ghana...) in their edits. This needs to be clarified and considered for inclusion, particularly related to Outcome 3.1 on coordination (perhaps could be the related Output).
- Regarding the pilots - please clarify the intent of the first section of the table under Output 2.1.4, particularly what is meant by “enforcement of policy measures for all pilots” and then the table cells (a), (b) etc.. Are these activities that will be conducted?
- For the pilots, we encourage early lifecycle actions. Most notably missing is bans on unnecessary products. Have you considered a pilot that would ban or at least impose a fee and promote alternative systems – e.g. banning plastic bags, coffee cups, etc.?
- For the pilots, we also want to ensure there are markets for the recycled plastic. Please incorporate this aspect.
- The fourth pilot mentions using plastics for road paving blocks; however, as Inger Andersen, ED of UNEP recently noted, in a plastics event, plastic roads result in runoff of microplastics into soils, waterways and ultimately the ocean and, therefore, increase ocean plastic pollution. As Inger implored, “please do not use plastic in roads.”
- References to stats need to come from the source. Para 4 has a reference to GPAP (<https://wef.ch/gpap>) which is not the source for the plastic more than fish stat – please reference the actual report. For consistency, all references should be either in parentheses with a reference list at the end or else by footnote. And the footnotes need to be complete – 5 “Solomon Kusi Ampofo” is not a complete reference.

(Karrer, Nov 1 2019)

Yes; however, during PPG the following points need to be addressed:

- consider how to include a pilot activity that incorporates policies to reduce the production of single-use plastics (e.g. plastic bag bans or taxes). The pilot (v) is more about awareness-raising than directly limiting production.

- further clarify plans for the outputs under outcome 1.1 as there seem to be overlapping interests. Please ensure the opportunities and barriers for private sector behavior shifts are considered in addition to the legal aspects. In addition, GPAP has conducted scenario analyses in Indonesia, which is useful in considering the implications of options. GPAP may be conducting a similar analysis in Ghana.
- ensure the co-financing items are specific to Ghana. There are a few organizations, such as WB and Circulate Capital, where it's unclear if they are working in Ghana on plastics or more broadly engaged with GPAP. If the latter, then not relevant for this co-financing.

### Agency Response

- GPAP added in their edits that for Component 1 there would be a "Situational analysis: plastic flows Community-level archetypes". If they are planning to do this, then please include in Table B and the PAS.

**UNIDO response:** Output 1.1.1. "Situational analysis: Plastic flows assessed for community-level archetypes" has been added to Table B and also paragraph 64 has been added. The following has been added "During PPG details of this situational analysis will be further detailed, which will also result in refining Annex D to ensure that circular economy life-cycle stages, especially from upstream private players are included."

- Component 2 includes technology transfer and public-private partnerships, but these aren't reflected in the subsequent outcomes or outputs, which focus only on capacities and pilots. Please revise Component 2 or include outcomes and outputs to address these aspects.

### UNIDO response:

- Former Outcome 2.1 has been split into two outcomes 2.1. and outcome 2.2. and titles now better reflect capacity building in Outcome 2.1 and Pilot projects in Outcome 2.2.
- Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 have remained.
- Output 2.2.1 (FORMER Output 2.1.3) has been moved to Outcome 2.2. and now includes the aspect of Public-private partnerships (PPP). Paragraph 90 has been added.
- Output 2.2.2 (FORMER Output 2.1.4) now uses the term "BAT/BEP" instead of "Technology transfer". Paragraph 91 has been revised.

- Component 2 seems to cover too much. It might best be split into 2 outcomes of 2.1 capacity building and 2.2 demo activities or into 2 Components.

### UNIDO response:

- Former Outcome 2.1 has been split into 2 outcomes, namely "Outcome 2.1. Capacity built among all relevant stakeholders to ensure integration and mainstreaming of circular economy approaches within plastics management" and "Outcome 2.2. Pilot projects implemented to deliver circular economy benefits".

- Output 2.1.3 (Sustainable financing and business models developed and applied in the pilots) seems more appropriate in Output 2.2 on pilots.

**UNIDO response:**

- Output 2.1.3 has been moved to Outcome 2.2. and is now the new Output 2.2.1. This has been done in Table B and also in the body text.
- Component 3 needs to reflect not only communication and knowledge management, but also coordination between various actors. It seems that what's noted as 3.1 on coordination should be reflected in Component 3 and that then there should be Outcomes 3.1 on communication, 3.2 on KM and 3.3 on coordination. These three outcomes would then lead into the outputs.

**UNIDO response:**

- The title of Component 3 has been revised to 'Coordination, communication strategy and knowledge management among key partners and stakeholders for achieving Ghana's NPAP/GPAP and NPMPs objectives' to better reflect the three outcomes and their related outputs on communication, KM and coordination.
- The Outcomes have been revised to ensure that outcome 3.1. is about coordination, outcome 3.2. is about communication and outcome 3.3. is about KM. [The outcomes are now the following: "Outcome 3.1. Coordinated action and synergies with key international, regional and national partners and stakeholders ensured to achieve Ghana's NPAP/GPAP and NPMPs objectives"; "Outcome 3.2 Communication strategy in place to raise awareness about NPAP/GPAP, NPMP and relevant plastic topics"; and "Outcome 3.3. Knowledge management set up to promote Ghana's NPAP and NPMPs objectives"](#)
- Accordingly, the outputs have been re-arranged to fit to the relevant outcomes.
- GPAP proposed Output 3.1.2 (enhance continuity of GPAP Secretariat in Ghana...) in their edits. This needs to be clarified and considered for inclusion, particularly related to Outcome 3.1 on coordination (perhaps could be the related Output).

**UNIDO response:**

- GPAP's proposed output has been added as "Output 3.1.1. Enhance continuity of GPAP Secretariat in Ghana to improve transparency, accountability and coordination of the various legislative instruments, capacity building efforts and pilot demonstration activities for a circular plastics economy framework"
- GPAP's proposed output text has been added as paragraphs 98-101.
- Regarding the pilots - please clarify the intent of the first section of the table under Output 2.1.4, particularly what is meant by "enforcement of policy measures for all pilots" and then the table cells (a), (b) etc. Are these activities that will be conducted?

**UNIDO response:** Yes, these policy measures will be enforced for the pilots, as found applicable. It is meant to enhance the importance of early lifecycle and framework (e.g. markets for recycled plastics) in addition to technical actions mentioned under the pilots. The following sentence has been added “Policy measures for the pilots to be enforced, as found applicable for each pilot”

- For the pilots, we encourage early lifecycle actions. Most notably missing is bans on unnecessary products. Have you considered a pilot that would ban or at least impose a fee and promote alternative systems – e.g. banning plastic bags, coffee cups, etc.?

**UNIDO response:** Paragraph 92 revised to the following” All pilots will be refined during PPG, including pilot activities incorporating policies to reduce production of single use plastics (e.g. plastic bag bans or taxes)”.

- For the pilots, we also want to ensure there are markets for the recycled plastic. Please incorporate this aspect.

**UNIDO response:**

(a) Pilot 1 includes (iv) Financing and business model creation to ensure sustainability/value-chain creation, especially national demand for biodegradable plastics, of this pilot

(b) Pilot 2 includes: (iv) To connect national recycling industries with international demand for secondary plastics as feedstock of verified quality to increase demand, price and sustainability of business models

(c) Pilot 3 includes: (iii) “During PPG, the creation of a virtual platform to ensure national demand for recycled plastics will be explored”

(d) Pilot 4 includes: (iv) “Collaboration with private sector partners... ensure that there is demand for collected plastics for remanufacturing.”

- The fourth pilot mentions using plastics for road paving blocks; however, as Inger Andersen, ED of UNEP recently noted, in a plastics event, plastic roads result in runoff of microplastics into soils, waterways and ultimately the ocean and, therefore, increase ocean plastic pollution. As Inger implored, “please do not used plastic in roads.”

**UNIDO response:** “Plastics for road paving blocks” has been removed from pilot 4.

- References to stats need to come from the source. Para 4 has a reference to GPAP (<https://wef.ch/gpap>) which is not the source for the plastic more than fish stat – please reference the actual report. For consistency, all references should be either in parentheses with a reference list at the end or else by footnote. And the footnotes need to be complete – 5 “Solomon Kusi Ampofo” is not a complete reference.

**UNIDO response:** In-text citations and a list of references at the end of the document have been included. Please note in the GEF portal this is at the Knowledge Management Section, paragraph 179.

**Additional revisions:**

- The following has been added to paragraph 63 a) During PPG outputs under outcome 1.1 will be further aligned to ensure that opportunities and barriers for private sector behavior shifts are considered in addition to the legal aspects. For example, an existing scenario analyses in Indonesia made by GPAP will be used in considering the implications of options to carry out a similar analysis in Ghana.
- Former paragraphs 104 and 105 have been moved to Paragraphs 46 and 47 because they are more appropriate for the background information.
- Former paragraphs 111 and 112 have been removed because they are redundant with the newly inserted paragraphs 113-114. Paragraphs 115-117 have been revised and further be defined during PPG.
- In the pilot table private-public partnerships has been included as principle (g). In addition “shared economy and extended life options” has been added to (a).

**Co-financing**

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

No, the co-financing needs to be updated based on the input GPAP provided to the table. In addition, GPAP noted Circulate Capital in the co-financing list. Please clarify if they are planning to invest in Ghana and note accordingly.

Also related to co-financing, it is important that the project outcomes, outputs and activities reflect the activities funded by the GEF and by other entities to ensure an integrated project. It, therefore, needs to be clear who will be undertaking which aspects. Which activities will be conducted by GEF funding; whereas others through co-financing? Perhaps a simple table specifying by output would help. Please be sure to include the GPAP planned activities since we want to ensure the PIF reflect an integrated project of both GEF funded and GPAP activities

(Karrer, Nov 1, 2019)

Yes, These points are addressed including a table indicating the split between GEF and other funders by output.

### **Agency Response**

The co-financing Table C has been updated to include all GPAP's inputs.

In addition, a table showing a potential breakdown of GEF grant and co-financing per output has been developed prepared and can be found attached.

### **GEF Resource Availability**

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

Yes, these funds are available from IW and CW, which are outside STAR allocation.

### **Agency Response**

### **The STAR allocation?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**



NA

### **Agency Response**

### **The focal area allocation?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

Yes, these funds are available from IW and CW, which are outside STAR allocation.

### **Agency Response**

### **The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

### **Agency Response**

### **The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

**Agency Response**

**Focal area set-aside?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

**Agency Response**

**Impact Program Incentive?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

**Agency Response**

**Project Preparation Grant**

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, Nov 1, 2019) Yes.

**Agency Response**

**Core indicators**

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

Yes.

**Agency Response**

**Project/Program taxonomy**

**7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, Nov 1, 2019) Yes.

**Agency Response**

**art II – Project Justification**

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

Yes, these have been described.

**Agency Response**

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

Yes, these have been described.

**Agency Response**

### 3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

Please see previous points to address.

---

(Karrer, Nov 1, 2019) These points are now addressed.

#### Agency Response

Please see answers to previous comments.

### 4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

No, a critical aspect of addressing plastics in the GEF-7 Strategy is taking a circular economy approach, which needs to be better reflected in the PIF, including:

- In the brief explanation of what is entailed for the circular economy (para 60), the text notes “plastic design, reuse and recycling...”. CE also includes banning unnecessary plastics, particularly single-use items (e.g. plastic bags) and shifting to alternative materials. The mention of alternative biodegradable materials (bullet in para 61) needs to be clear that would decompose in seawater, which most “biodegradable materials” will not.

- Annex D Plastic Value Chain seems to only address waste collection and recycling. I don't see mention of upstream players, particularly the private sector to create alternative materials, redesign, promote repair, resale, shared economy options. These players are fundamental to moving to a CE approach.
- Annex E Plastic Framework for Ghana – the fundamental barriers are heavily focused on collection and waste management. There is one barrier on collection, one on waste management/sorting/recycling. Then there's one on lack of awareness. There's only one barrier that vaguely refers to lack of policy incentives to promote circular economy strategies. This aspect needs greater consideration.

(Karrer, Nov 1, 2019)

Yes; however, during PPG the following points need to be addressed:

- - further refine plans, including under Output 1.1.1, to ensure all stages of the plastic lifecycle are addressed and the relevant stakeholders, particularly the private sector, are actively engaged. There tends to be a focus on waste collection and recycling; whereas the GEF is committed to ensuring upstream players, particularly from the private sector are engaged to create alternative materials, redesign products for circularity, promote repair, refill and resale, and foster other shared economy options. These players are fundamental to moving to a circular economy approach.
- reconsider the Annex E Plastic Framework for Ghana. Specifically, reconsider the fundamental barriers/challenges to incorporate upstream barriers – reducing demand for plastic products, shifting to alternative materials, and redesigning to be reusable/recyclable/compostable, etc.

## Agency Response

- In the brief explanation of what is entailed for circular economy (para 60) , the text notes “plastic design, reuse and recycling...”. CE also includes banning unnecessary plastics, particularly single use items (e.g. plastic bags) and shifting to alternative materials. The mention of alternative biodegradable materials (bullet in para 61) needs to be clear that would decompose in seawater, which most “biodegradable materials” will not.

**UNIDO response:** Throughout the document the term “plastics degradable in sea-water “ has been revised accordingly.

- Annex D Plastic Value Chain seems to only address waste collection and recycling. I don't see mention of upstream players, particularly the private sector to create alternative materials, redesign, promote repair, resale, shared economy options. These players are fundamental to moving to a CE approach.

**UNIDO response:**

- Annex D has been revised throughout the life-cycle stages to include upstream activities, especially from the private players.

- Paragraph 64 now mentions “During PPG details of this situational analysis will be further detailed, which will also result in refining Annex D to ensure that circular economy life-cycle stages, especially from upstream private players are included”.
- REVISED Annex D is attached.

· Annex E Plastic Framework for Ghana – the fundamental barriers are heavily focused on collection and waste management. There is one barrier on collection, one on waste management/sorting/recycling. Then there’s one on lack of awareness. There’s only one barrier that vaguely refers to lack of policy incentives to promote circular economy strategies. This aspect needs greater consideration.

**UNIDO response:** A revised Annex E is attached to better include the lack of policy incentives to promote circular economy strategies.

In addition, the following has been added to paragraph 63 “Please see Annex E for the Theory of Change. Please note that during PPG the framework will be considered for other barriers/challenges in order to incorporate upstream barriers – e.g. reducing demand for plastic products, shifting to alternative materials, redesigning to be reusable/recyclable/compostable, etc”

## 5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

Yes

### Agency Response

## 6. Are the project’s/program’s indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

Yes

### Agency Response

#### 7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

Please see points regarding engagement in West Africa in the question regarding Knowledge Management below.

(Karrer, Nov 1, 2019)

Yes, these points are now addressed.

**Agency Response** Comment regarding learning and sharing among the West African Region has been addressed in the Knowledge Management section.

### Project/Program Map and Coordinates

#### Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

Yes, the project will work at the national level and in several indicated sites.



## Agency Response

### Stakeholders

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

Yes, the key players have been elaborated. In addition to the government, GPAP is an important collaborator. However, I understand that when working in Ghana, GPAP is referred to as the National Plastic Action Platform. If so, please ensure NPAP is appropriately referenced.

During PPG please ensure the appropriate referencing for GPAP relative to NPAP.

## Agency Response

References related to NPAP and GPAP have been checked.

### Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

No, please add basic information on the role of women in plastic lifecycle and how this project will address this aspect. For example, in some countries women and children are the majority of the informal waste pickers whose conditions are unsanitary and unhealthy. If this project would consider how to address waste collection and management to ensure improved work conditions, then this would be important to note.

(Karrer, Nov 1, 2019)

Yes, this point is addressed.

**Agency Response**

Paragraph 144 has been updated to include special situation of women and children related to waste collection, management and disposal.

In addition, the following has been added to paragraph 144 "Details are to be assessed during the PPG phase, including a detailed gender analysis and gender action plan."

**Private Sector Engagement****Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

No, This section does not reflect the existing engagement of the private sector in addressing plastics in Ghana. In particular the GRIPE alliance. There are also several private companies noted in your stakeholder list. Please revise to reflect the existing public-private partnerships and indicate how these will be strengthened. Working with GPAP and through UNIDO, it will also be possible to work with global corporations that play a role as they are the producers of products imported to Ghana or potential buyers of recycled material. Please incorporate this aspect into the text.

(Karrer, Nov 1, 2019)

Yes, these points are addressed.

### **Agency Response**

Paragraphs 151-153 have been revised to highlight the existing PPPs and GPAP's role in working with global corporations.

### **Risks**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

No, Please elaborate on the potential impacts of climate change.

(Karrer, Nov 1, 2019)

Yes, this point is addressed.

### **Agency Response**

The 'Climate Risk' in the Risk Table (Section 5) has been revised to elaborate on potential impacts on climate change and mitigation measures.

### **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?**  
**Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

No, There is an extensive list of Executing Agencies (Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation/EPA, World Economic Forum (GPAP), UNDP, Seureca Veolia). While these are all important partners, they will not all be receiving funding. Please limit the EAs to MESTI at this time and during PPG the appropriate EA can be determined. Relatedly, GPAP is considering where to house the Ghana NPAP which may be a consulting firm. If that's the case, that firm could be the EA. GPAP will not make this decision before the workprogram, so this will have to be considered during PPG.

In addition, the diagram after para 105 implies that the GEF/UNIDO project will be an umbrella for GPAP, government institutions etc. It implies that GEF/UNIDO is overseeing all these institutions, which is not accurate. We expect the funding from the GEF/UNIDO project to go toward implementing the Ghana NPAP activities to executing the National Plastic Management Policy as reflected by the project components. Rather than placing GEF-UNIDO Project overall all the institutions, instead it would seem we should be beside this list of institutions. Please redesign this diagram so it does not indicate that GEF/UNIDO are overseeing all the noted organizations. Further, there is no explanation in the text of this diagram further indicating it does not accurately reflect project plans.

(Karrer, Nov 1, 2019)

Yes, these points have been addressed.

#### **Agency Response**

Part I has been revised to only mention MESTI. Table2 and Paragraphs 156 and 157 have been revised accordingly.

Diagram (mentioned in former paragraph 105) has been deleted.

## Consistency with National Priorities

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

Yes

**Agency Response**

## Knowledge Management

**Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, Oct 22 2019)

No, The KM section has a clear explanation of plans with GPAP globally; however, there is limited discussion regarding plans for sharing experiences and promoting action in Africa, please expand on these plans particularly related to West Africa noting relevant partners and efforts for sharing experiences.

In addition, the International Waters focal area supports IWLEARN, which is a knowledge platform for sharing among IW projects. All projects are required to contribute 1% of their budget to participate in IWLEARN activities, including producing or engaging in many of the items already planned such as webinars, blogs, training workshops, etc. Please include plans to engage in IWLEARN, including the annual marine conference and biannual IW conference.

(Karrer, Nov 1, 2019)

Yes; however, during PPG please consider refining Output 3.3 which notes “promoting” Ghana’s work when it needs to also note learning from other countries’ experiences to ensure two-way learning. Also Output 3.1.1 seems focused on waste management, not upstream strategies that would ensure a circular economy perspective and is important for knowledge sharing.

1.

### **Agency Response**

- Paragraph 172: The following has been added “During PPG, details will be outlined to ensure how Component 3 can develop a detailed circular economy lifecycle approach so that upstream strategies are incorporated within the knowledge management, coordination and communication strategy towards a circular economy perspective.
- Paragraph 174 has been updated on IWLEARN.
- Component 3 has been revised to include “to learn from other countries’ experiences” in Table B and the body text.

### **art III – Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, Nov 1, 2019) Yes

### **Agency Response**

## Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Nov 1, 2019) Yes.

### Agency Response

### EFSEC DECISION

### RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer Oct 22) The above concerns need to be addressed.

(Karrer, Nov 1, 2019) Yes, the project is recommended for clearance.

### ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

## Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

As noted above, during PPG and for CEO endorsement, the following points need to be addressed:

- consider how to include a pilot activity that incorporates policies to reduce the production of single-use plastics (e.g. plastic bag bans or taxes). The pilot (v) is more about awareness-raising than directly limiting production.
- further clarify plans for the outputs under outcome 1.1 as there seem to be overlapping interests. Please ensure the opportunities and barriers for private sector behavior shifts are considered in addition to the legal aspects. In addition, GPAP has conducted scenario analyses in Indonesia, which is useful in considering the implications of options. GPAP may be conducting a similar analysis in Ghana.
- ensure the co-financing items are specific to Ghana. There are a few organizations, such as WB and Circulate Capital, where it's unclear if they are working in Ghana on plastics or more broadly engaged with GPAP. If the latter, then not relevant for this co-financing.
- - further refine plans, including under Output 1.1.1, to ensure all stages of the plastic lifecycle are addressed and the relevant stakeholders, particularly the private sector, are actively engaged. There tends to be a focus on waste collection and recycling; whereas the GEF is committed to ensuring upstream players, particularly from the private sector are engaged to create alternative materials, redesign products for circularity, promote repair, refill and resale, and foster other shared economy options. These players are fundamental to moving to a circular economy approach.
- reconsider the Annex E Plastic Framework for Ghana. Specifically, reconsider the fundamental barriers/challenges to incorporate upstream barriers – reducing demand for plastic products, shifting to alternative materials, and redesigning to be reusable/recyclable/compostable, etc.
- ensure the appropriate referencing for GPAP relative to NPAP.
- refine Output 3.3 which notes “promoting” Ghana’s work when it needs to also note learning from other countries’ experiences to ensure two-way learning. Also Output 3.1.1 seems focused on waste management, not upstream strategies that would ensure a circular economy perspective and is important for knowledge sharing.

### Review Dates



	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/23/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/1/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		