



Distr.: General

8 June 2020

Original: English

Plastic Waste Partnership working group**First meeting**

Beau Vallon, Seychelles, 2-5 March 2020

Agenda item 5 (e) of the provisional agenda*

**Discussion on modalities for pilot projects
to be undertaken by the working group of
the Plastic Waste Partnership**

Modalities for pilot projects of the Basel Convention Partnership on Plastic Waste working group

I. Introduction

1. At its fourteenth meeting, held from 29 April to 10 May 2019, the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal adopted decision BC-14/13 on further actions to address plastic waste under the Basel Convention. In section VI of decision BC-13/14, the COP, among other things, welcomed the proposal to establish a Basel Convention Partnership on Plastic Waste, decided to establish a working group of the Partnership, adopted the terms of reference of the Partnership¹ and requested the working group to implement its workplan² for the biennium 2020-2021.
2. Section III, paragraph 3 (d) of the terms of reference provides that the overall tasks of the working group include to undertake pilot projects which support the delivery of the other overall tasks of the working group. The workplan for the working group for the biennium 2020–2021 provides that the working group is to develop and undertake pilot projects in three topic areas of the workplan, namely on policy and regulatory framework, environmentally sound management of plastic waste, and private sector collaboration. Section VIII of the Terms of reference provides that the working group may establish project groups, as necessary, to work on specific tasks to assist in the undertaking of activities falling within the mandate of the working group.
3. The present note, including its annex, has not been formally edited.

II. Implementation

4. In their proposal prepared for the first online consultations of the Partnership working group, held on 13 November 2019, the co-chairs invited members of the working group to submit their views on the activities, including possible pilot projects, that could be undertaken by each project group as a priority during the biennium 2020-2021. The co-chairs proposed that the co-chairs of the Partnership

* UNEP/CHW/PWPWG.1/1

¹ UNEP/CHW.14/INF/16/Rev.1, annex I.

² UNEP/CHW.14/INF/16/Rev.1, annex II.

working group, with the support of the co-chairs of the project groups, develop a proposal for the activities of the Partnership working group for 2020-2021³.

5. The submissions received have been made available on the website of the Convention⁴, except in the case where members requested their submissions to be kept confidential. A compilation of the information received is set out in document UNEP/CHW/PWPWG.1/INF/8. Various submissions highlight the importance of pilot projects and a number of concrete proposals have been put forward.

6. The annex to the present note sets out proposed modalities for the submission, selection, implementation and evaluation of pilot projects of the Partnership working group.

III. Outcome

7. At its first meeting, the Partnership working group considered the information in the present note including its annex, with a view to agreeing on the modalities for the submission, selection, implementation and evaluation of pilot projects of the Partnership working group and to establishing, pursuant to section VIII of the Terms of reference for the Basel Convention Partnership on Plastic Waste, a steering group tasked with overall guidance and oversight of the process.

8. The modalities for the submission, selection, implementation and evaluation of pilot projects of the Partnership working group were adopted by electronic means on 8 June 2020.

³ UNEP/CHW/PWPWG.1/2 related to Agenda item 5 (c) of the provisional agenda of the first meeting of the Partnership working group.

⁴

<http://www.basel.int/Implementation/Plasticwastes/Callforinformation/Followuptofirstonlineconsultation/tabid/8317/Default.aspx>

Annex

Modalities for the submission, selection, implementation and evaluation of pilot projects of the Basel Convention Partnership on Plastic Waste working group

1. The present modalities aim to clarify roles, responsibilities and processes to enable the Plastic Waste Partnership working group to undertake capacity building pilot projects for the benefit of developing country Parties or Parties with economies in transition, which support the delivery of the other overall activities of the working group, in line with its workplan adopted by the Conference of the Parties; in conformity with applicable United Nations (UN)/UN Environment Programme (UNEP)/Basel Convention's rules and regulations (e.g. financial), procedures and policies (notably on engagement with non-State stakeholders, corporate and policy due diligence, delegation of authority, partnerships, procurement, and legal instruments); and consistent with the relevant provisions of the Basel Convention and decisions of the Conference of the Parties.
2. These modalities are without prejudice to other activities undertaken by the working group pursuant to its mandate.
3. The working group of the Basel Convention Partnership on Plastic Waste, at its first meeting, established pursuant to section VIII of the Terms of reference for the Basel Convention Partnership on Plastic Waste, a steering group tasked with overall guidance and oversight of the process for submission, selection, implementation and evaluation of pilot projects in line with applicable rules and regulations.

I. Steering group

4. The steering group tasked with overall guidance and oversight of the process for submission, selection, implementation and evaluation of the pilot projects in line with applicable rules and regulations is established by the working group of the Partnership. In this context, the tasks of the steering group address the following (see details in section II):
 - (a) Specify the budget range, timeframe and other modalities for the pilot project proposals;
 - (b) Screen and assess proposals for pilot projects;
 - (c) Select and prioritize pilot projects to be implemented;
 - (d) Oversee implementation of pilot projects and monitor progress made; and
 - (e) Review the evaluations of pilot projects and provide advice to the working group on potential follow-up activities and projects replicating the pilots.
5. The steering group is formed by the co-chairs of the project groups of the Partnership working group and the officers of the Partnership working group. As appropriate, in undertaking the tasks listed in paragraph 4 above, the co-chairs of the project groups facilitate a consultation with and solicit input from the members of their respective project groups on projects submitted under their project group.
6. The steering group works by electronic means. The steering group may also decide to meet during the face-to-face meetings of the Partnership working group or other back-to-back meetings, time permitting. The Secretariat arranges for and services the meetings and supports the activities of the steering group.

II. Process

7. The processes related to pilot projects can be divided into four stages:
 - (a) Submission of pilot project proposals;
 - (b) Selection of pilot projects;
 - (c) Implementation of pilot projects;
 - (d) Evaluation of pilot projects.
8. Sections A to D below explain each of these stages in detail. Appendixes I to IV to the present annex contain templates to facilitate a streamlined, efficient and transparent process for the

submission, selection, implementation and evaluation of the projects. Any reference to activities undertaken by the Secretariat in respect of pilot projects is subject to receipt of the necessary financial resources.

9. The proponent of a project proposal and its implementing partner (if different from the proponent) that is a member of the working group, an officer of the working group or a co-chair of a project group does not participate in the selection process in relation to that proposal. If the proposal is selected and implemented, the proponent/implementing partner does not participate in the evaluation of the project. The member, officer or co-chair also takes all reasonable steps to avoid any perception of involvement in those processes.

A. Submission of pilot project proposals

10. Following the establishment of project groups and the completion of their respective workplans, the Secretariat publishes on its website and as widely as possible via its available channels, a call for proposals for each round of pilot projects, taking into account the workplans for the current biennium developed by the working group at its first meeting and the examples of possible pilot project topics agreed to by the project groups. The call for proposals includes relevant documentation, templates and guidance on the process for submitting the proposals. The timeframe for submission of proposals is two months starting from the date of publication of the call for proposals, unless a different deadline is otherwise agreed by the working group.

11. Proposals are submitted through the Secretariat, using the template available in appendix I to the present annex. Only proposals received by the deadline and completed using the template will be considered for selection.

12. A proponent of a pilot project proposal ensures that the following eligibility criteria are met for the proposal:

(a) Proposals may be submitted by Parties and Basel and Stockholm Convention Regional and Coordinating Centres, as well as any not-for-profit entities and non-Party States that have observer status under the Basel Convention;

(b) Only one project proponent or implementing partner (if different from the proponent) may be identified for each proposal; other entities contributing to the project may be identified as “project partners”;

(c) Proposals must be accompanied by a letter of endorsement from the Focal Point of the Party in which the project is to be implemented (for projects to be implemented in several countries, endorsements must be obtained from each of the respective Parties);

(d) Projects are to be implemented in Parties eligible to receive funding under the technical assistance programme of the Basel and Stockholm Conventions, namely developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition, subject to donor requirements that may apply in some cases.

13. The proponent or implementing partner (if different from the proponent) that is a not-for-profit entity is required to complete the Form for Due Diligence Review - Selection of not-for-profit entities included at the end of Appendix I, and satisfactorily fulfil the criteria as outlined therein.

14. The proponent or implementing partner is encouraged to engage relevant partners, including government, civil society, private sector and informal sector in the development of its proposal.

15. In-kind or financial contributions from the proponent or implementing partner, as well as relevant Parties and others, are welcome.

16. Proposals can be submitted for an indicative budget of USD 50,000 to 80,000 and an indicative timeframe of 12-18 months⁵.

B. Selection of pilot projects

17. The Secretariat circulates the proposals received by the deadline to the steering group for its consideration, along with the following information:

(a) Identification of where the proponent or implementing partner of a project proposal is a member of the working group, an officer of the working group or a co-chair of a project group;

⁵ COVID-19 related restrictions may impact the proposed timeframes for implementation of pilot projects.

- (b) Information on the eligibility of each proposal, including a due diligence check for not-for-profit proponents or implementing partners;
- (c) Draft assessment of proposals considered to be eligible, using appendix II to the present annex;
- (d) Draft ranking of the proposals considered to be eligible.

18. On receipt of the proposals together with abovementioned information, the members of the steering group may request additional information and/or ask clarifying questions to the proponent through the Secretariat as they may deem necessary. On receipt of the responses to all questions and transmission of any additional information that may have been requested, the steering group, with the support of the Secretariat, proceeds with assessing each proposal using the template available in appendix II to the present annex.

19. Other selection criteria may be specified, if so decided by the steering group; such selection criteria should be clearly documented.

20. In assessing, ranking and selecting the project proposals, the co-chairs of the project groups facilitate a consultation with the members of their respective groups for those project proposals submitted under their project group with a view to, among others, ensuring that the proposed projects align with the workplan of the project group and to provide input as to their ranking.

21. Should the eligibility criteria for a pilot project proposal or a proponent/implementing partner not be met based on the information provided in paragraph 17(b) above, the steering group does not proceed with the assessment of the proposal.

22. Based on the completed assessment, the steering group ranks and selects the pilot projects that can be considered for funding and prioritizes these taking into account the financial resources available and financial resources that may be provided for the implementation of selected projects after the selection process has been finalized. Donors providing voluntary contributions may select projects they wish to fund from this list of projects selected by the steering group. Donors may also earmark their voluntary contributions for one or several activities of projects from the list of projects selected by the steering group.

23. The Secretariat informs the members of the Partnership working group of the outcome of the assessment and selection of pilot projects.

24. The Secretariat also informs the proponents of the selected pilot projects accordingly and requests them to make any adjustments to a project proposal that may have been requested by the steering group. The completed project template is annexed to the legal instrument concluded between the Secretariat and the implementing partner. Once the legal instrument between the implementing partner and the Secretariat has been signed by both, the Secretariat will provide the implementing partner, within available resources, with any further assistance and guidance that may be needed to proceed towards the project implementation.

C. Implementation of pilot projects

25. The Secretariat monitors and oversees the implementation of the pilot project and regularly updates the steering group as well as the Partnership working group on the progress made.

26. Upon finalization of the pilot project, the implementing partner submits the final deliverables to the Secretariat and the steering group for review. The final deliverables are revised in accordance with any comments submitted by the steering group through the Secretariat. The implementing partner further submits a final narrative report to the Secretariat, using the template available in appendix III to the present annex, as well as the substantive and financial reports required by the UN legal instrument.

D. Evaluation of pilot projects

27. Once the final narrative report is received, the steering group, with the support of the Secretariat, undertakes a final evaluation of the pilot project, using the template available in appendix IV to the present annex.

28. The Partnership working group, through the Secretariat, reports to the Conference of the Parties on the pilot project activities undertaken. This report includes justification of the selection of the projects implemented, results achieved, as well as any lessons learned and conclusions arising out of the pilot projects.

III. Dissemination of results

29. Based on the final evaluation of the pilot project, the Secretariat prepares a short factsheet summarizing the outcomes of the project. The factsheet is published on the website of the Basel Convention to be used in awareness-raising activities by Parties and others to draw attention to the results of the project and invite stakeholders to consider the outcomes.

30. Additional documentation, such as the final project narrative report, may also be made available on the website of the Basel Convention.

Appendix I

Partnership on Plastic Waste working group pilot projects – template for proposals

(to be completed by the project proponent)

<p><u>Secretariat use only:</u></p> <p>Date received:</p> <p>Reference number:</p>
--

Instructions: Please read before proceeding.

Please carefully complete the fields listed below. Incomplete submissions will not be considered. The Secretariat may contact the proponent in case of clarifying questions.

Before submission, please ensure that the eligibility criteria are met:

- a) Proposals may be submitted by Parties and Basel and Stockholm Convention Regional and Coordinating Centres, as well as any not-for-profit entities and non-Party States that have observer status under the Basel Convention;
- b) Only one project proponent or implementing partner (if different from the proponent) may be identified for each proposal; other entities contributing to the project may be identified as project partners;
- c) Proposals must be accompanied by a letter of endorsement from the Focal Point of the Party in which the project is to be implemented (for projects to be implemented in several countries, endorsements must be obtained from each of the respective Parties);
- d) Projects are to be implemented in Parties eligible to receive funding under the technical assistance programme of the Basel and Stockholm Conventions, namely developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition, subject to donor requirements that may apply in some cases.

Please note that any action by the Secretariat to support the tasks of the Partnership on Plastic Waste working group, including the steering group, is to be in conformity with applicable United Nations (UN)/UN Environment Programme (UNEP)/Basel Convention’s rules and regulations (e.g. financial), procedures and policies (notably on engagement with non-State stakeholders, corporate and policy due diligence, delegation of authority, partnerships, procurement and legal instruments) and consistent with relevant provisions of the Basel Convention and decisions of the Conference of the Parties.

1. Project identification

1.1 Title of the project

1.2 Proponent (indicate full name of the entity)

Contact details	First Name:	Family Name:
	Gender:	
	Position:	
	Institution:	Type of institution
	Address:	
	City:	Zip code:
	Country:	
	Tel:	
	Email:	

Comment

1.3 Implementing partner (indicate full name of the entity)

Contact details

First Name: _____ Family Name: _____

Gender: _____

Position: _____

Institution: _____ Type of institution: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ Zip code: _____

Country: _____

Tel: _____

Email: _____

Comment

Note: The implementing partner is the entity with which the Secretariat would, as appropriate, enter into a legal agreement; it may be the proponent itself or a different entity, as identified in the project proposal.

Is the implementing partner a not-for profit entity? Yes No

If yes, the attached “Form for Due Diligence Review - selection of not-for-profit entities” is to be completed by the implementing partner and submitted with this form, under the responsibility of the proponent.

2. Proposed project description

- 2.1 Country(ies) of project implementation
- 2.2 Project duration (number of months)⁶
- 2.3 Background and project justification, including previous and/or planned projects/initiatives it builds on (max 250 words)
- 2.4 Objective(s) (max 150 words)
- 2.5 Activities (please enumerate, indicate a title for each activity and describe; add rows if needed) (max 500 words)

2.6 Please provide a simple workplan. (add more lines/columns if needed)

Activities	Year 1				Year 2		Responsible
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	
1.)							
2.)							
3.)							

2.7 Expected outputs (add rows if needed)

Outputs	Delivery date	Means of verification
	Click here to enter a date.	
	Click here to enter a date.	
	Click here to enter a date.	

⁶ Indicative minimum project duration is 12 months; indicative maximum project duration is 18 months. COVID-19 related restrictions may impact the proposed timeframes for implementation of pilot projects.

Outputs	Delivery date	Means of verification
	Click here to enter a date.	
	Click here to enter a date.	
	Click here to enter a date.	
Outputs	Delivery date	Means of verification
	Click here to enter a date.	
	Click here to enter a date.	
	Click here to enter a date.	

- 2.8 Project management: please explain how project implementation will be organized, including size and composition of the project team, expertise of the members of the project team and monitoring arrangements. (max. 250 words)
- 2.9 Project partners: please explain which partners will be engaged. (max. 150 words)
- 2.10 Risk analysis, please identify the top 3 risks for successful project implementation and the measures that will be taken to address these.

3. Budget

3.1 Budget⁷ breakdown in USD (please add more lines if needed)

Budget class	Item description ⁸	Unit description ⁹	Quantity	Unit cost	Total
Activity 1:					
Staff, expert and other personnel costs	[item]				
Contractual Services ¹⁰	[item]				
Travel	[item]				
Equipment, Vehicles and Furniture ^{10 11}	[item]				
Operating and Other Direct Costs	[item]				
Supplies Commodities and Materials ¹⁰	[item]				
Transfers and Grants Issued to Implementing Partner (IP) ¹²	[item]				
	Subtotal				
Activity 2:					
Staff, expert and other personnel costs	[item]				
Contractual Services	[item]				
Travel	[item]				
Equipment, Vehicles and Furniture	[item]				

⁷ The indicative budget can range from USD 50,000 to 80,000.

⁸ There can be several items in each budget category.

⁹ These are, for example, working months per person in case of staff or days in case of consultants, or number of travels.

¹⁰ Total amount of goods or services procured from other legal entities (companies) is limited to 15% of the total budget. If a higher degree of procurement is required, include it and we will look at the modalities of implementation.

¹¹ These are non-expendable assets. If the project implementation requires the purchase of these types of assets the ownership of the assets at the end of the project needs to be agreed. We also require a list of inventory as part of the end of project reporting requirements.

¹² These include non-profit organisations who are implementing partners who also adhere to value of the United Nations.

Operating and Other Direct Costs	[item]				
Supplies Commodities and Materials	[item]				
Transfers and Grants Issued to Implementing Partner (IP)	[item]				
	Subtotal				
Activity 3:					
Staff, expert and other personnel costs	[item]				
Contractual Services	[item]				
Travel	[item]				
Equipment, Vehicles and Furniture	[item]				
Operating and Other Direct Costs	[item]				
Supplies Commodities and Materials	[item]				
Transfers and Grants Issued to Implementing Partner (IP)	[item]				
	Subtotal				
	Total				

Comment

UN Budget classes explanation

No	Budget Class Name	Explanation
1.	Staff, expert, and Other Personnel Costs	<p>(i) Includes all costs related to project personnel and their entitlement. These include staff, administrative and support staff, consultants, experts, and interns.</p> <p>(ii) Meeting facilitators, interpreters, translators and evaluation consultants are also all to be budgeted under this Budget Class if they are contracted in their individual capacity. However, if they are contracted as a company then that must be budgeted under “Contractual services”.</p> <p>(iii) All contracting for staff, experts and other personnel should follow a transparent, fair and competitive recruitment process.</p>
2.	Contractual Services	<p>(i) Works and services of a commercial nature contracted following procurement procedures. This could include contracts given to NGOs if they are more similar to procurement of services than a grant transfer. (NGOs that are implementing partners to be budgeted under “Transfers and Grants Issued to Implementing Partner (IP)”.</p> <p>(ii) Where meetings/workshops require venue to be hired e.g. Hotel, then relevant costs to be budgeted under this Class.</p> <p>(iii) Commercial printing/publication contracts to be budgeted here</p> <p>(iv) All contracting should follow a transparent, fair and competitive procurement process. The companies should adhere to the highest standards of moral and ethical conduct.</p>

		(v) Total amount of goods or services procured from other legal entities (companies) is limited to 15% of the total budget. If a higher degree of procurement is required, it may be included and we will look at the modalities of implementation
3.	Travel	(i) Includes all reasonable travel related costs for staff, consultant, other personnel meeting participant. (ii) the costs can include reasonable cover for daily subsistence allowance or accommodation, meals, flight/train/bus/boat tickets, terminal expenses as applicable (iii) only economy class travel is allowed for all travelers, including staff.
4.	Equipment, Vehicles and Furniture	(i) Procurement of non-consumables e.g. IT equipment, vehicles, furniture etc. This would relate to all costs to put asset into service and the cost of disposal of the asset upon reaching its useful life. (ii) if this budget category is used, the ownership after the project of the equipment purchased will be agreed. (iii) final financial statement should include an inventory list of non-expendable (fixed) assets. (iv) Total amount of goods or services procured from other legal entities (companies) is limited to 15% of the total budget. If a higher degree of procurement is required, it may be included, and we will look at the modalities of implementation
5.	Operating and Other Direct Costs	(i) Rental of premises/equipment; utilities; cleaning; vehicle maintenance; communication costs including telephone and internet; Bank fee;
6.	Supplies, Commodities and Materials	(i) Consumable supplies e.g. office stationery, supplies, tools, etc.; (ii) Costs associated with the delivery, storage and distribution of consumable supplies procured such as transportation, freight, customs, insurance, warehousing and other logistical requirements;
7.	Transfers and Grants Issued to Implementing Partner (IP)	(i) To be used if SGP partner will work together with other non-profit partners and transfer funds to them under a contract. (ii) any procurement or partnering with for-profit companies should be budget under class "Contractual Services". (iii) The choice and the contracting of an implementing partner should follow a transparent and fair process. The partners should adhere to the highest standards of moral and ethical conduct. (iv) Implementing partners are required to provide a financial statement and refund any unspent balance of funds received, after the implementation of the agreed activities has ended. (iv) if this modality and budget category is used, approval is on a case by case basis and more information will be required as it has implications on the due diligence of the subcontractors.

3.2 Will co-funding be provided? If yes, please provide estimated amount and source.

3.3 Has an application for financial support through other financial mechanisms or trust funds, such as, but not limited to the Small Grants Programme of the Convention, the implementation fund of the Convention, the Global Environment Facility, and the Special Programme to support institutional strengthening at the national level for implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, the Minamata Convention and the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, covering activities specified in this project proposal been submitted and/or accepted? Yes No

If yes, please provide additional information.

4. Link to the goal and workplan of the Plastic Waste Partnership working group

4.1 Objectives

Please explain how the project will contribute to the goal¹³ of the Partnership working group.
(max 250 words)

4.2 Project groups
Under which project group will the project fall? (tick all that apply)

1) Prevention and minimization

2) Plastic waste collection, recycling and other recovery, including financing and related markets

3) Transboundary movements

4) Outreach, education and awareness raising

Comment

4.3 Activities
To which activity(ies)/pilot project(s) specified in the workplan¹⁴ will the project contribute?
(indicate all that apply, if more than one)

5. Additional project information

5.1 Innovation
Does the project aim at developing new tools to address plastic waste, tackle a new aspect of ESM plastic waste and/or feature another innovative element? If yes, please explain in the comment section. Yes No

Comment

5.2 Testing of existing guidance and tools
Does the project aim at testing existing guidance and tools for plastic waste (e.g. inventory, ESM guidance)? If yes, please explain in the comment section. Yes No

Comment

5.3 National relevance
Are the objectives of the project aligned with the needs of the country/ies in which the project is to be implemented and aligned with its/their ongoing national policy processes and initiatives? If yes, please explain in the comment section. Yes No

Comment

5.4 Replicability
Does the project have a high potential for scale/replicability, e.g. by providing a practical example of how other Parties and stakeholders can better succeed in similar activities? If yes, please explain and indicate which project outputs and activities could be replicated in other countries in the comment section. Yes No

Comment

5.5 Leveraging
Is the result of this project expected to trigger expanded activities in the immediate future? If yes, please explain in the comment section. Yes No

Comment

5.6 Sustainability
Will the conditions for achievement of the outcomes to be established through this project prevail beyond the project duration? If yes, please explain in the comment section. Yes No

¹³ The goal of the Basel Convention Partnership on Plastic Waste is to improve and promote the environmentally sound management of plastic waste at the global, regional and national levels and prevent and minimize their generation so as to, among other things, reduce significantly and in the long-term eliminate the discharge of plastic waste and microplastics into the environment, in particular the marine environment.

¹⁴ Project group workplans are available on the Basel Convention website at:
<http://basel.int/Implementation/Plasticwaste/PlasticWastePartnership/tabid/8096/Default.aspx>.

	Comment		
5.7	Gender mainstreaming Does the project advance gender mainstreaming? If yes, please explain in the comment section. Comment	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
5.8	South – south cooperation Does the project advance south-south cooperation? If yes, please explain in the comment section. Comment	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
5.9	Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Does the project contribute towards the achievement of the SDGs? If yes, please explain how and to which SDGs and targets the project contributes in the comment section. Comment	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

To be completed by a proponent or implementing partner (if different from the proponent) that is a not-for-profit entity

Form for Due Diligence Review Selection of not-for-profit entities

Category A: (Red) Exclusionary criteria		
Criteria:	Yes/No	Comments:
1. Legal status and governance		Copies of the Partner’s incorporation/registration document; and its governing documents (e.g. by-laws) must be publicly available
1.1 Does legal status reflect a not-for profit status?		
1.2 Has the entity been duly registered?		
2. Financial and administrative capacity		
2.1 Are its audited financial statements publicly available, showing sound financial management?		
3. Technical capacity		
3.1 Does the entity have the basic technical capacities to carry out the project?		
Category B: (Yellow) Caution		
Criteria	Yes/No	Comments:
4. Alignment to UN values:		
4.1 Does the entity fail to meet relevant obligations or responsibilities required by the United Nations?		
4.2 Does the entity violate sanctions established by the UN Security Council?		

4.3	Are there any issues with the entity that could pose a reputational risk to UNEP/BRS?			
5.	Already working with UNEP/BRS:			
5.1	Is the entity currently working with any part of UNEP/BRS as an implementing partner?			
Category C: (Green) Positive screening (eligibility criteria)				
Criteria:	Yes/No	Score¹⁵ 1/0	Comments:	
6.	Specific Technical Capacities			
6.1	Does the entity have relevant proven experience in implementing similar activities (e.g., at a similar level of technical complexity; access to relevant information sources/networks)?			
6.2	Has the entity previously managed activities in the same geographic area?			
6.3	Has the entity previously managed efforts at a similar scale of funding?			
6.4	Are there additional technical merits for partnering with the entity?			
7.	Strategic Capacity			
7.1	Does the organizational mandate of the entity cover the purpose of the proposed activity?			
7.2	Does the entity have an environmental or sustainability policy that reflects similar / complementary values to those of BRS/ UNEP?			
7.3	Does the entity have positive feedback from working with BRS, UNEP, the UN and/or other intergovernmental organizations?			
7.4	Are there additional strategic merits for partnering with the entity?			
Total Score for positive screening:			x/8	>5
				3-5
				<3
<i>Score of more than 5 – clear yes; score of 3-5 – require an explicit, clear commitment; score of less than 3 – consider no</i>				

Duly authorized officer of the implementing partner

Signature:

Name:

Title:

Date:

BRS internal use

¹⁵For questions 6-7 award 1 point for YES, 0 for NO.

Signature:

Name:

Title: Executive Secretary, BRS Secretariat

Date:

Appendix II

Partnership working group pilot project – Project selection

(to be completed by the steering group)

Date received:
 Reference number:
 Proponent:
 Title of the project:
 Overall cost:

1. Preliminary conditions and eligibility

1.1 Completeness check: Is the proposal form duly completed and is a letter of endorsement from the Focal Point of the Party in which the project is to be implemented (for projects to be implemented in several countries, endorsements must be obtained from each of the respective Parties) attached?

1.2 Does the proposal meet all of the following basic eligibility criteria? Where appropriate, the proponent can be contacted to provide any potentially missing information. The following eligibility criteria apply:

- a) Proposals may be submitted by Parties and Basel and Stockholm Convention Regional and Coordinating Centres, as well as all not-for-profit entities and non-Party States that have observer status under the Basel Convention;
- b) Only one project proponent or implementing partner (if different from the proponent) may be identified for each proposal; other entities contributing to the project may be identified as project partners;
- c) Proposals must be accompanied by a letter of endorsement from the Focal Point of the Party in which the project is to be implemented (for projects to be implemented in several countries, endorsements must be obtained from each of the respective Parties);
- d) Projects are to be implemented in Parties eligible to receive funding under the technical assistance programme of the Basel and Stockholm Conventions, namely developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition, subject to donor requirements that may apply in some cases.

1.3. Is the implementing partner a not-for-profit entity? Yes No

If yes, has the “Form for Due Diligence Review - selection of not-for-profit entities” been completed? Yes No

For Secretariat completion:

Does the not-for-profit entity satisfactorily comply with the due diligence requirements outlined in the “Form for Due Diligence Review - selection of not-for-profit entities”? Yes No

If the proposal and the proponent/implementing partner do not satisfy the above eligibility criteria, the evaluation is to be terminated at this stage.

2. Overall assessment

Provide an overall assessment of the project proposal’s quality, taking into account among others coherence across the activities, outputs, feasibility considering timeframe and budget, its linkages with the goal and workplan of the Partnership, engagement of stakeholders etc. (max 350 words)

3. Quantitative assessment

The following section provides a quantitative assessment using a series of Yes/No answers to complement the qualitative assessment provided in the executive summary. The comment field can be used to elaborate on what the project did well and/or what may be missing as well as to point out any other relevant issues.

Score: Yes = 2 points / To some extent = 1 point / No = 0 points

Evaluation question	Comments	Points
---------------------	----------	--------

1.	Does the background and project justification provide a rationale and sufficiently strong evidence of the needs that are to be addressed through the project		
2.	Is the objective clear and achievable?		
3.	Are the activities coherently structured and can be reasonably expected to serve to achieve the project objective objective(s)?		
4.	Are the outputs tangible and correspond to the activities?		
5.	Is the organisation of the project management team sufficient to expect smooth implementation?		
6.	Will the project engage relevant partners, incl. government, civil society, private sector, informal sector etc.?		
7.	Are key risks identified and can the proposed measures be expected to be mitigate them?		
8.	Is the timeline featured in the workplan achievable?		
9.	Is the project cost-effective, i.e. can it be expected to deliver high impact at low cost?		
10.	Has significant co-funding been secured?		
11.	Does the proposal succeed in explaining how the project will contribute to the goal of the Partnership working group?		
12.	Is the proposal linked to at least one of the working group project groups?		
13.	Is the proposal linked to at least one of the activities specified in the workplan?		
14.	Does the project aim at developing new tools to address plastic waste, tackle a new aspect of the ESM of plastic waste, and/or feature another innovative element?		
15.	Does the project aim at testing existing guidance and tools for plastic waste (e.g. inventory, ESM guidance)?		
16.	Are the objectives of the project aligned with the needs of the country and aligned with ongoing national policy processes and initiatives?		
17.	Does the project have a high potential for scale/replicability, e.g. by providing a practical example of how other Parties and stakeholders can better succeed in similar activities?		
18.	Is the result of this project expected to trigger expanded activities in the immediate future?		
19.	Will the conditions for achievement of the outputs to be established through this project prevail beyond the project duration?		
20.	Does the project advance gender mainstreaming?		
21.	Is the project to be implemented in a small island developing State and/or a least developed country?		
Overall score (maximum score = 42)			

4. Final assessment

Taking into account the qualitative and quantitative assessment, please categorise the project proposal as follows:

- Outstanding – strongly recommended for selection
- Satisfactory - recommended for selection subject to availability of funding
- Partially satisfactory – only recommended subject to further improvements and availability of funding
- Unsatisfactory - not recommended for selection

Final comments:

Appendix III

Partnership working group pilot project – Final narrative report (to be completed by the implementing partner)

1. Project identification and implementation arrangements

1.1 Title of the project

1.2 Implementing partner

1.3 Country(ies) of project implementation

1.4 Project duration From To
(MM/YYYY) (MM/YYYY)

1.5 Partners engaged in the project

Brief summary of how partners were engaged in the project, including potential challenges encountered (max 250 words)

2. Project self-evaluation: Objectives, outputs, timeframe and budget

2.1 Narrative summary of project implementation (max 250 words)

2.2 Did the project achieve its objectives as outlined in the project document?

Yes

Partly

No

Brief summary

2.3 Please describe the activities that have been implemented, including any challenges encountered in implementing them. (please use the same numbering and titles of activities as indicated in the project document; add rows, if needed) (max 500 words)

2.4 Did the project complete the outputs as outlined in the project document?

Yes

Partly

No

If partly/no, explain:

Using the table below, please indicate how the outputs have been delivered. (add rows if needed)

Activity 1:		
Outputs	Date delivered	Evidence (e.g. electronic copy of report, website)
	Click here to enter a date.	
	Click here to enter a date.	
	Click here to enter a date.	
Activity 2:		

Outputs	Delivery date	Evidence
	Click here to enter a date.	
	Click here to enter a date.	
	Click here to enter a date.	
Activity 3:		
Outputs	Delivery date	Evidence
	Click here to enter a date.	
	Click here to enter a date.	
	Click here to enter a date.	

2.5 Has the project been completed on time?

Yes

No

If no, please explain:

2.6 Have the funds been spent in accordance with the project budget?

Yes

No

If no, please explain:

2.7 Has co-financing been provided in accordance with the project budget?

Yes

No

If no, please explain:

3. Project self-evaluation: additional project information

3.1 Please explain how the project contributed to the goal of the Partnership working group. (max 200 words)

3.2 Please explain in how far the project paved the way for follow-up activities. (max 200 words)

3.3 Please explain measures that have been taken to ensure the sustainability of the project's outputs. (max 200 words)

3.4 Please explain in how far the project advanced gender mainstreaming. (max 200 words)

3.5 Please explain if the project advanced south-south cooperation. (max 200 words)

3.6 Please explain if the project contributed towards the achievement of the SDGs. (max 200 words)

4. Further information

4.1 Please outline any lessons learned from the project. (max 250 words)

4.2 Please provide any advice how the project could be replicated in other countries/regions. (max 250 words)

4.3 Please provide feedback on experiences/lessons learned in the use of existing tools.

4.4 Please provide a list of documents/tools developed as part of the project.

4.5 Please provide any further information you consider relevant.

Signature of a duly authorized officer of the implementing partner:

Name:
Position:
Date:

Appendix IV

Partnership working group pilot project – Final evaluation

(to be completed by the steering group)

Reference number:

Implementing partner:

Title of the project:

Country/ies:

Project duration: From (MM/YYYY) To (MM/YYYY)

1. Project evaluation: Objectives, outputs, timeframe and budget

1.1 The project achieved its objectives as outlined in the project document.

Yes Partially No

Comment

1.2 The project completed the outputs and met the corresponding targets as outlined in the project document.

Yes Partially No

Comment

1.3 The project has been completed within the indicated timeframe.

Yes No

Comment

1.4 The funds have been spent in accordance with the project budget.

Yes No

Comment

1.5 Co-financing has been provided in accordance with the project budget.

Yes No

Comment

2. Project evaluation: additional project information

2.1 The project contributed to the goal of the Partnership working group.

Yes Partially No

Comment

2.2 The project paved the way for follow-up activities.

Yes Partially No

Comment

2.3 Adequate measures have been taken to ensure the sustainability of the project's outputs.

Yes Partially No

Comment

2.4 The project advanced gender mainstreaming.

	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>		Partially	<input type="checkbox"/>		No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment									
2.5	The targeted stakeholder group(s) have been successfully engaged and actively participated in the project activities.								
	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>		Partially	<input type="checkbox"/>		No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment									
2.6	Adequate measures have been taken to allow replication of the project in other countries/regions.								
	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>		Partially	<input type="checkbox"/>		No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment									

3. Overall evaluation

3.1	Evaluation of the overall quality of the project implementation									
	Outstanding	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>	Partially satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comment										
3.2	Evaluation of the overall quality of the developed documents/tools									
	Outstanding	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>	Partially satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comment										
3.3	Other comments/concluding remarks									
