MINUTES

1. Welcome

1.1 Mr Luther Bois Anukur, Regional Director, IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa region welcomed the members to the 1st meeting of the National Scientific Committee at the Fairview Hotel, Nairobi, Kenya. The purpose of the meeting was to build a strategic coalition and agree on its role, scope, and function based on the shared Terms of Reference, update on the status of project implementation, receive feedback and strategic guidance, and review and validate the proposed 2018-2020 workplan.

2. Introductions

2.1 In attendance were David Wanjala, MOITC; Obadiah Mungai, NEMA; Prof Jared Onyari, KEWMA; Caroline Muriuki, NEMA; Faith Temba, KAM; Joyce Waweru, PETCO; Dr Ayub Macharia, MEF; Luther Bois Anukur, IUCN ESARO; Peter Manyara, IUCN MARPLASTICCS RPO. In absentia was a representative of SIDA, whose terms of reference were changed to observers.

2.2 The members nominated Dr Macharia as the Chair of the meeting and adopted the agenda as presented.

3. Overview of the MARPLASTICCS Project

3.1 The RPO gave an overview of the MARPLASTICCS project, including the basis of its establishment, global significance of the plastics issue and links to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), project objectives, and key deliverables.

3.2 Majority of the members did not have questions at this stage given they had already had previous exposure to the project overview presentation.

3.3 PETCO mentioned that they are already working with CORDIO to address PET bottles, and sought to know whether IUCN was aware of CORDIO and was in touch with them on marine plastics.

3.4 KAM advised to amend the key deliverable under policy to a broader Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) framework from the deliverable captured as Take Back Scheme. This was agreed upon by members.

3.5 KAM and NEMA sought to better understand the timing and roll out of different initiatives vis-à-vis the needs and initiatives in the country. This was to be clarified during the presentation of the work plan.
3.6 KAM reiterated that project outputs should be tools that stakeholders are able to access and use. Will the plastic footprint for companies be freely available and useable beyond the project? IUCN highlighted that despite the proprietary nature of different methodologies, MARPLASTICCCs will endeavour to deliver tools based on Open Science and citizen science principles.

3.7 KAM also sought to understand the eligibility of companies for the plastic footprint tool, and whether it considers a whole value chain or just part of it. IUCN responded that the tool is adaptable and is applicable within a wide range of company contexts.

3.8 MEF noted that the plastics footprint methodology had received prominence at the Sustainable Blue Economy conference as reiterated by the Cabinet Secretary. This is an important contribution of the project given that few countries have good levels of data and information regarding their plastic footprints.

3.9 KAM queried whether there were opportunities to learn from other countries, where MARPLASTICCCs is implementing activities. IUCN responded that the Capacity pillar of the project provides for opportunities for learning and sharing with and from others across the five countries.

3.10 NEMA pointed out on the importance to consult other initiatives, such as DANIDA’s support to the government of Kenya on plastics to avoid duplication. IUCN requested that members provide information on any initiatives of relevance that they come across so as to explore synergies at the national level.

3.11 The civil society representative, KEWMA advised that since waste management in the country is a devolved function, it is key to consider having at least a representative from the Council of Governors within the NSC.

3.12 As regards the proposed PPP projects, members sought to know if their organizations would be eligible to submit proposals towards the upcoming request for concepts/proposals on viable projects. IUCN responded that their organizations are eligible as any proposals will be vetted thoroughly by IUCN and the NSC.

4. Roles and responsibilities of NSC

4.1 The RPO delivered a presentation on the role and functions of the National Steering Committee, its membership, and organizational procedures of its meetings.

4.2 The Chairman posed a question on why all meetings are planned for Nairobi. Members elaborated that it was important if meeting venues were held in different cities to ensure maximum focus.

4.3 NEMA advised that it would be important for IUCN to consider submitting a formal letter to organizations to appoint or nominate their representatives to the NSC, and for such nominees to be formally recognized by their organizations and to ensure ownership. KAM noted that it would be important to highlight the value proposition to organizations constituting the NSC.

4.4 For effectiveness of the NSC, it would be important to share all materials for review early enough.

4.5 Could IUCN consider complimentary specialist committees which delve deeper into specific issues? These could be useful in enriching the NSC’s work.

4.6 As regards the number of meetings, members proposed that it could be more strategic to convene NSC meetings on a needs basis.


5.1 The IUCN RPO presented briefly on the outcomes of the Theory of Change (ToC) workshop and its input in developing a shared understanding, vision and results. He pointed out on the role of the ToC in ensuring alignment of country priorities to project deliverables given each country’s uniqueness. He revisited the need for continuous stakeholder mapping as an ongoing process, given the emerging realities on the ground.

5.2 The RPO also gave an update on overall project implementation and outlined the priorities to end of 2018 and the 2019-2020 workplan.

5.3 Members advised on the need for IUCN to share Terms of Reference beforehand with NSC members in order to enrich the TORs and shape their scope of engagement before implementation of different activities.

5.4 It was advised to reduce on the overall number of meetings and workshops, with focus given towards the two ‘major’ activities, i.e. footprint analysis and legal review work.

5.5 On data aggregation for the national plastic footprint analysis, NEMA proposed that it would be important to add an activity to aggregate the data from different sources, organizations and datasets. Members advised that a snowball
data acquisition technique, where a consultant approaches entities on one-on-one meetings basis will be effective. This requires well-defined and clear boundaries on the data required.

5.6 Is the PPP a Public-Private-Partnership in its strict sense? As this affects the timelines significantly if so pursued. IUCN clarified that the PPP was not initially envisaged as a PPP in its strict sense, but as a project that integrates the interests of the public and private sectors, municipalities and county governments, and local communities.

5.7 Members noted the importance for IUCN to focus on concrete activities and strengthen areas with tangible output that will bear fruit and recognition at the highest levels of government. Examples of these areas were mentioned as the plastics footprint baseline, legal gap analysis, PPP project, and regional technical working group on marine litter. The members encouraged IUCN to ensure that these deliverables come out as big for ownership and uptake by the Cabinet Secretary.

5.8 On the single-use plastic strategy, MEF highlighted that this is a priority activity for the Cabinet Secretary and that the earlier in the timeline it could be supported, the better. NEMA has already developed a Plastics Waste Management Bill which is currently under review.

5.9 Members proposed to add wider engagement technical workshops that provide useful comments to studies before their ultimate consideration and validation by the NSC.

5.10 In policy support, NEMA asked whether IUCN could consider drafting support to some policies and regulations, beyond providing recommendations in the one or two priority areas identified during the ToC. MEF added that the project plays an important role in achieving what government is not able to achieve with ease given meagre resources. Activities such as development of TORs and their management is always taxing on the part of government, while priorities identified within the project are necessary in Kenya.

6. Way forward and next steps

6.1 The members adopted the 2018-2020 workplan, with a caveat that critical comments be considered.

6.2 IUCN to prepare letters to institutions for their official nomination of representatives to the NSC.

6.3 IUCN need to support enhanced communication e.g. through policy briefs every six months as an example, while recognizing the NSC members in such publications. What has emerged from the NSC could be a start. Such communications helps enrich the implementation of the national workplan.

6.4 IUCN will consider KAM’s request to deliver a presentation on the company’s Plastics Footprint Methodology for an appreciation of what is and how it could be useful to companies.

6.5 IUCN will share the report of the NSC by December 7, while NSC members will submit their comments on the draft minutes no later than 14 December 2018. If a member does not submit feedback by that date, it is assumed that he or she has no comments to add and accepts the documented minutes as is.

6.6 Next formal meeting of the NSC is scheduled for the July 2019, with a date to be communicated later, although an ad hoc meeting of the NSC could be convened in early 2019 for review and selection of a PPP project.

7. AOB

7.1 IUCN could consider capturing additional national-level activities within its programme, such as the World Wetlands Day, World Environment Day, and World Oceans Day as these are critical activities spearheaded at the Cabinet Secretary’s level.

7.2 It is critical to invite and integrate the media during project events for effective dissemination of key messages.

There being no other business, the Chairman thanked participants for their dedication and time to participate in the NSC meeting and closed the meeting at 5.00pm.

[END]