

Promoting Resource Efficiency and Circularity to Reduce Plastic Pollution for Asia and the Pacific

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10628

Countries

Regional (Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand, Viet Nam)

Project Name

Promoting Resource Efficiency and Circularity to Reduce Plastic Pollution for Asia and the Pacific

Agencies

ADB

Date received by PM

5/14/2021

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Leah Karrer

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

MSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). No.

The CER indicates the project will occur in Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand, and Viet Nam. There are city action plans (output 1.1) in Manila City, Philippines, Tan An, Viet Nam, and Cirebon, Indonesia. There are policy plans for (output 1.2) for Viet Nam and Thailand. And there are pilots (output 2.2) planned for Cirebon, Indonesia and Tan An, Viet Nam. Please clarify what activities will occur in Myanmar.

Please clarify the intent of Outcome 1 related to city action plans. Table B says ?drafted? and the text under the Theory of Change says ?supported? and then the text under Output 1.1 says ?developed and implementation supported?.

There continues to be an emphasis on downstream measures. Often there is mention of circular economy as well as SWM. SWM is one aspect of CE. If SWM is called out, then so too should the other aspects ? alt materials, reuse? For example, under Output 3 The Bankable investments workshop notes CE, alternative materials and SWM but not the other aspects.

Output 1.1 - The city action plans focus heavily on waste collection and management and do not reflect a circular economy approach, which also encompasses alternative materials, reuse, refill systems and repairs and resale services. Manila City and Tan An, for example, both discuss examining existing SWM systems, but not existing reuse or refill systems. Investments in infrastructure need to include considering not only recycling facilities, but also commercial sanitation for washing reusable durable bottles, cups, plates, utensils, etc that are otherwise single-use disposables as well as for resale and repair services. The workshops need to include not only recycling but also reuse/repair/resale stakeholders. Discussion of analyzing perceptions needs to consider not only perceptions of waste, but also perceptions of solutions such as reuse, repair, resale, etc and how to overcome the misperception that plastic disposables are ?safer? and ?cleaner? than reusables.

Of greatest concern, all 8 of the items listed for the Cirebon city action plan are focused on recycling. None of the upstream options are even mentioned. And the discussion of Cirebon mentions a Circular Business Hub and Test Facility for plastic recycling activities through the GEF project, but this hub is intended to foster all circular innovations not only related to recycling.

There is mention of biodegradable materials as alternatives to plastics. ?Biodegradable? does not have a set standard and often requires extreme conditions such as high temperatures and does not degrade in landfills or in the marine environment. ?Compostable? in contrast is recognized to mean will degrade in a composting facility, but requires actually being sent to a compost facility. In the Ghana project standards are identified for biodegradable and composting standards, which may be useful to consider.

Output 1.2 focuses on recycling and waste management with little mention to how policies to promote upstream actions will be pursued.

Output 1.2 mentions Viet Nam and Thailand. What about the other countries?

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). No.

As noted in the PIF review, government co-financing at least in-kind is expected and private sector support was also discussed. Please pursue this option or provide an explanation as to why the governments are not providing resources to support this project, which suggests a lack of commitment. Please also explain the lack of support from the private sector.

The co-financing loan documentation indicates \$50M co-financing; whereas the CER indicates \$69,000 in loan. Please clarify or correct. Please also ensure the letter confirming the grant amount of \$3.7M is included.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response
Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, June 7, 2021).

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems,
including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects
were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is
there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a
description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). No.

The photos of buildings and maps are included twice.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). No.

There have been extensive consultations with global initiatives, such as GPAP, WWF Plastic Smart Cities, UNEP, World Bank and others. However, it seems the NGOs in the countries have not been consulted.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). No.

The private sector does not seem to have been engaged. There is mention of Coca-Cola but it is unclear what role they would play in the project and they have not been consulted. Here is an opportunity to discuss with them a pilot reusable bottle system. At the city level also the private sector associations such as chambers of commerce have not been engaged. Only in Indonesia it seems there have been some consultations with businesses.

Agency Response
Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response
Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). No.

The regional EA needs to be identified.

The institutional arrangements indicate that ADB will serve as executing agency, which is not accepted under GEF policy. An entity other than the ADB has to execute the project, which includes hosting the PCU. The regional organization (TBD) would seem the likely choice. Currently the regional executing entity is written as only "supporting" coordination, which suggests little authority.

The CoFos have been removed. These entities were going to play an important role to engage stakeholders. Please explain how these responsibilities will be undertaken by other entities.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). No.

The Partner knowledge sharing webinar series is noted twice. Also, it mentions waste trade but not other circular strategies (alt materials, refill, reuse, resale, repair, etc).

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response
Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response
Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	6/7/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations