

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

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10628

**Countries**

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

**Project Title**

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

**GEF Agency(ies)**

ADB

**Agency ID**

**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, July 8 2020). Yes

(Karrer Sept 10 2020). No. Please address these 2 points:

- 1) Project information - item "countries", the participant countries for which we found Letters of Endorsement (Myanmar, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, Viet Nam) are missing. Please include the countries' names accordingly.
- 2) Maps in Section 1b. and Annex A should be included in the Portal.

(Karrer Sept 11 2020). Addressed.

#### **Agency Response**

ADB Response: 11 September 2020

The two points have been addressed. Thank you.

### **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, July 8 2020). No. In particular these issues need to be addressed:

- 1) There continues to be a heavy emphasis on solid waste management. The GEF is committed to pursuing circular economy approaches, which requires addressing the entire lifecycle of plastics, including materials, design, use as well as waste management. Instead there are still sections throughout the document that either only note SWM plans. These sections include: a) the explanation of the situation in Asia and the Pacific described under Baseline scenario. The first paragraph starts focused on SWM. There needs to be an explanation of the entire plastic pollution reduction measures (e.g. redesign of products for reuse or recycling, elimination of unnecessary single use plastics, shift to reusable and refillable systems, and increased use of recycled content). b) Outcome 1.1 lists a series of baseline analyses which detail SWM assessments without any mention of the other phases of circular economy. There needs to be analysis of recycled content, redesign for recyclability, resale and reuse opportunities, refill and shared system options, repair, etc.; c) Output 2.1 notes SWM assessments and waste audits which need to be expanded to consider the other aspects of circular approaches; d) Output 2.2 pilot activities mentions pursuing reduce-reuse-recycle approaches, but then the explanation of the pilot activities focuses only on waste management. e) The list of criteria for selecting sites in Output 2.2 notes waste management efforts, but not early phase interests – e.g. efforts to pursue shared or refill systems. Sites that understand and embrace circularity (not just waste management) should be prioritized. f) The description of Output 3.1 Knowledge products notes SWM related efforts and nothing about early phase efforts (i.e. redesign, recycled content, reuse/refill systems etc.); g) the explanation of 8. Knowledge Management emphasizes SWM under the assessment without mention of other aspects of CE.
- 2) The linkages with GPAP regional plans on plastics need to be clear. The section Linkages with GPAP and NPAPs only notes GPAP is working in Indonesia and Viet Nam. GPAP has been pursuing an ASEAN regional plastics project and it is very important that the GEF coordinate with those plans. An explanation as to the status of the GPAP ASEAN plans needs to be provided and it needs to be very clear that coordination mechanisms will be determined during PPG.
- 3) There is brief mention of focusing on ghost fishing as the pilot in Indonesia. While this is recognized as an aspect of plastic pollution, given that ghost fishing raises its own unique issues / solutions / stakeholders and given that the GEF / ADB Indonesia plastic project will address ghost fishing, it seems the limited capacity of this project would best be focused on land-based aspects rather than extended limited resources to tackle the unique aspects of ghost fishing.

There are also several smaller issues:

- 4) When inputting the revision, please note the project as “regional” and “Asia” to ensure it gets directed to the correct staff
- 5) The plans under Outcome 1, specifically the table of country considerations, needs to reference the GEF funded Indonesia project in the list for Indonesia.
- 6) The GEF projects section has a few inaccuracies. The COBSEA Regional Action Plan for Marine Litter is not a GEF project. There is mention of the Plastic Silit project as “proposed”; it has now been approved. And there is no mention of the other two GEF funded plastic projects, which are in Ghana and Latin America.

Please note that a critical aspect of PPG will be identifying the regional level executing agency. A few options are noted, including COBSEA and PEMSEA, and this issue needs to be resolved during PPG for CEO endorsement. WWF is noted as a close collaborator, which suggests they would also be considered.

During PPG clarification also needs to be provided with regard to what is meant by 1.2 policies,... “advanced”. The plans for establishment and enforcement need to be clarified.

(Karrer, Aug 5 2020). No.

- 1) The explanation in the section Linkages with Global Plastic Action Partnership and National Plastic Action Partnerships does not include an explanation as to the status of the GPAP ASEAN plans, which needs to be included. Please also clarify that coordination mechanisms will be determined during PPG. Also, for consistency, please refer to the GPAP Playbook as “GPAP in a Box” as noted elsewhere in the PIF.
- 2) While we appreciate that SWM is an important part of addressing plastic pollution and the USA Council comments also reflect the importance of SWM, we also want to ensure the full lifecycle of plastics is addressed – i.e. eliminate unnecessary plastics including switching to alternative materials, innovate and design for reuse and refill, and circulate for recycling. The revision still has a heavy emphasis on SWM and minimal reference to alternative materials and reuse/refill strategies, which are common strategies in circular economy approaches to plastic pollution. A few examples of needed revisions are noted and please review the entire document to ensure consistency in addressing all phases. Output 2.1 still emphasizes waste collection and recycling and needs to be expanded to also consider the other aspects of circular approaches. Also Output 2.2 two demos are focused on waste sorting, collection and recycling. These need to be reconsidered to include early phase demos. We’d suggest one demo per phase (eliminate unnecessary plastics, instigate reuse and refill systems, and then collection & recycling). The list of criteria for selecting sites in Output 2.2 heavily emphasizes waste management efforts with little mention of early phase efforts – e.g. efforts to pursue shared or refill systems. Sites that understand and embrace circularity (not just waste management) should be prioritized. Output 3.1 notes themes that include SWM, but again not alternative materials, reuse, refill. Output 3.2 still emphasizes SWM and recycling with little note of the importance of elimination and reuse/refill systems. In short, when SWM is noted then so too eliminating plastics and redesign for reuse and refill should also be noted. PPG there needs to be close attention to ensuring these early phases are priorities in the project.  
We understand that during PPG reconsideration will be given to whether ghost fishing will be one of the pilot projects. Our concern is that land-based sources contribute 80% of marine pollution. Recovering fishing gear is a complicated undertaking and quite different from plans for reducing single use plastic packaging, the main source of marine plastic.

We also understand that during PPG the criteria and selection of the regional level executing agency will be determined. A few options are noted, including COBSEA, PEMSEA and WWF.

(Karrer, Sept 1 2020). Yes. During PPG there needs to be close attention to ensuring these early phases are priorities in the project. Further, during PPG the regional level EA will be selected.

## Agency Response

### ADB Responses 24 August 2020

- 1) These insertions have been made in the appropriate section - which is highlighted. Note that the GPAP Playbook and GPAP in a Box, are two different things. The distinction has been noted in the narrative.
- 2) Extensive modifications have been introduced throughout the Project Justification and the Alternative Scenario to address the CE concerns. These are in highlight. Note that under Outcome 2 - related to pilot project and investments, we confirm that **no** GEF funds will be used. These activities are funded by other donors. What we have done, based on our video conference call on Friday, 14 August, is to make some changes to the activities of other donors, where permissible, and also include the cross-reference to Outcome 3 - on knowledge relevant to CE, which will be integrated with Outcome 2 actions.
- 3) Ghost fishing gear has been removed from consideration under this project.
- 4) The document outlines the criteria by which regional mechanism will be selected. (See Section 6 Coordination).

ADB Response: 22 July 2020:

A number of revisions have been introduced to address the concerns identified in the review.

However we would like to ask for guidance from GEF on the comment received from the US Government on the related “Plastik Sulit” PIF in Indonesia: *“the limited solid waste management work ..... causes concern that this project misses an important opportunity to contribute to improved environmentally sound waste management systems, which would enable the project to achieve more significant and sustainable results. Recognizing that the GEF’s comparative advantage may lay outside the implementation of solid waste management system, we recommend the project consider the development of a solid waste management strategy, as an additional component of the governance mechanisms.”* The need to ensure that efforts to promote circular economy approaches have foundation in sound integrated solid waste management, seems to be important to some practitioners.

With respect to GPAP linkages #2): There have been direct communications on GPAP in relation to this regional MSP PIF (beyond the collaboration in Indonesia), with inputs provided on their ASEAN plans. This section of the PIF has been modified accordingly.

With respect to "ghost fishing gear" \$ 3): The observation is noted with thanks. Prior to ADB/GEF Indonesia “Plastik Sulit” project PIF approval, Government of Indonesia had specifically requested to include ghost fishing in the pilot project funded by the Japan Fund for Poverty Reduction. This can be re-evaluated now that the GEF / ADB Indonesia plastic project (Plastik Sulit) responds to this Government need more fully. This will be clarified during the project preparation phase.

With respect to reference to COBSEA etc #6): The reference to COBSEA has been modified.

Regarding reference to the Plastik Sulit initiative in Indonesia: It is our understanding that the Plastik Sulit project in Indonesia has only received PIF approval, but not CEO endorsement – which is why we consider this “proposed”. However, we now have referenced this as “PIF-approved”. Our team has secured the PIFs for the Ghana and LAC projects, which are now referenced in the body of the PIF.

On the regional level coordination /execution: The project has identified principal national government ministries / departments as GEF Executing Entities. The project will consider more formal engagement with a ‘coordinating body / mechanism’ during project preparation. During preparation of these PIF revisions, additional due diligence has been undertaken on this matter, and clearly no single organization stands out. While it is not possible to make a commitment at such an early stage on the project development cycle, what we have done, is to elaborate some minimum criteria for selection, and leave the field open to explore how the “coordination model” will be established.

On point related to Output 1.2 "policies advanced": Thank you = “advanced” has been revised to “drafted” and the scope will be further clarified during project preparation. The project would support the processes to design and draft policy and regulatory measures, and outline establishment and enforcement measures. Actual legislative approval processes and enforcing policy measures is beyond the scope of the project.

## 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, July 8 2020). Yes. However, we expect some government investment for this project. During PPG this aspect needs significant attention to determine how the governments will provide in-kind or cash contributions.

### Agency Response

ADB Response: 22 July 2020

Co-financing from national and sub-national recurrent expenditures and in-kind contributions will be discussed with respective Governments during project preparation. Options for some private sector co-financing may also be explored.

## 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, July 8 2020). No. The source of Chemicals and Waste funds should be noted as POPs for both Table D and Table E. Please ensure and indicate that 1% of IW funds will go towards engaging in IWLEARN activities.

(Karrer, Aug 5 2020). Yes.

## **Agency Response**

ADB Response 22 July 2020:

Tables D and E have been modified.

The PIF does not require a budget submission. The 1% allocation for IWLEARN will be included at the CER stage. However, reference has been made in the PIF narrative on Knowledge Management, to be sure.

## **The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

## **Agency Response**

## **The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

## **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, July 8 2020). Yes. \$50,000 is the allowable cap for MSPs.

## 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, July 8 2020). No. The proposed target for POPs (core indicator 10) is three times the target of this core indicator. The calculation assumes all prevented plastic is usually burnt, which is unlikely to be the case. Please re-evaluate the estimate.

(Karrer, Aug 5 2020). No. Core indicators section notes 344g TEQ, which is fine and in line with expectations. However Annex D worksheet (Word doc) explanation notes 7gTEQ avoided and then 3,136gTEQ. Further, the Annex worksheet references a Worksheet and the Worksheet on file (Excel) indicates 3,143 gTEQ. Please insure consistency in calculations. It seems these two documents reflect the previous calculation and need to be updated.

(Karrer, Sept 1 2020). Yes.

## Agency Response

ADB Response 24 August 2020

1) The reviewer must have referenced the outdated Excel worksheet from 20-06-17. The Annexed worksheet file that should be viewed is titled "**20-07-27 Revised GEF GEB Core Values**" - and has the revised data. (unfortunately we cannot delete annexes and uploaded documents in the Portal).

ADB Response: 22 July 2020

The calculation does not assume that 100% of plastic is usually burned. The core assumption is that 47% of prevented waste is typically burned. This is in line with SystemIQ's findings for Indonesia (our principal reference). The volumes do appear high as four of these 5 countries are among the top plastic polluters in the world.

Based on the GEF Sec comment, we have revised our approach and provided more conservative estimates (refer to the narrative section on GEBs and the Core Indicator Worksheet annexed). This will be re-assessed during project preparation.

## 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, July 8 2020). Yes.

## Agency Response

## Part 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, July 8 2020). Yes.

**Agency Response**

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

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

(Karrer, July 8 2020). Yes.

**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, July 8 2020). Yes.

**Agency Response**

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

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

(Karrer, July 8 2020). Yes.

## Agency Response

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, July 8 2020). 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, July 8 2020). No.

Under the Global environmental benefits section, please clarify the amount of gTEQ avoided to be consistent with the amount in Table F, 3,143 and please clarify that this is for POPs.

(Karrer, Aug 5 2020). No. Please see previous points under the above #6 regarding consistency.

(Karrer, Sept 1 2020). Yes.

## Agency Response

ADB Response 22 July 2020:

The revised calculation of 344 gTEQ is based on UNEP Dioxin guidance for plastics with a high PVC content and open/inefficient burning. It

has been calculated based on the revised approach outlined in the Core Indicator worksheet.

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

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

(Karrer, July 8 2020). Yes.

**Agency Response**

**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, July 8 2020). Yes.

**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, July 8 2020). No. See points under Coordination question.

(Karrer, Aug 5 2020). No. See points under Coordination question.

(Karrer, Sept 1 2020). Yes.

#### **Agency Response**

ADB Response 22 July 2020:

The PIF distinguishes "partners" and "stakeholder". A provisional stakeholder matrix has been included in Section 6 on coordination. This will serve as basis for Stakeholder Engagement Plan to be elaborated during project preparation. Annex D has been re-formatted and updated as requested. This will also continue to be reviewed.

### **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, July 8 2020). Yes.

#### **Agency Response**

### **Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

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

(Karrer, July 8 2020). Yes.

**Agency Response**

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**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, July 8 2020). Yes. With regard to the statement related to COVID19, please note that the tremendous increase in use of single use plastic for medical, food and other applications makes the urgency of this project even greater.

**Agency Response**

ADB Response: 22 July 2020

There is some additional content included on COVID-19 in the risks section / table.

**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, July 8 2020). No.

Annex D seems to have the most comprehensive list of partner organizations; however it does not indicate how they will be engaged. There are also a few key NGO alliances to consider adding, including GAIA and Break From Plastic. The private sector entities are mostly individual companies, yet, there are alliances to consider adding, including PRAISE (recycling alliance in Indonesia) and similar in Thailand and possibly other countries. ASEAN is also important to note.

There are inconsistencies between the various sections throughout the document that reference coordinating with partners, including Annex D, 6. Coordination, Relevant partner grants, and Output 3.1. Although the most comprehensive list of partners Annex D does not include some of the organizations noted under Output 3.1 (e.g. Greater Mekong Subregion Economic Cooperation, BIMP-EAGA).

The table in Project partnerships section does not include all the organizations in Annex D although the table does include useful information on the areas of partnership. I'd suggest integrating the information from the table into Annex D and then referencing the annex.

The section In addition, provide indicative info on how stakeholders... notes that WWF will be a key partner; however, WWF is not noted previously in the document including in earlier sections explaining relevant initiatives or knowledge sharing plans. Also in Regional Cooperation there is reference to working particularly with COBSEA, ASEAN and PEMSEA. How does WWF fit with those plans?

PEMSEA is not listed in the 6. Coordination table and explanation; yet, PEMSEA is noted elsewhere as a close partner. Please clarify.

The description of ASEAN seems outdated (the Framework was adopted in June 2019) and does not mention the relevant working groups. Please update.

Finally, an important part of this project is fostering additional funding for circular approaches to address plastic pollution by sharing information from the analysis of potential ADB investment opportunities. Doing so requires sharing insights from the Component 2 where ADB will be identifying opportunities for loans. The planned intent is that these insights would be shared with other potential investors, including MDBs. GIZ, Circular Capital, World Bank and USAID as previously discussed. Please reflect these plans in the explanation for Component 2, specifically Output 2.1.

(Karrer, Aug 5 2020). No. Thank you for the revisions and updates. Please include the MDBs as partners in the Coordination section as an important part of this project is fostering additional funding for circular approaches to address plastic pollution by sharing information from the analysis of potential ADB investment opportunities. Doing so requires sharing insights during Component 2 when ADB will be identifying opportunities for loans. The planned intent is that these insights would be shared with other potential investors, including MDBs. GIZ, Circulate Capital, World Bank and USAID as previously discussed. Alliance to End Plastic Waste has also recently indicated interest in aligning with this project. Please reflect these plans in the explanation for Component 2, specifically Output 2.1.



(Karrer, Sept 1 2020). Yes.

## **Agency Response**

### ADB Response 24 August 2020

Modifications have been provided in the relevant sections of the PIF.

### ADB Response: 22 July 2020

Annex D was intended to provide more information on the landscape of activities being undertaken on circular economy by partners and other agencies, rather than the project's proposed key partnerships or arrangements for coordination.

Based on the GEF review / feedback the following revisions have been done: i) distinction between stakeholders and "partners", ii) revisions throughout the narrative threads related to these references to ensure consistency, iii) inclusion of provisional stakeholder engagement matrix, iv) re-formatting and updating of Annex D.

Regarding the reference to WWF: The references to potential WWF coordination and collaboration (as well as other organizations) have been updated in several sections, with consistency.

Regarding the reference to PEMSEA: PEMSEA has been included under Section 6. Coordination; as well as Annex D.

Regarding the reference to ASEAN: Sections related to ASEAN have been reviewed and updated. The Sections on stakeholder engagement, national policy priorities and Annex D are pertinent.

Regarding the sharing of information to leverage investments: Reference has been added under Output 2.1 on a knowledge approach for sharing recommendations on the assessments to key stakeholders, including potential investors.

## **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, July 8 2020). 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, July 8 2020). No. There is an entire output (3.1) focused on knowledge sharing, which is appreciated; however, the description is not consistent with the subsequent 8. Knowledge Management section. The KM section notes there will be a specific KM plan, assessments and partnerships, which are not referenced in the Output 3.1 explanation. These two sections need to be consistent.

The explanation of Output 3.1 is unclear. It notes the project will “support the following” and then lists a series of efforts, such as the Greater Mekong Subregion Cooperation Program, Healthy Ocean. Technology and Innovation Forum, which are led by other organizations. Presumably what you mean is that you’ll share experiences with these efforts. Is that correct? If so, then the full list of projects you plan to coordinate with needs to be considered. It’s unclear why these specific efforts are noted, not others. It would seem that the other GEF plastics projects (Indonesia, Ghana, LAC) would be included and more broadly IWLEARN needs to be referenced for KS. Also, other investors also need to learn the insights from the project.

The list also includes items that it seems will be led by the project, such as Innovative financing roundtables, cross-country knowledge sharing, which are important to include.

These two sets of KM efforts (led by other organizations and led by the project) need to be distinguished. The purpose of these efforts also need to be clear. For example, what will be shared in the cross-country knowledge-sharing and capacity building efforts? Presumably, the process of creating action plans will be shared. This needs to be clear. The connection to Output 3.2 products also needs to be explained.

The explanation of Output 3.2 notes that dissemination of the knowledge products will be determined with media and CoFo partners. It would seem that the natural means of dissemination would be all the mechanisms listed in Output 3.1. It is important to share through existing fora and project led knowledge sharing efforts, which is the focus of 3.1.

(Karrer, Aug 6 2020). No. Thank you for the revisions. Please add IWLEARN to the list in the first bullet under Externally Led Activities. Please add sharing knowledge regarding investment opportunities with potential investors, such as MDBs, impact investors and others perhaps through the noted finance roundtables.

(Karrer, Sept 1 2020). Yes.

## **Agency Response**

### ADB Response 24 August 2020

This had been done in relevant sections.

### ADB Response: 22 July 2020

Revised. Content from Section 8 has been incorporated into Output 3.1 to make it more consistent and cover the strategic approach to KM.

Regarding Output 3.1: Noted. The list is meant to highlight those activities where ADB and the project already have an active role. We have reorganized the list to distinguish between project-led and external activities; for the latter, we have highlight key fora where ADB has an active role, including sub-regional cooperation programs and the GPAP. (See comment below.)

Regarding two sets of KM efforts: Revised. Activities have now been organized into two categories, (1) Project led activities and (2) Externally led activities. The purposes of each activity has now been indicated.

Regarding Output 3.2: Revised. Knowledge products in Output 3.2 have now been linked to activities in Output 3.1 where appropriate. Dissemination is now referenced as being coursed through activities in Output 3.1 as well as relevant media and CoFo partners.

## **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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

(Karrer, July 8 2020). Yes.

Agency Response

### 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, July 8 2020). 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

NA

Agency Response

**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, July 8 2020). No. Please see the previous points to be addressed.

(Karrer, Aug 5 2020). No. Please see previous points to be addressed.

(Karrer, Sept 1 2020). Yes.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

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

**/iew Dates**

PIF Review    Agency Response

First Review	7/8/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/10/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/1/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	

## PIF Recommendation to CEO

### Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Marine plastic pollution has gained widespread political and public attention and is now recognized as a global environmental problem of highest concern. Over eight million tonnes of plastic enter the ocean annually and by 2050 there will be more plastic than fish in the sea. Southeast Asia is at the center of this crisis as 9 of the top 12 marine plastic polluting countries are in this region and 8 of the top 10 plastic polluting rivers are in Asia (Jambeck 2015).

To address this complex threat, the GEF is committed to pursuing a circular economy approach with a heavy emphasis on public-private partnerships. With this goal in mind, the objectives of this project are to reduce plastic pollution in Southeast Asia by catalyzing action in five priority countries (Indonesia, Philippines, Viet Nam, Thailand and Myanmar), by identifying further investment opportunities and by sharing experiences throughout the region to foster more action. More specifically, the project components are: 1) develop at least 4 national and municipal actions plans and establish policies, laws and incentives to reduce plastic pollution; 2) invest in plastic pollution reducing measures, including community pilot demonstrations to foster a circular plastics economy; and 3) share experiences and foster regional partnerships to motivate change beyond the five core countries. Nearly 700,000 metric tonnes of plastic litter will be avoided as a result of this project. ADB, which is the GEF Agency, is providing \$91,300 in loans and \$3,700 in grants to pursue plastic pollution initiatives identified through the GEF-funded action plans.

This project is innovative in vision and in execution. It is addressing and promoting measures to address the fully lifecycle of plastics in a region where the focus tends to be on downstream waste management efforts, particularly waste collection, recycling and waste-to-energy. This project is also actively seeking public-private partnerships, including through technology incubators.

Sustainability of the initiatives pursued during this project is ensured from the design of the project. The project is closely aligned with

regional and national initiatives, such as the work of the National Plastic Action Programs in Viet Nam and Indonesia. It is also fostering private sector engagement and MDB investments both of which ensure long-term commitments by key stakeholders that will far exceed the duration of this MSP.

In terms of scaling this work, the emphasis on sharing experiences with other countries in the region will also help motivate the adoption of circular solutions to plastic throughout the region. The linkages with regional initiatives, such as those led by GPAP, PEMSEA, COBSEA and World Bank, will further foster sharing and scaling.

In short, this MSP will serve as a catalyst for real action in the region to counter plastic pollution, one of the greatest threats to marine biodiversity and a growing contributor to climate change.