Strengthening Indonesia's Reduction and Elimination in the Distribution and Supply Chain of Mercury from National Health (SIRENE)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11546
Countries
Indonesia
Project Name
Strengthening Indonesia's Reduction and Elimination in the Distribution and Supply Chain of Mercury from National Health (SIRENE)
Agencies
UNDP
Date received by PM
6/20/2025
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Anil Sookdeo
Focal Area
Chemicals and Waste
Project Type
FSP

PIF

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?

b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?

d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?

b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a

robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?
b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?
c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?
d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?
f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?
g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?
h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?
i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?
j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?
k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?
l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project
a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?
b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?
c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

While the institutional arrangements and rationale are generally clear, it would be helpful to include an organogram and funds flow diagram to illustrate lines of responsibility and financial management. In addition, the section on coordination could be strengthened by providing a more explicit mapping of ongoing donor, bilateral, or multilateral initiatives in the health and waste sectors to demonstrate synergies and avoid duplication.

Oct 6, 2025 - comment cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Response 17Sep2025

An Organogram was included in the CEO ER Sub-Section "Institutional Arrangement and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project". A funds flow diagram has also been added. (pages 29-30).

Coordination and Partnership with other relevant projects has been added to the CEO ER (page 34 - 44).

5.3 Core indicators
a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?
b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?
Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The core indicators are well aligned with the GEF-8 guidelines and targets are reasonable. To strengthen the section further, please:
Provide clearer explanation of the calculation methodology for UPOPs avoided (gTEQ/year) and GHG reductions (tCO?e), including assumptions and emission factors used.
Ensure that the indicators for POPs, UPOPs, mercury, and plastics are mutually exclusive to avoid any potential double-counting across core indicators.
Where possible, include a short justification for expected beneficiary numbers (100,000) linked to facility-level engagement, to reinforce credibility of the target.

Oct 6, 2025 - comment cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Response 17Sep2025

Explanation of the calculation methodology for each of the Core Indicator has been added to the CEO ER document, under sub-sector "Core Indicator" (pages 46-49).

Note that narrative section under Core Indicator in CEO ER Portal doesn't support table/picture format. Thus, some tables are not embedded in CEO ER Portal but references have been made.

5.4 Risks
a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?
b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?
c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The risk assessment is generally clear and comprehensive, with appropriate ratings and realistic mitigation measures. To strengthen the section further, please:

Explicitly assess market and private sector uptake risks, including affordability and availability of mercury-free devices, and outline measures to encourage sustained adoption.

Clarify responsibilities for monitoring and reporting on environmental and social safeguards (e.g., which unit will oversee implementation of the SESP and Gender Action Plan), to reinforce accountability.

Where possible, provide a summary table of residual risks post-mitigation to ensure clarity and alignment with GEF safeguard reporting expectations.

It is unclear if the assessments and ratings under the Innovation risk categories speak to actual innovative features to be implemented by the project. If not, then we suggest keeping this risk dimension blank. Otherwise, please clarify further the link with innovation risk.

Key risk: Please describe how the Overall risk rating was identified.

Oct 6, 2025 - comment cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Response 17Sep2025

On the Overall Risk Rating clarification:

(i) The significance of each risk is based on a combined assessment of probability of occurrence and extent of impact, in which result in scale of being either Low, Moderate, Substantial, or High.

(ii) Based on the highest significance of the individual risks, the project has been assessed as overall Social and Environmental risk categorization rating of **?Moderate?** (important to note that SES Policy only address SES risk, additional administrative, operational, innovation and management/implementation risks are asssed using the Risk Log).

(ii) FInally, the Overall SESP Risk "Moderated" is also compounded by the overall assessment of the SES Risks in the project that are "Most of the risks pre-identified are largely of impacts of medium magnitude, limited in scale (site-specific) and duration (temporary), can be avoided, managed and/or mitigated with relatively uncomplicated measures. The risks to both human health (workers and communities) and the environment, are inherent in any handling, transport and processing of mercury-containing devices, mercury-containing waste and mercury waste"

Market and private sector uptake risks are included as Risks 14 in the table "Risks and Assumptions (as per GEF Requirements and Templates) under Section V.

The relevant **Roles and Responsibilities** section for Risk monitoring was also strengthened in the CEO ER under Sub-Section "Risks to Achieving Project Outcomes", page 51.

Finally, we clarify that the list of Risks also consider that, eventually, if the Risks are not avoided, mitigated or treated they can become residual to the project completion. However, the Risk Mitigation Plans serve the exact purpose to manage these. In addition, we do confirm that, as per UNDP SES Policy, the Risks are expected to be continuously monitored and assessed during project lifecycle, and during these exercises that are reported to the Project Board annually, any evental (new) **residual risk**s, when and if identified, are to be included the Project Risk Log for proper treatment.

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities
6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response
6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response
6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
The project does not clearly identify which of the 23 Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) targets it contributes to. Given its focus, the project could credibly demonstrate contributions to Target 7 (reducing pollution from hazardous chemicals), Target 14 (integrating biodiversity and health), and Target 22 (inclusive and participatory governance).

Please revise the document to explicitly state the relevant GBF targets and describe how the project contributes to each.

Oct 6, 2026 - Comment cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Response 17Sep2025

Noted and appreciated the reminder, these were added to CEO ER under Section B Project Description, Sub-section Project Results (page 28)

7 D. Policy Requirements
7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response
7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response
7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

On stakeholder engagement: This project should provide more details on the key stakeholders in the healthcare sector and the public relevant to project component and outputs, including CSOs, local communities and minority groups and project consultation with these groups in project development. In addition, Agency should include more details in the risk table on potential stakeholder risks and summarize the project measures to address these, including plans to engage and consult stakeholders in project implementation, including more clearly describe key stakeholder group?s roles and contributions to project objective.

Oct 6, 2026 - comment cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Response 17Sep2025

Annex 8, **Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)**, listed all relevant stakeholders, and the SEP has been updated to include the role of each stakeholder in the project, and the outlined the engagement mechanism during project implementation.

Annex 6, **Risk Register**, has been updated to include Stakeholder risks.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

On Environmental and Social Safeguards:

A. We acknowledge the submission of the ESS supporting documents, including the identification of risks, proposed mitigation measures, and grievance mechanisms.

i. With reference to Annex 5, ESS Supporting Document, Part B: Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks?specifically Risk 7 (page 15) on Indigenous Peoples: their rights and safeguards are not limited to situations where they reside in ancestral lands. The principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) remains applicable in urban contexts as well. It is therefore essential to ensure that Indigenous Peoples are engaged in a meaningful manner throughout the project, with their rights and FPIC upheld in line with GEF?s ESS.

Action: Please clarify how Indigenous Peoples? rights will be respected and upheld across the different phases of the project, in both rural and urban settings, whenever project activities may affect them.

B. In the Project Document (PD), please include a concise summary of key risks and mitigation measures, in addition to the information already presented.

C. Regarding the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, ensure that the process involves a broad range of actors?from government institutions to users of medical facilities?including Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs), persons with disabilities, women, and other relevant groups.

Oct 6, 2026 - Comment cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Response 17Sep2025

SESP (Annex 5 of the UNDP ProDoc): Risk 7 a clarification on Indigenous People has been added. The distinction between urban and rural contexts was removed, and emphasis on presence of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether residing on ancestral/customary lands) added.

Explanation on how customary (indigenous) peoples will be respected and upheld in the Project implementation. The new text reads:

Stakeholder engagement plan and stakeholder consultations will involve customary peoples where/if relevant. Principle of Free Prior Informed Consent will be respected where indigenous (customary) community will be present in the Project?s activities implementation area.

A presence of customary (indigenous) peoples will be established through SESP screening for any site-specific activity during the project implementation (the risk 7 concerning Customary (Indigenous) Peoples is part of the screening criteria). It is also among the requirements for the scope of the envisaged site-specific targeted assessment ESA (environmental and social audit) for the activities entailing physical site-specific developments such as sites for processing and temporary or final storage of the mercury or mercury-contaminated wastes, or other similar infrastructure. If case of presence of customary (indigenous) Peoples, the ESA will determine need and scope for additional safeguard actions (e.g. Indigenous Peoples Plan). In addition the following Indigenous Peoples-specific exclusion criterium will apply in the site selection process: Customary lands, or lands claimed by customary communities.

It is important to clarify that extensive visits and consultation meetings were held during PPG Phase, and no presence of Indigenous Communities or engagement with indigenous communities was fully identiied in the inteded screened project sites or with the targeted project partners, for this reason, no dedicated Indigenous Peoples Plan as per relevant UNDP Standard 6 is envisaged.

For the ESMF (Annex 9): Minor adjustments were added to ensure consistency with the changes in SESP indicated above. (i.e. explicit mentions of need for screening the site-specific activities for presence of customary peoples, observing FPIC during consultations, etc.)

See sections: "Assessment ? Environmental and Social Audit", and "Management"

B. Summary of key risks and mitigation measures - added in the ProDoc p 43)

C. Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP), Annex 8, as per clarified in response 7.3 above, it includes all relevant key stakeholders, with their respective roles in the project detailed, and the engagement mechanism during project implementation added.

8 Annexes
Annex A: Financing Tables
8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):
STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)
a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The PPG utilization is clearly itemized and consistent with GEF requirements. To strengthen transparency, please consider adding a brief narrative justification for each expenditure category (e.g., purpose of international consultants vs. local consultants, rationale for supplier costs). This will help clarify how each line item directly supported project preparation activities and provide additional assurance of cost-effectiveness.

Oct 6, 2025 - comment cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Response 17Sep2025

Additional details and justifications have been added in CEO ER, Annex D: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG).

Note that there is no narrative section for UNDP to input in the details and justifications the CEO ER Portal.

8.3 Source of Funds
Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?
Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?
e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-

kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

On co-financing: In-kind contributions are usually categorized as recurrent expenditures, but the in-kind cofinancing from Wastec International is listed under Investment mobilized. Conversely, grants are typically recorded as Investment mobilized, but the grant cofinancing from Asosiasi Produsen Alat Kesehatan Indonesia has been categorized as Recurrent expenditures.

In addition, except for the cofinancing letter from UNDP, the other cofinancing letters do not provide sufficient details on the nature and usage of the cofinancing. These details should be included in the updated letters or reflected in the cofinancing description section.

Oct 6, 2025 - comment cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Response 17Sep2025

Recurrent Expenditures details of "in-kind" contributions from each Co-financer and what Project Outcomes and Outputs the co-financing amounts will support in the project have been updated in the CEO ER under Annex B: Endorsement, below Sub-section "Compilation of Letters of Endorsement" (pages 60-62).

Annex B: Endorsements
8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:
Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework
8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?
b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)
c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?
d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The Results Framework is sound and compliant. To strengthen it further, please:
Ensure methodologies for UPOPs and GHG calculations are explicitly referenced (e.g., emission factors, assumptions, tools used), in line with the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework guidance.
Harmonize phrasing of indicators so they are fully consistent with GEF Core Indicator definitions (e.g., ?Quantity of mercury reduced? vs. ?20 metric tons of mercury reduced?).
Where possible, add intermediate milestones (e.g., by mid-term) to track progress toward end-of-project targets for pollutants reduction.

Oct 6, 2025 - comment cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Response 17Sep2025

Explanation of the calculation methodologies for GEF Core Indicators has been added after Sub-section "Core Indicators" of the CEO ER (page 46 to 49) .

We kindly clarify, though, that the Project Results Framework as included in the CEO ER (Annex C) and the UNDP Project Document (Section VII Project Results Framework) already includes the intermediate milestones (Mid-term Targets) to facilitate tracking of project progress and achievements of meeting of targets at mid-term and End-of-Project.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates
8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

llustrative maps are included and provide a clear picture of the four regional clusters where interventions will take place. However, the dedicated table of geographic coordinates (latitude/longitude) for each project site is not included. Please add the coordinates in the required tabular format to fully comply with GEF requirements and to ensure consistency between the descriptive maps and the formal geographic data.

On Map and coordinates: please consider entering geographic coordinates through the dedicated data entry tables, such as the centroid of the targeted four regions.

Oct 6, 2025 - comment cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Response 17Sep2025

Details of the four regional cluster centers and geographic coordinates have been added and updated in Annex E of the CEO ER.

Annex G: GEF Budget template
8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?
b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?
c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The budget table in the CEO Endorsement Request portal view (which is the document that is posted after endorsement) is 30 pages long. Additionally, there are several budget lines that bundle the costs/information of activities / positions, which restricts the possibility to properly assess the reasonability to charge those activities/positions to the project components / M&E / PMC. Please provide the information of each activity / position itemized through individual budget lines, and by using a reasonable number of words to describe them ? this is a systematic request to UNDP for their budgets. Kindly present the budget per component instead of per output, so the Description will have more room, and the number of pages will be shorter. Per the resubmission, we will review the budget again and provide comments as appropriate.

Oct 7, 2025 - - While the budget table presents itemized expenditures / positions, the positions included in the TORs in ProDoc (see page 154 in the attached word file are not matching those in the budget table. For instance, in the ProDoc one finds one National Project Director + one Project Manager, while in the budget table there is one National Project Manager, which is a combination of these two positions. Another example is that in ProDoc one finds one Project Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (=working Group Coordinator no. 4), but in the budget table there is one Project Assistant for Working Group 4. Also, in the Budget Table there is one Project Assistant for Working Group 1, 2, 3, with no TORs in the ProDoc. In ProDoc there is a Project Regional Facilitator, but such position does not exist in the budget table. Also, in the Budget table there is a Project Assistant with no TORs in ProDoc. Similar situation applies to a Working Group Coordinator for WGC 1, 2, 3 ($290,000) and Project Assistant for WGC 1, 2, 3 ($198,000) ? the first position?s cost is even higher than the wrongly named National project Manager ($202,500).

Perhaps this is the result of copying ? pasting from a different project. Regardless, we cannot assess the reasonability of having the above positions. Please present the TORs in a way that matches the positions in the budget table ? one would expect to see TORs that do not show overlapping responsibilities, and whose costs is reasonable. Please when possible, to merge positions.

- There are several budget lines namely ?Office Supplies? - ?Other Operating Costs? for $233,000. The total for both items are higher than normal. Please revise.

October 27, 2025 - OP reviewed this resubmission and found that there are still some comments on the budget table to be addressed by UNDP as follows:

1. Rental and maintenance for PMU should be charged to PMC but not to project components.

2. Transportation costs should be categorized as Travel but not as Other operating costs.

Nov 10, 2025 - comment cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Response 17Sep2025

We apologize for any misunderstanding, as the TBWP template is used as per previous project.

We clarify that a new detailed budget table has been prepared following instructions from the GEF Secretariat as per recent submissions revised, and now we believe they contain the level of details required for the GEF Secretariat's assessment.

UNDP Response 23October2025

In relation to the Project Personnel TORs and Budget:

(a) National Project Director X Project Manager:

- We clarify that the National Project Director (NPD) position, who is a Career Civil Servant is accountable for Project (including the application of financial resources), the person will be Member the Project Board and lead of the execution of the project, being fully co-financed by the Executing Agency (Government of Indonesia). This information is included in Annex 14, "Background" of the TOR.

- The Project Manager, who is Responsible for the day-to-day execution and the management of the project inputs has its responsibilities listed in the referred TOR (page 155 of ProDoc). The PM is also responsible for the supervision of all project personnel, monitoring and reporting, reporting to the NPD and to the Project Board. This position is fully financed by the GEF resources.

- To further clarify that there are no duplication of functions, we had included a comparative table in pages 155/156 of the ProDoc.

(b) Working Group Assistants X PMC/PMU Project Assistant:

We clarify that the Project Assistants' TORs are made in generic manner, bringing the general description/responsibilities of a Project Assistant (baseline) project level post, hence they are harmonized to assure a similar remuneration scale (since the Assistants also need to follow similar operational/administrative processes). However, the workload is divided per component as each assistant support the field execution under the supervision of the Regional Project facilitators. This is to commensurate with each Component workload that is closely linked to the Regional demands coming from field activities. To further clarify, we:

- Renamed the post of "Project Assistants" to "Working Group Assistants - WGA" and adequated the consolidated generic TOR for the 4 WPAs highlighting the component-level activities:

- Separated one (1) TOR for the Project Assistant placed under PMU (responsible for the over-arching level activities for the whole project (as also aligned with the task and output description of Annex 7 to the UNDP ProDoc.)

In terms of budgeting: (as per PRODOC Budget Notes 1 c), 4 c), 11 c) 19 c), 24 c), 34 c), 41 a) and 44 a))

- One Project Assistant (PA) placed under PMU = 100 weeks at rate of $750/week, total of $75,000

- WGA1 at $52,500 (for 70 weeks each); at rate of $750/week,

- WGA2 at $60,000 (for 80 weeks); at rate of $750/week,

- WGA3 at $85,500 (for 114 weeks); at rate of $750/week,

- WGA4 at $86,250 (for 115 weeks); at rate of $750/week

(c) Working Group Coordinator X Monitoring and Evaluation Project Officer

We clarify that the Working Group Coordinator of Component 4 (WG4) accumulates the position of the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, hence no additional budget is allocated to this position. In terms of budgeting (PRODOC Budget Notes 1 c), 4 c)), 11 c) 19 c), 24 c), 34 c), 41 a) and 44 a)):

- WGC1 at total of $77,000 (for 70 weeks each) at a uniformed rate of $1,100,/week

- WGC2 at total of $88,000 (for 80 weeks) at a uniformed rate of $1,100,/week

- WGC3 at total of $125,400 (for 114 weeks) at a uniformed rate of $1,100,/week

- WGC4 (PMEO) at $126,750 (rounded up), (for 115 weeks) at a uniformed rate of $1,100,/week

- One (1) Project Manager placed under PMU = total of 150 working weeks at $1,350/week, total of $202,500 over 5 years;

We have revised the Annex 14 to reflect the proper levels of individualization of TORs, highlight TORs that have generic responsibilities but split over different components to commensurate with specific project activities and delivery of their outputs (for MGCs and MGAs) and added the estimated budget costs to facilitate the review.

In relation to the Office Suppliers Budget Lines, we also clarify the PRODOC Budget notes (page 82) include the details as follows:

- Budget Note 6) Supplies for Working Groups and Regional Facilitators for years 1-4 of operation and for development of policies, regulations and guideline, total 15,000: the $15,000 allocation is distributed in four years (year 1-4) in the yearly amount of $3,000, 5,000, 5,000 and $2,000 respectively. Considering there are 4 Working Groups and 4 Regional Facilitators, the yearly amount is fully justified for the needs in supporting their operations.

- (Budget Note 15) Supplies and materials to support collection, packaging, distribution and temporary storage of MCMDs and contaminated plastic at healthcare facilities, total $20,000. ($10,000 each in year 2 and year 4)

- (Budget Note 29) Supplies to support collection, distribution and temporary storage of MCMDs and contaminated plastic, $20,000 ($5,000 each in year 2-5): the budget allocation is to facilitate the necessary supplies and materials needed to safely collect, safe packing and proper temporary storages of MCMDS and contaminated plastic at the vast number of health facilities and many outlying and limited access areas. The total $40,000 allocation was estimated in view of the needs in the respective project years given how decentralized the MCMDs are distributed in Indonesia, a country with challenging logistics.

- (Budget Note 37) Supplies to support financial mechanism development and replication, $7,000 per year for years2-5, total $28,000: Kindly note that the allocation is to allow support for the health facilities on placing new mercury-free equipment. Financially, the project will be collaborated with the MFMD manufacturer(s) . With a budget allocation of 28,000 USD, the project can provide about 227 units of aneroid sphygmomanometers, focusing on area with limited distribution access and challenging financial institution accessibility. This allocation would allow the proof of concept of utilization by health facilities in Indonesia?s difficult-to-access areas.

In relation to the "Other Operating Costs" Budget Lines we also clarify the PRODOC Budget notes (page 82) include the details as follows:

- (Budget Note 8) Rental and maintenance of premises for PMU, Working Groups and Regional Facilitators, at $5,000 per year for 5 years, total $25,000 and (Budget Note 17) and Rental and maintenance of premises for PMU, Working Groups and Regional Facilitators, at $5,000 per year, for 5 years, total $25,000

- (Budget Note 30) Rental and maintenance of premises to support Working Groups, Regional Facilitators and Project Management Unit IPMU) for the collection, distribution and temporary storage of MCMDs and contaminated plastic at healthcare facilities at $17,000 per year, total $85,000. Kindly note that there are office space needs for the four Working Groups, the four Regional Facilitators and the PMU. The $50,000 and $85,000 allocations amount to $135,000 for the 5 years, at $27,000 per year, $2,250 per month. The $2,250 for month rental and maintenance allocation is considered reasonable for space to accommodate a total 14 personnel.

- (Budget Note 9) Miscellaneous expenses to support review and establishment of policies, regulations and guidelines, the Working Groups and Regional Facilitators at $5,000 per year for 5 years, total $25,000

- (Budget Note 31) Miscellaneous expenses to support collection, distribution and temporary storage (page 82) of MCMDs and contaminated plastic at national and sub-national healthcare facilities, $5,000 per year for years 2-5, total $20,000

The allocation of $25,000, at $5,000 per year against Budget Note 9 and $20,000 against Budget Note 31 at $5,000 per year for years 2-5, averaging $417 per month are considered reasonable and justified costs for conducting activities at the vast number of health facilities through Indonesia, many of which are in outlying islands with limited accesses and necessary requirements.

- (Budget Note 32) Transportation costs for nation-wide collection and transport of MCMDs from the sub-regencies to the 514 regencies ($668,000) in the 38 provinces, and from the 514 regencies to the four (4) regional project sites ($132,000), total $800,000

The proposed transportation budget of USD 800,000 over the four-year project period at $20,000 per year is essential to ensure the timely, safe, and efficient delivery of MCMDs from remote sub-regencies health facilities to designated regional project sites of SIRENE Project. This allocation is strategically structured to support the decentralized health logistics system in a geographically complex archipelago comprising over 17,000 islands, 38 provinces, and 514 regencies?many of which are located in hard-to-reach rural and peri-urban areas with limited infrastructure.

- Budget Noat 48) Miscellaneous covering supplies, printing, publication at $5,000 per year for years 2-5, total $20,000: this is mis-labelled. It has been revised to read ?Conduct one yearly meeting/training workshop at $5,000 per workshop, for knowledge sharing and exchanges, total $20,000?

- (Budget Note 54) UNDP Annual audit costs at $9,010/year for Year 2, and 9,100/year for Years 3-5, Total $36,310: Kindly note that Annual Audit costs are the estimated costs to conduct such annual audit.

UNDP Response 6November2025

In relation to Comment #1 that refers to the TBWP Budget Lines (Former Rental costs), UNDP confirms the EA/IP will take over all PMU-related rental costs with its co-finance. Hence, the following budget changes were included in the Budget Table (UNDP ProDoc Annex I and stand-alone TBWP Excel File attached) and UNDP ProDOC (Section XI, Budget notes 17, 8, and 30):

- Budget Position 56 (Budget Note 17): "Training, Workshops, Meetings" to allow that Yearly Technical Assistance activities at Project sites can take place, under Component 1, to deliver annual capacity building/campaigns in each project site to stretch local presence of project technical teams, facilitate exchange of experience and consultation, collect feedback/inputs from local stakeholders to improve project execution focusing on the enforcement-related activities. (US $ 5,000 year x 5 years timeframe = US $ 25,000). AND

- Budget Position 63 (Budget Note 8) "Contractual services-Individual "Technical Expert (Individual Consultant) to oversee yearly project site level engagement activities (budget position 56) to ensure the enforcement best practices and replication of local regulations and standards, and the implementation of appropriate technical measures across sub-regencies and regencies. (US $ 1,100/week X 22.8 weeks = US$ 25,000 for 5 years implementation) AND

- Budget Position 58 (Budget Note 30): new line "Contractual services-Company" to engage qualified service provider (company) for the oversight of collection, distribution and temporary storage of MCMDs and contaminated plastics at healthcare facilities, including the establishment of proper MRV systems and final reporting to Project Board, as well on-site technical assistance during the collection, distribution, and temporary storage of MCMDs and contaminated plastics at healthcare facilities. (US $ 85,000).

In addition, in relation to the second comment dated from Oct 27, 2025 (for Budget Position 60 / Budget note 32); UNDP clarifies that the budget line refers to the hiring of a specialized waste management/disposal company to provide services to ensure packaging integrity, standardization and safety of the hazardous waste containing Mercury, as well as to carry transportation services related to the nation-wide (de-centralized) collection and transport activities of MCMDs in the sub-regencies at the 514 regencies in the 38 provinces, and from the 514 regencies to the four (4) regional project sites. Therefore, the suggested Budget Line (Travel) was considered not the most accurate to fill the purpose of the activities, instead, UNDP changed this line from "Other Operating Costs" to "Contractual Services - Companies"

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes
8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.
b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.
c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Additional Annexes
9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation
Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Pending reponse and further review of the Secretariat.

Oct 27, 2025 - Please see pending comment on the budget.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	**9/2/2025**	**9/17/2025**

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
Additional Review (as necessary)	**10/6/2025**	**10/23/2025**
Additional Review (as necessary)	**10/27/2025**	**11/6/2025**
Additional Review (as necessary)	**11/10/2025**	
Additional Review (as necessary)		