



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

Review PIF 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

3/20/2024

Review completed by PM

4/9/2024

Program Manager

Yuki Shiga
Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste
Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

2024.5.1
 cleared.

2024.4.24

- Thank you for clarifications on fees. Please submit the updated OFP endorsement letter accordingly.

2024.4.9:

- The Agency Fee of the Project Grant and the PPG Agency Fee in Portal (US\$ 626,050 and US\$ 14,250 respectively) are higher than those in the Letter of Endorsement (US\$ 593,100 and US\$ 13,500 respectively). Please adjust the figures in Portal to match those in LoE or get a new LoE that matches the figures in Portal.

General Project information			
Project Title: Strengthening Indonesia's Reduction and Elimination in the Distribution and Supply Chain of Mercury from National Health (SIRENE)			
Region:	Indonesia	GEF Project ID:	11546
Country(ies):	Indonesia	Type of Project:	FSP
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency ID:	UNDP-9660
Executing Partner:	Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Republic of Indonesia	Executing Partner Type:	Government
GEF Focal Area (s):	Chemicals and Waste	Submission Date:	3/29/2024
Teamwork: Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Focal Areas, Chemicals and Waste, Influencing models, Transform policy and regulatory environments, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Demonstrate innovative approach, Stakeholders, Civil Society, Private Sector, Local Communities, Gender Equality, Gender Mainstreaming, Knowledge Generation, Knowledge Exchange, Learning, Capacity Development			
Type of Trust Fund:	GET	Project Duration (Months):	60
GEF Project Grant (G):	6,990,000.00	GEF Project Non-Grant (G):	0.00
Agency Fee(G) Grant (G):	626,050.00	Agency Fee(G) Non-Grant (G):	0.00
Total GEF Financing (including):	7,216,050.00	Total Co-financing:	32,990,000.00
PPG Amount (A):	150,000.00	PPG Agency Fee(s) (F):	14,250.00

Ref. No. : S.99/PP/MSR/KLN.1.3/B/04/2024 To: Mr. Pradeep Kurukulasuriya Executive Coordinator – Environmental Finance Bureau for Policy and
 End Subject : I Project Identification Form Endorsement for Strengthening Indonesia's Reduction and Elimination in the Distribution and Supply Chain of Mercury from National Health (SIRENE) Programme Support United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

In my capacity as GEF Operational Focal Point for Indonesia, I confirm that the above project proposal (a) is in accordance with my government's national priorities, and our commitment to the relevant global environmental conventions; and (b) was discussed with relevant stakeholders, including the global environmental convention focal points. I am pleased to endorse the preparation of the above project proposal with the support of the GEF Implementing Agency listed below. If approved, the preparation of the proposal will be supported by and the project executed by Ministry of Environment and Forestry. I request the GEF Implementing Agency to provide a copy of the project document before it is submitted to the GEF Secretariat for CEO endorsement.

The total financing (from GEF TF) being requested for this project is US\$ 7,346,000 inclusive of project preparation grant (PPG), if any, and Agency fees for project cycle management services associated with the total GEF Project Financing. The financing requested for Indonesia is detailed in the table below.

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area Name	GEF Project Financing	Amount (in US\$)			Total
				GEF Project Financing Agency Fee	Project Preparation Grant (PPG)	Project Preparation Agency Fee	
GEFTF	UNDP	Chemicals and Waste	6,990,000	626,050	150,000	13,500	7,346,000
Total GEF Resources			6,990,000	626,050	150,000	13,500	7,346,000

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Grant/ Non-Grant	GEF Project Grant(s)	Agency Fee(s)	Total GEF Financing(s)
UNDP	GET	Indonesia	Chemicals and Waste	Mercury	Grant	6,990,000	626,050	7,216,050.00
Total GEF Resources(s)						6,990,000.00	626,050.00	7,216,050.00

Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

Is Project Preparation Grant requested? Yes

PPG Amount (B)	PPG Agency Fee (S)
150,000	14,250

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Grant/ Non-Grant	PPG(s)	Agency Fee(s)	Total PPG Funding(s)
UNDP	GET	Indonesia	Chemicals and Waste	Mercury	Grant	150,000	14,250	164,250.00
Total PPG Amount						150,000.00	14,250.00	164,250.00

- The allocated amount (US\$ 657,600) to M&E is 10% of the project grant (US\$ 6,590,000). Per guidelines, the recommended % for projects between US\$ 5 to US\$ 10 million is 3%. Please revise.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)						
M&E	Technical Assistance	4.1. Monitoring and evaluation activities carried out as per GEF requirements. 4.2. Learning and knowledge sharing activities carried out and knowledge products developed and shared.	4.1.1. Assessed and applied Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP). 4.1.2. Gender Action Plan and awareness raising activities on collection,	GET	657,600.00	3,288,000.00

Agency's Comments

2024.04.09 dated response:

1.a: The Executing Agency and UNDP are liaising to obtain the updated LoE from GEF OFP Indonesia. Hence UNDP confirms, in principle, that the correct values accepted by the OFP are the ones entered in the Portal (US\$ 626,050 and US\$ 14,250 respectively).

1.b: The PIF M&E budget has been revised accordingly to 3% (US\$197,700) instead of 10%.

2024.04.24 dated response:

LOE has been updated with correct Agency Fee. Please kindly find it in the documents section.

2. Project Summary

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 results?

Secretariat's Comments

2024.4.9: cleared.

Agency's Comments

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

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?

Secretariat's Comments

2024.4.23:

cleared.

2024.4.9:

components 2 and 3 seem to be 'investment' rather than 'technical assistance' in terms of component type, as these cover pilot activities on the ground. Or please clarify why these components should be categorized as technical assistance.

Agency's Comments

In accordance with the EA, Component 2 is mostly designed to be categorized as Technical Assistance (TA) since there is a need of the Government of Indonesia to gain international support on the process of establishing and institutional capacities and circular models to meet the required mechanism and technical guidance in accordance with the Minamata Convention. There is one Output, related to the establishment of a pilot plant for mercury disposal, however, bulk of baseline investment will be carried out by co-finance, while the GEF incremental interventions will come to support the proper environmentally sound establishment procedures, that including selecting and testing most suitable BAT/BEP and establish all enabling conditions around it.

Similarly, Component 3, as regarded by the EA, also seems to be more fit as TA component as this will support the capacity building of Indonesia in controlling, monitoring, and verifying mercury containing medical devices (MCMDs) in health sector through a pilot activity that can be replicated further to other relevant areas technical (appropriate technology choices, selection, and application). It will facilitate Indonesia to properly assess and test mercury solidification technologies, in which bulk of the investment costs will be provided by co-finance.

In general, both components, in conjunction, will indeed provide an example of good governance on how to reduce and phase-out mercury in health care facilities through appropriate mechanisms and appropriate technology application.

However, both the Implementing Agency and the Executing Agency are open to reconsider this categorization to INVESTMENT if the GEF Secretariat consider this is more fit in front of the project intended outputs and as per GEF Guidelines.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

2024.4.24:

cleared.

2024.4.9:

Please ensure that all policies, guidelines, and financial mechanisms developed are gender-responsive. Relevant outputs in this regard are: Outputs 1.1.2., 2.1.1, 3.1.2. and 3.3.1. Also please ensure to include on stakeholders to be engaged or consulted (Component 2) -- informal women's organization in waste collection, as well as network of experts such as the Gender and Chemicals Partnership (<https://gender-chemicals.org/gandcpartnership>). Under M&E, ensure that the GAP is budgeted (4.1.2) and in outcome 4.2, please ensure that gender equality considerations are captured in KM products to be developed.

Agency's Comments

- ? As suggested, Output 1.1.2; Output 2.1.1; Output 3.1.2 and Output 3.3.1 were revised to incorporate the Secretariat comments.
- ? Relevant outputs in Component 2 will ensure proper engagement through Stakeholders Engagement Plan (SEP) and Gender Action Plan (GAP) that are planned to be developed during the CEO preparation process (as usual practice, these costs are included in the PPG Funding request)
- ? These recommendations are duly noted and the detailed budget table to be developed during in the CEO PPG process will include budget for Gender Action Plan (GAP) implementation and monitoring under 4.1.2. and 4.2. and relevant results (Knowledge Management).

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

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

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments 2024.4.9: cleared.

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments 2024.4.9: cleared.

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) 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?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments 2024.4.9: cleared.

Agency's Comments

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

2024.5.1

cleared.

2024.4.24:

Thank you for the clarifications. Please update the PIF to reflect these explanations provided in the review sheet.

2024.4.9:

- Component 3 mentions that private sectors (including NGOs) will be involved. Please elaborate on how these companies and NGOs etc. will be identified and selected (selection criteria etc.) so that we can make sure that the right partners will be involved.
- Component 3 also mentions capacity of local partners at least four cluster areas will be strengthened. Please elaborate on the rationale for selecting these four cluster areas.

Agency's Comments

- ? *2024.04.09 dated response:* The EA notes that the engagement in Medical Devices areas is truly dependent of private sector as it relates to a complex supply chain of alternatives and also circular chain for proper disposal. Hence the PPG will start screening these chains (work which will be continued during implementation) to identify the stakeholders that can be benefited by the project.

- ? In terms of supply of private sector partner for mercury temporary storage and operation of the solidification facilities, the Government of Indonesia has a short list of companies operating in the area of healthcare waste management which will be further screened during PPG phase to assess their capacities to contribute with the project.

- ? Also, it is noted that the scope of mercury-related issues, it is acknowledged that a relative large number of NGOs and CSOs do work on that area from several angles/sectors, and the Government of Indonesia is cognisant of the importance of their participation in public debate, but also as knowledge providers and potential replicators. The PPG will start to work on mapping these entities, while these will be formally engaged during implementation phase of the project through public calls, but also potentially as part of the Project Board consultative committee.

- ? The 4 (four) Cluster Areas refer to the structure of Environmental Management in Indonesia. Indonesia is an archipelagic state consisting of large and small islands. The project will pay attention to the 4 (four) main groups of clustered Islands (Sumatera, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, Maluku and Papua and Java, Bali and Nusa Tenggara) following the regional offices of environmental management in the country. This cluster mechanism is expected to strengthen the process and progress of mercury reduction and phase-out.

2024.04.24 dated response: Relevant sections had been revised as per above in the PIF (paragraphs 21(i) and 21 (ii)).

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

2024.4.24

cleared

2024.4.9:

Please mention and highlight the incremental/additional cost reasoning.

Agency's Comments

Please note this has been included in paragraphs 26 and 27 of project Outline section of PIF:

It is acknowledged that Ministry of Environment and Forestry and the Ministry of Health of Indonesia have baseline level of capacities to handle issues related to healthcare waste management and mercury management. However, their capacities is still not fully adequate to conduct and complete the required mechanisms in full accordance with the Minamata Convention. Hence, without the GEF intervention, critical actions related to the Policy and Regulatory Frameworks and the Institutional Technical Capacities critical to support elimination of Mercury in healthcare sector may be delayed and not fully realized.

The GEF incremental support will also be essential to support Indonesia to better manage and coordinate the environmentally sound and safe mercury disposal by allowing governmental interventions to focus on the technological and physical changes required to properly collect, stabilize and dispose large quantities of Mercury, as well it will help Indonesia to allocate its limited resources effectively in the space of circular economy, reducing united adverse risks related to future build-up of e-waste coming from mercury-related alternative technologies in the medical devices sector.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments 2024.4.9: cleared.

Agency's Comments

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

2024.5.2: cleared

2024.5.1:

Core Indicator 11 has been updated to 50:50 ratio; however, it is 35,000 v 65,000 in the summary section.

The project will reduce and safely dispose of 20 metric tons of mercury from Indonesia's Health sector and avoid emissions of 20 g T UPOPs. 100 mt of POP-containing plastics will be collected and safely disposed of. 20,000 tons of recyclable plastic and metals materials will be collected and recycled. 100,000 people directly involved in these supply chains (35,000 female and 65,000 male) will benefit from this initiative.

Indicator 11 People benefiting from

	Number (Expected at PIF)
Female	50,000
Male	50,000
Total	100,000

2024.4.24:

Indicator 6.2:

- Please provide GHG calculation and the source of data used for the calculation (i.e. how 100,000 Mt CO₂-eq was calculated from the 176,946 units of MCMDs and what are the sources of data used for such calculation etc.), in a calculation table.

Indicator 9.8:

- Please provide target for plastics waste only and exclude metal waste. If the target for plastic and metal wastes need to be together, please provide justification.

2024.4.9:

Indicator 6.2:

- Please provide an explanation to why this GHG emissions reduction is considered as indirect and not direct.
- In addition, please submit an excel sheet with the GHG calculations, providing also information on the data sources. For further information on how the GEF defines direct and indirect emissions reductions, please check the following Manual (section I) - <https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/C.33.Inf.18.Climate.Manual.pdf>
- For the estimation of the GHG emission reductions, the GEF guidelines (as shared above) suggest to use for the accounting period the lifetime of the investment, allowing for the calculations to go beyond the project implementation and therefore the normal project monitoring period. Based on this, the agency may want to reconsider a longer accounting period in line with the guidelines shared above.

Indicator 9.8 is for plastic waste. According to the explanation in the proposal, it seems 20,000 tons includes both plastic and metal waste. It mentions "plastic and metals material collected and recycled".

Indicator 11: While the proposal states that a female ratio of at least 30% is in line with national regulations, it is highly encouraged to reconsider the gender proportion by the full proposal (CEOER).

Agency's Comments

2024.04.09 dated response:

Indicator 6.2:

- ? We understand that the Document C.33.Inf.18.ClimateManual is dedicated to assist agencies to calculate GHG reductions of energy related projects. Hence, as disclosed in its page 3, para 10, *"Direct emission reductions are calculated by assessing the fuel savings attributable to the investments made during the project's supervised implementation period?"*
- ? As informed in the PIF, the basis of the GHG reduction calculation in this project proposal related to the reduction / elimination of 5% of the releases or emissions in 2022 is the baseline withing the total of 176,946 units of MCMDs that will go under non-incineration treatment and also due to the avoided open burning of healthcare related plastics
- ? Hence, given the above, it seems that the GHG reductions would better fit in the description of the Indirect Emissions of the same document, on its page 4, para 12: *"investments are strongly affected by the long-term outcomes of the GEF activities that remove barriers; for example, those that build capacity, improve the enabling environment, and stimulate replication. Their GHG emission reductions are referred to as "indirect" GHG savings."*

? UNDP and EA will prepare the proper calculation table and consider the extended impact after project to be submitted for the GEF Sec with revised GHG reductions target.

Indicator 9.8: Yes, it is correct, it include both plastics and metals

Indicator 11: it is noted. EA is proposing, and will strive to achieve, a 50/50 ratio.

2024.04.24 dated response:

Indicator 6.2:

- The estimates are based on Report Medical Waste Management for Primary Health Centers in Indonesia, that assessed the more rudimentary incineration kilns in selected sites of Indonesia resulting in CO₂-eq emissions from the other of 6-13%.

- An average 9.5% emissions was applied to determine potential GEB for the project.

- As per Ministry of Environment and Forestry Affairs ([MOEF](#)) there was a 30 percent increase of daily medical waste in Indonesia at 382 metric tones. Over 5 years of project implementation, on a BAU Scenario, 697,150 metric tones of HCW would continue to be generated.

- As per WHO (2023) about 27% of the waste is properly managed treated in Indonesia, hence, during 5 years implementation, about 508,919 metric tones of HCW would continue to be mismanaged and incinerated (in below performance, rudimentary, kilns or through open uncontrolled burning).

- Minding the project target of avoiding burning of 20,000 metric tones of plastics and metals wastes and 100mt of POPs-contained plastics, conservatively, the project would be avoiding 10,000 tons of CO₂-eq emissions due to open burning processes at an emission rate of 9.5%.

- The above will be further refined during CEO ER PPG phase in order to better estimate CO₂-eq emissions avoidance with proper segregated data on waste output in the sought project locations (*please note this information has been included in the PIF, under the methodological explanation of GEBs calculation*).

Indicator 9.8: The estimates in GEB for this Indicator do include mixed plastics and metals, not only because MCMDs are usually built with these materials (as the

dismantling would happen outside the healthcare unit) but also, given the lack of proper segregation at healthcare facilities, other materials also end up being mixed in these types of waste, as per data provided by consulted stakeholders that operate in the HCWM collection and disposal system in Indonesia. Further investigation will take place during CEO ER PPG phase to breakdown these waste streams into plastics only, if acceptable by the Secretariat. *(please note this information has been included in the PIF, under the methodological explanation of GEBs calculation).*

Agency Response to 5.4 **day 01.05.2024**

Thank you for your comment. Entire PIF document has been checked accordingly. We have realized that it remained only in the Project Summary Section, and it has been adjusted accordingly.

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

Secretariat's Comments2024.4.9: cleared.

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

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 screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments2024.4.24:

cleared.

2024.4.9:

(i) Please spell out ?NIM? under the ?Capacity for Implementation? risk category.

(ii) Please review and confirm the ?Substantial? risk rating for the ?Capacity for Implementation? risk category with a focus on ensuring that the residual risk rating is provided by accounting for anticipated mitigation measures. Does the risk remain Substantial even based on the suggested mitigation measure?

Agency's Comments

- (i) ?NIM? stands for ?National Implementation Modality?, which as following GEF rules, means that the Government *Executing Agency is responsible for project execution and national ownership of project.
- (ii) We apologize for the typo, but this risk was supposed to be originally rated as ?moderate? in PIF Stage, while during CEO PPG the IA will continue to assess the EA?s implementation capacity.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments2024.4.9: cleared.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

- 6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?**

Secretariat's Comments2024.4.9: cleared.

Agency's Comments

- 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's Comments2024.4.9: cleared.

Agency's Comments

- 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's Comments2024.4.9: cleared.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments 2024.4.9: cleared.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

2024.5.1

cleared.

2024.4.24:

- on IPLC, please update the PIF to reflect the explanation provided in the review sheet.
- on manufacturers, distributors, companies etc., please elaborate on how these companies were identified among different companies. What is the rationale for focusing on these companies and not others?

2024.4.9:

- Engagement with IPLC is not clear. Please elaborate. In addition, agency should further elaborate on the different stakeholders' roles to project outcomes and plans to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan before CEO endorsement. Moreover, the agency should provide information on stakeholders consulted during project identification phase, including a summary and list of names and dates of consultations with IPLCs and CSOs.
- The proposal lists several manufacturers, distributors, companies etc. that were identified. Please elaborate on how these were identified.

Agency's Comments

? *2024.04.09 dated response:*

The project will require certain level of technical knowledge, understanding and awareness on the process of mercury identification, collection, submission, treatment, etc., but is also acknowledge that, given the targeted sector healthcare and related medical devices industries, it is expected that the engagement of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities are not going to be at the same level as it would be in ASGM-alike projects. Minding these limitations concerning the sector and project sites, the project will involve IPLC particularly

located in the final areas to be selected during CEO PPG through stakeholders consultation procedures, gender-equality public awareness raising and trainings. The Social and Environmental Screening Procedures (SESP) will also involve the IPLC to ensure the expected process and results.

? - The proper Stakeholders Engagement Plan (SEP) will be developed during PPG phase to account for the consultations procedures to be carried out during CEO ER process, but also for the ones that will need to be carried out during project execution.

? - Summary expected roles for the clusters of stakeholders had been added to the PIF, minding that these will be further developed during PPG phase.

- The EA has been establishing and maintaining good partnership with the private sector. It works closely with the private sector to strengthen public-private partnerships. It will increase efficiency and innovation, economic growth (ensure social welfare), and address complicated development challenges. The Government of Indonesia involves manufacturing companies, distributors and suppliers, and waste management companies to ensure that the private sector is willing to welcome and respect the recommended actions and support its implementation on timely manner.

2024.04.24 dated response:

? Clarification on IPLC has been updated in the relevant section of PIF.

? On the long-list of private sector stakeholders, we clarify that these were surveyed during the preparation of National Inventory of Mercury in Health Sector in Indonesia (May, 2023) conducted by the Ministries of Environment and Forestry and the Ministry of Health. In principle, these would be an exhaustive list of companies that used to import MCMDs and are introducing electronic alternatives into market. However, during CEO ER PPG, further consultations will be carried out to try to identify other ones that can also operate in the medical devices supply chain in Indonesia.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 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's Comments

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Commentsyes

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Commentscleared

Agency's CommentsPlease kindly note that the comment has been addressed in related section.

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments

2024.5.1

cleared.

2024.4.24:

Please further provide how the 'amount' of investment mobilized were estimated. In particular investment mobilized from private sector, as this account for about half of the entire co-financing.

2024.4.9:

Please elaborate further on how investment mobilized was identified, particularly that from private sector. What is the basis of \$15 million?

Agency's Comments

2024.04.09 dated response:

These are preliminary identification of the investments of several public and private sector stakeholders(especially the manufacturers, and importers) that will establish the supply chain of Hg-alternatives medical devices, investments for temporary storage of mercury, investment for pilot plant for stabilization of mercury, and investments of Ministry of Health and Healthcare units for the replacement and disposal of mercury.

As informed in the PIF, these include:

- The Ministry of Health, Ministry of Finance, will provide investments through green public procurement activities to speed up the replacement of medical devices that contain mercury for mercury-free medical devices as results of project activities related to policy strengthen and finance activities.

- Private sector, most notably, producers and importers of medical devices, will mobilize investments for retrofitting their facilities to produce mercury-free devices but also to establish national structures to test, calibrate, certify and service the alternative devices being phased-in by the project, which are mostly electronic ones. Also, companies will invest in local capacities to collect, recover, and treat mercury from old devices, including piloting technologies for stabilization and solidification of mercury.

2024.04.24 dated response:

The initial investment mobilized valued in USD 15 million was identified with support of the Indonesian Associations of Producers, Importers and Distributors of Medical Devices and the Association of HCWM Companies and their associates and this amount relates to:

a) Investments on retrofitting/line adaptation/testing facilities/royalties of medical devices manufacturers facilities for them to produce up to standards electronic (mercury-free) devices, most notably, investments required to establish national structures to test, calibrate, certify and service the alternative devices being phased-i.

(b) Healthcare waste management companies will invest (co-finance) in the local plants to safely dismantle MCMDs and to stabilize and solidify mercury recovered from old devices.

(c) Supply chain stakeholders are also expected to cooperate to establish proper voluntary EPR mechanisms to assure phased-in electronic devices can be collected and properly recycled upon their end-of-life, so pilot investment on this EPR scheme are also sought by the project.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?s(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

An OFP letter was uploaded with the second submission.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Commentsyes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Commentsyes

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Commentsyes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Commentsyes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Commentsyes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments2024.5.2:

This PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

2024.5.1 /4.24/ 4.9:

Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration (please highlight the change).

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9 April 2024 UNDP Response

LOE is uploaded.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/9/2024	4/9/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/24/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/1/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/2/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		