Polychlorinated Biphenyls-free Indonesia: Financing a shift to more efficient energy systems through the elimination of related waste and contaminated equipment

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11425

Countries

Indonesia

Project Name

Polychlorinated Biphenyls-free Indonesia: Financing a shift to more efficient energy systems through the elimination of related waste and contaminated equipment

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

10/18/2023

Review completed by PM

11/8/2023
Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo
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 Yes

Agency's Comments

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 Yes

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 Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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 Yes

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 Yes

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 Yes

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 Yes

Agency's Comments

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 Yes

Agency's Comments

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 Yes

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 Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKs

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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 Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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 Comments Yes

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 Comments Yes

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 Comments Yes

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 Comments

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

The Agency has provided a list of stakeholders that were consulted during PIF development. However, they did not include any Civil society organizations. References is made to an annex with a detailed list of stakeholders, but this was not attached. Agency should provide a list of stakeholders including CSOs that will be consulted during the project development phase.

Nov 8, 2023 - comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

06 Nov 2023

Civil Society Organizations will be fully consulted during the project development phase. The list of stakeholders initially identified is attached as Annex G.

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 Comments Yes

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 Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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 Yes

Agency's Comments

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

The LoE document cannot be opened. Please upload as a pdf file.

October 23, 2023 - LoE is uploaded and correct.

Agency's Comments

6 November 2023

The revised LoE with the corresponding footnote is attached.

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

Secretariat's Comments

The LoE document cannot be opened. Please upload as a pdf file.

October 23, 2023 - LoE is uploaded and correct.

Agency's Comments

6 November 2023

The revised LoE with the corresponding footnote is attached.

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

Secretariat's Comments

The LoE document cannot be opened. Please upload as a pdf file.

October 23, 2023 - 1. Letter of Endorsement: the template utilized for this project removed the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: ?Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate. In March when the June 2023 Work Program was being constituted, Agencies were informed that LoEs ?with modifications cannot be accepted and will be returned?. While the removal of the footnote seems to be trivial, it is not: this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project. Please get an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE (this is an alternative to request a new LoE).

2. Letter of Endorsement explicitly says that ?the executing entity will be determined during the project preparatory phase?. However, in Portal there is an executing partner identified (Ministry of Environment and Forestry) that is not included in the LoE. Please ask the Agency to remove the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (also the executing agency type) as it is not endorsed by the Government - it can be included later during the preparation phase as needed (the Agency can write ?to be determined? in both fields).

Nov 8, 2023 - On the other two comments related with the LoE, we noted that there is a new letter of endorsement which includes the footnote requested in the first comment below. The letter also includes the Ministry of Environment and Forestry as the executing Agency. However, in Portal does not include The Ministry of Environment and Forestry ? instead, now it includes ?to be determined?. Please ask the Agency to make the change in Portal so the Ministry of Environment and Forestry endorsed by the OFP as the executing Agency is included accordingly.

November 13, 2023 - comment addressed.

Agency's Comments
09 November 2023

The change in Portal from 'to be determined' to 'Ministry of Environment and Forestry' based on the latest OFP LoE has been made.

06 November 2023

1. A revised LoE to include the corresponding footnote "Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency " is attached.

2. Entry in the portal is revised and reflects 'to be determined'.

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 Comments Yes

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 Comments Yes

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 Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

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 Comments

October 19, 2023 - The LOE was not submitted. Please upload the LOE and create the link on the main portal page.

October 23, 2023 - LoE is uploaded and correct. Technical review is complete without further comments. Project is being sent for policy screen.

October 27, 2023 - please see comments from the policy screen.

November 8, 2023 - Please address the new comment resulting from the revised LoE which includes an identified executing agency.

November 13, 2023 - Comments addressed. Project is recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

8 November 2023

The latest PPO comment resulting from the revised OFP LoE with regards to the identified executing agency has been made.

6 November 2023

Comments from the policy screen have been addressed.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	**10/19/2023**	**11/6/2023**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
Additional Review (as necessary)	**10/23/2023**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**11/8/2023**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**11/13/2023**	
Additional Review (as necessary)		