GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	**5052**		
Country/Region:	**Indonesia**		
Project Title:	**Reducing Releases of PBDEs and UPOPs Originating from Unsound Waste Management and Recycling Practices and the Manufacturing of Plastics in Indonesia**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5073 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**POPs**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CHEM-1; CHEM-1; CHEM-1; Project Mana;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$100,000**	Project Grant:	**$3,990,000**
Co-financing:	**$18,731,594**	Total Project Cost:	**$22,821,594**
PIF Approval:	**February 20, 2013**	Council Approval/Expected:	**April 12, 2013**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Anil Sookdeo**	Agency Contact Person:	**Mr. Jacques Van Engel**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes.	Yes
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	No. OFP endorsement letter is missing. Oct. 15, 2012 Endorsement letter provided.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	UNDP has no direct experience working on specific issue of PBDEs application in plastics and its emission. However, UNDP has been involved in municipal waste management projects and is experienced in capacity building and policy mainstreaming.	This will be the first such project by any GEF agency in that it deals with one of the new POPS, however UNDP has significant experience working on waste management projects which would be directed to the implementation of this project.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	NA

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	The proposal fits into UNDAF (2011-2015) especially in terms of strengthening national capacity on implementation of resources efficient clean production. UNDP country office has experience with GEF/MLF projects.	Yes
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	Yes
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes. CHEM-1	Yes
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes	Yes
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Municipal waste incineration is identified as one of the key sources of POPs emission according to the NIP. There is also a clear interest from the government to address UPOPs and PBDEs emission. However, it's unclear how significant plastics manufacturing sector is in comparison to other sectors such as e-waste recycling or open burning (50% of municipal waste in the country uses it) in terms of demonstrating UPOPs/PBDEs emission reduction and waste recycling. What is	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		the plan of the GoI on how to regulate this particular new POPs issue? Oct. 15, 2012 Addressed.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	To be assessed pending clarification on project design. Oct. 15, 2012 Addressed.	Yes. In particular the results of this project needs to be properly and widely communicated to other regions of Indonesia and other countries that will need to deal with waste containing PDBE.
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	What's presented is baseline situation. It's not mentioned how the GOI or bilateral partners actually worked and invested in implementing the plans etc. and how GEF builds on it. Oct. 15, 2012 Addressed	Yes
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		This is the first project of this type so the cost effectiveness cannot be demonstrated. The challenge is different from other POPS since the chemicals being addressed in this project are contained in the make up of various types of plastics. The project proponents should carefully record the costs of each step in the interventions during project implementation in order to begin the process of establishing costs for these projects.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	To be assessed when baseline projects are presented. Oct. 15, 2012 Addressed.	Yes
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Mostly, pending clarification on above questions.	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Oct. 15, 2012 Yes. Project framework is clear.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	UPOPs and PBDE emission is estimated in PIF.	Yes
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?	Yes	Yes
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes	Yes
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Climate Change risk is not identified in this waste management and recycling project. Oct. 15, 2012 Addressed.	Yes
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Not mentioned. Oct. 15, 2012 Addressed.	Yes
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The role of relevant stakeholders is specified.	Yes
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		N/A

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	4.8% of GEF grant.	Yes
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	To be assessed when baseline is clear. Oct. 15, 2012 Addressed.	Yes
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	1:4. 13% is in cash, the rest in-kind or unknown at this stage.	Co-financing is confirmed.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNDP is bringing 349,000 of cash co-financing to this project.	Yes
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes. Please note the STAP's comment on the monitoring and reporting of results from this project. Since this is the first PBDE project the proponents and the agency need to document the implementation and results and lessons learned for the project.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	Yes	Yes
	• Convention Secretariat?		The Convention Secretariat has confirmed the eligibility of Indonesia.
	• Council comments?		The comments from the Government of the United States of America have been sufficiently addressed.
	• Other GEF Agencies?	None Received	Non Received.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	Not recommended. Please address above comments. Oct. 15, 2012	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		All the comments are addressed. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	1. Please provide relevant information on the plan of the GoI to regulate PBDE and new POPs issue and the contribution of this proposed project toward mainstreaming new POPs issue to government waste management agenda. 2. Please specify how private sector (esp. potential pilot sites) is engaged in project preparation and raise countermeasures on how to address the lack of incentives and thus participation from private sector.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		Yes
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Yes
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 23, 2012	November 14, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 15, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments

PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes
Secretariat Recommendation	**3. Is PPG approval being recommended?**	Yes
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 08, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.