



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

GEF ID:	<b>5052</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Indonesia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Reducing Releases of PBDEs and UPOPs Originating from Unsound Waste Management and Recycling Practices and the Manufacturing of Plastics in Indonesia</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5073 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>POPs</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF	Objective (s):	<b>CHEM-1; CHEM-1; CHEM-1; Project Mana;</b>	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$3,990,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$15,960,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$19,950,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jie Pan</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Dr. Suely Carvalho</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	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.	

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

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	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.	
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	
	• 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	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	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 UOPs 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	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		burning (50% of municipal waste in the country uses it) in terms of demonstrating UPOPs/PBDEs emission reduction and waste recycling. What is 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.	
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	
	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?		To be assessed pending clarification on project design.  Oct. 15, 2012 Addressed. but needs to be further elaborated at CEO endorsement stage.
	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.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Mostly, pending clarification on above questions.  Oct. 15, 2012	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		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.	
	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	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	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.	
	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.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The role of relevant stakeholders is specified.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	4.8% of GEF grant.	
	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.	
	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.	
	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.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Not recommended. Please address above comments.  Oct. 15, 2012  All the comments are addressed. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 23, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	

	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.