

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

|                                  |                               |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Overall Rating:</b>           | Satisfactory                  |
| <b>Decision:</b>                 |                               |
| <b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b> | 00083160                      |
| <b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>  | GEF - Reducing PBDE and UPOPs |
| <b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>   | 2016-03-16 / 2021-03-30       |

**Strategic**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?

- ☐ 3: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives, assumptions were tested to determine if the project's strategy was valid. There is some evidence that the project board considered the implications, and documented the changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes did not fully integrate in the project. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project team considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team considered these changes to the project as a result.

**Evidence:**

The project team always identified potential inputs that could be integrated into the project implementation. In term of technology, for instance, when the project was initiated, it did not plan to integrate Internet of Things (IOT) system in the Mini Depo development and establishment. Based on the intensive discussions with the Implementing Partner (Ministry of Industry) and other relevant stakeholders, it then considered its importance and strengthened the facility by integrating the IOT into the facilities and laboratories.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=itAeaW-fOiw>

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name   | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | IOTMiniDepoCirebonSENSOR1_8677_301<br>( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IOTMiniDepoCirebonSENSOR1_8677_301.jpeg">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IOTMiniDepoCirebonSENSOR1_8677_301.jpeg</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 9:24:00 AM |
| 2 | IOTMiniDepoCirebonSENSOR2_8677_301<br>( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IOTMiniDepoCirebonSENSOR2_8677_301.jpeg">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IOTMiniDepoCirebonSENSOR2_8677_301.jpeg</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 9:24:00 AM |
| 3 | IOTMiniDepoCirebonMONITOR_8677_301<br>( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IOTMiniDepoCirebonMONITOR_8677_301.jpeg">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IOTMiniDepoCirebonMONITOR_8677_301.jpeg</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 9:24:00 AM |

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- ☐ 3: The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution .The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project responded to at least one of the developments settings1 as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

**Evidence:**

Yes, the project is aligned with the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and national priorities. It was implemented to achieve CPD Outcome 3. By 2020, Indonesia is sustainably managing its natural resources, on land and at sea, with an increased resilience to the effects of climate change, disasters and other shocks (New CPD Outcome 3. Institutions, communities and people actively apply and implement low carbon development, sustainable natural resources management, and disaster resilience approaches that are all gender sensitive). CPD Output 3.5. Systems strengthened to properly manage, dispose and phase out hazardous chemicals (SP Output 1.4.1 - Signature: Sustainable Planet).

<https://tabloidmaritim.com/2019/02/27/timeline-larangan-pakai-pbde-di-industri-pada-2030/>

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | PAR_2020_02_PBDEUPOPs-Dec2020_8677_302 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PAR_2020_02_PBD EUPOPs-Dec2020_8677_302.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PAR_2020_02_PBD EUPOPs-Dec2020_8677_302.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 9:37:00 AM |

**Relevant****Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them?

- ☐ 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)*
- ☐ 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected
- ☐ Not Applicable

#### Evidence:

UNDP and the Ministry of Industry invited relevant stakeholders representing various sectors (Ministry of Environment and Forestry, National Development Planning Agency/BAPPENAS, Ministry of Finance, GEF-OFP, association of manufacturing industries, association of recycling industries, local governments, experts, etc.) during the project identification, project document (prodoc) development, and full-size project implementation.

The Project Board consists of various stakeholders involved in the Supplier (UNDP and GEF-OFP), Executing Agency (Ministry of Industry) and Beneficiaries (Ministry of Environment and Forestry, BAPPENAS, Ministry of Finance, Customs, Associations, and NGOs). The Executing Agency (Implementing Partner) has been actively leading the activities. Meanwhile, the Project Board members were also actively involved in the field monitoring to assure the project progress in different selected sites in West Java and East Java during the project preparation and implementation.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name  | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | 2021PBDEKunjunganDG_8677_303 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2021PBDEKunjunganDG_8677_303.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2021PBDEKunjunganDG_8677_303.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 5:20:00 AM |

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

- ☐ 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

#### Evidence:

The project withdrew knowledge and lessons learned in coordination with various stakeholders, especially relevant ministries, experts and private sector (associations). The conducted knowledge sharing whenever possible to share its lessons-learned while at the same time gain the inputs from the participants involved in the activities.

<http://202.47.80.50/berita-lingkungan/21/Berkolaborasi-dengan-UI,-Kemenperin-dan-UNDP-Sosialisasikan-PBDE-kepada-Mahasiswa>

#### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name   | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | PBDEEvidenceknowledgesharing_8677_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/PBDEEvidenceknowledgesharing_8677_304.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/PBDEEvidenceknowledgesharing_8677_304.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 9:53:00 AM |

5. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?

- ☐ 3: There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.
- ☒ 2: *While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).*
- ☐ 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

**Evidence:**

The project has strong impact to the awareness and knowledge of different levels of stakeholders. For public, it encouraged communities (including Youth) to pay more attention to the potential impacts of PBDEs-UOPs in plastics and electronic products. For public services, especially research institutions and laboratories responsible to release new products or imported goods, they paid more attention to the contents of materials and substances being used. Meanwhile for the manufacturing and recycling industries, they had better understanding on the impacts of their activities to health and environment. They also had better perspectives on how to deal with potential markets domestically and abroad.

In the meantime, according to the Multilateral Director of BAPPENAS, the project has been very good. He suggested another similar project to address the cases of persistent organic pollutants and their UOPs.

<https://www.republika.co.id/berita/pauank414/ministry-undp-encourage-people-to-reduce-plastic-waste>

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By                 | Modified On           |
|---|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | PBDEEvidence5_8677_305 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidence5_8677_305.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidence5_8677_305.pdf</a> )                   | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 10:45:00 AM |
| 2 | PBDEEvidenceScaleUp_8677_305 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidenceScaleUp_8677_305.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidenceScaleUp_8677_305.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 10:48:00 AM |

**Principled****Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

- ☐ 3: The project team gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

#### Evidence:

The project was sensitive to gender equality. It worked mainly in plastic recycling industry. It developed Gender Action Plan. It has 100% completed gender segregated data on recyclers was collected. It developed a gender mainstreaming strategy to strengthen the capacity to prevent harmful impact of hazardous chemical substances exposure. It developed Training module on plastic recycling sector on gender sensitive health and safety protection, and financial literacy in capacity building program. It worked with selected recycling associations, governments, recycling industries, NGOs and local organizations involved in Training of Trainers (ToTs).

<https://kps2k.org/lingkungan/kesetaraan-dan-keadilan-gender-pelaku-indutri-sektor-daur-ulang-limbah-plastik-1/>

<https://kps2k.org/lingkungan/kesetaraan-dan-keadilan-gender-pelaku-indutri-sektor-daur-ulang-limbah-plastik-2/>

<https://www.facebook.com/undpID/posts/dampak-paran-bahan-kimia-berbahaya-termasuk-pbdes-berbeda-pada-laki-laki-dan-p/10155950329846758/>

### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name   | Modified By                 | Modified On           |
|---|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | PBDEEvidence6_8677_306 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidence6_8677_306.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidence6_8677_306.pdf</a> )                                    | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 10:36:00 AM |
| 2 | PBDEEvidence6A_8677_306 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidence6A_8677_306.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidence6A_8677_306.pdf</a> )                                 | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 10:37:00 AM |
| 3 | PBDEEvidence6B_8677_306 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidence6B_8677_306.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidence6B_8677_306.pdf</a> )                                 | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 10:37:00 AM |
| 4 | PBDE_GenderActionPlan_1__8677_306 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDE_GenderActionPlan_1__8677_306.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDE_GenderActionPlan_1__8677_306.docx</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 8:34:00 AM  |

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- ☐ 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*
- ☐ 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)



**Evidence:**

UNDP has a long history supporting the development initiatives. UNDP has been working as one of the key development partners to achieve sustainable human development in economic, social, and environmental fronts. While working with the Government at the national, regional, and local levels, civil society and the private sector, UNDP aims at eradicating extreme poverty, and reducing inequalities and exclusion to protect both people and the planet.

The project was fully compliant with UNDP's environmental and social safeguards defined by integration of precautionary principle into programme/ project management cycles. The very design of this project correlates to the main objective of safeguarding to prevent and mitigate undue harm to the environment and people at the earliest possible planning stage, and to identify and realize opportunities to strengthen environmental and social sustainability.

The project design and its implementation has taken specific care to ensure women's participation. Considering that majority of the plastic waste collectors are women, improving the practice of collection, sorting and recycling of plastic waste will have a positive impact on women (reduced impact of POPs, heavy metals and PBDE). Overall, given the conditions or opportunities, the project provided women with safety at the workplace through introduction of proper plastic waste management in plastic recycling organizations in the country.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By                 | Modified On           |
|---|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | PBDEEvidence7_8677_307 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidence7_8677_307.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidence7_8677_307.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 10:53:00 AM |

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

- ☐ 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Project-affected people informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.*
- ☐ 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

#### Evidence:

Grievance mechanism is integrated with the process and procedure established and applied in the Implementing Agency (UNDP) and the Implementing Partner (Ministry of Industry/ Mol). Project-affected people were allowed to access directly with the Project Management Unit (PMU), UNDP and/or Mol. However, based on the experience during the project identification, preparation, and implementation, there was no grievance addressed to either UNDP, Mol and/or the PMU.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name  | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | PBDEEvidencegrievance_8677_308 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidencegrievance_8677_308.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidencegrievance_8677_308.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 3:15:00 PM |

#### Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- ☐ 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

#### Evidence:

Monitoring and Evaluation activities have been quite strong. The monitoring reports were produced regularly and shared with the 'Project Board'. The reports were discussed at the steering committee meetings, and the required instructions and actions suggested by the board were carried out.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name   | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | PBDEEvidenceMonitoring_8677_309 ( <a href="http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidenceMonitoring_8677_309.pdf">http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidenceMonitoring_8677_309.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 9:56:00 AM |

10. Was the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended?

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)
- ☒ 2: *The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)*
- ☐ 1: The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

#### Evidence:

Quoting the Terminal Evaluation, the project established an effective partnership arrangement for the implementation of the project with the other (other than the government counterparts) relevant stakeholders as well. This included the partnership with the private companies for recycling of plastic, suppliers of equipment for the mini depots. Some of the other partnerships established under the project included with the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, local government agencies (BAPPEDA) at Mojokerto, Local office of Environmental Management, Ministry of Industry, Plastic manufacturers/ third-party intermediaries, and recycling (plastic sorting) clusters, informal plastics recycling entities.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name   | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | PBDEEvidence10_8677_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidence10_8677_310.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidence10_8677_310.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 8:16:00 AM |

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

- ☐ 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.*
- ☐ 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

**Evidence:**

The project monitored the progress and its risks regularly. The project MTR did not identify any significant risk to the project. The PIR for the year 2019 identified significant risks on the establishment of Mini Depo. There was a significant delay on the development of Mini Depo in Mojokerto (East Java) that had issues related to the legal land ownership. The local government could not find assure the proposed land since the land was actually conserved for historical value (the city has been considered as the Majapahit Kingdom site). As an adaptive measure, the project had to obtain land clearance in other locations before proceeding with other activities.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | PBDEEvidencerisks_8677_311 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidencerisks_8677_311.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidencerisks_8677_311.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 3:31:00 PM |

**Efficient****Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

**Evidence:**

Yes, the project adequate resources to cover the project cost.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | PBDEEvidencefinance_8677_312 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidencefinance_8677_312.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidencefinance_8677_312.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 3:40:00 PM |

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

- ☐ 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

**Evidence:**

The project was implemented using National Implementation Modality - Country Office Service Support (NIM-COSS). Therefore, the Procurement Unit monitored the process of procurement plan and implementation closely. In coordination with Operations Unit and Finance and Resources Management Unit (FRMU), the Procurement Unit also monitored the project delivery progress.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | PBDEEvidenceprocurement_8677_313 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidenceprocurement_8677_313.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidenceprocurement_8677_313.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 3:47:00 PM |

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

- ☐ 3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.*
- ☐ 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

**Evidence:**

Assisted by the Head of Unit, Programme Manager, Operations Manager, FRMU Manager, Procurement Unit, and in coordination with the Implementing Partner, the Project Management Unit (PMU) monitored its own costs and assured the cost efficiencies.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | PBDEEvidenceprocurement_8677_314 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidenceprocurement_8677_314.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidenceprocurement_8677_314.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 4:32:00 PM |
| 2 | PBDEEvidencedelivery_8677_314 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidencedelivery_8677_314.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidencedelivery_8677_314.pdf</a> )          | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 4:33:00 PM |

Effective

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

15. Was the project on track and delivered its expected outputs?

- ☒ Yes  
☐ No

**Evidence:**

Yes, the project was implemented in accordance with schedule. Delays occurred during the project implementation due to political situation that could not be avoided (tour of duty in the Ministry of Industry) and Covid-19 pandemic (2020-2021).

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name   | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | PBDEEvidenceDelivery_8677_315 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidenceDelivery_8677_315.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidenceDelivery_8677_315.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 4:35:00 PM |

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- ☐ 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.*
- ☐ 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.



**Evidence:**

It was mandatory for all projects implemented by UN DP to conduct work plan review in coordination with Senior Management, the Implementing Partner and colleagues in Bangkok Regional Hub (BRH) regularly. To monitor the progress, UNDP also conducted quarterly-basis update and review. In addition, the PM U also facilitated regular Project Board Meetings involving various institutions (GEF-OFP, BAPPENAS, Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Environment and Forestry).

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | PBDEEvidenceprocurement_8677_316 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidenceprocurement_8677_316.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidenceprocurement_8677_316.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 4:42:00 PM |
| 2 | PBDEEvidencecedelivery_8677_316 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidencecedelivery_8677_316.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidencecedelivery_8677_316.pdf</a> )    | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 4:42:00 PM |

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- ☐ 3: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- ☐ Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

The project was supported by multi-stakeholders. It worked with relevant stakeholders at national and sub-national level. It worked closely with government institutions, research institutions, local government agencies, community-based organizations, private sector (manufacturing and recycling industry), universities, and experts since the project identification and preparation up to the implementation.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name   | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | PBDEEvidencestakeholders_8677_317 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidencestakeholders_8677_317.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidencestakeholders_8677_317.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 4:52:00 PM |

**Sustainability & National Ownership****Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

18. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

- ☐ 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- ☐ Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

Yes, the stakeholders and national partners were fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring. They were invited to get involved in the Project Board Meetings.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | PBDEEvidencePBM_8677_318 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidencePBM_8677_318.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEvidencePBM_8677_318.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 4:45:00 PM |

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation arrangements<sup>8</sup> adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- ☐ 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.
- ☐ Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

Yes, the project monitored the progress regularly. It reported the progress through Project Assurance Report (PAR), GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR), Mid Term Review (MTR), and Terminal Evaluation (TE).

## List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name   | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | Vertical-Fund-COVID-Survey-April-2020-PIMS5073_8677_319 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Vertical-Fund-COVID-Survey-April-2020-PIMS5073_8677_319.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Vertical-Fund-COVID-Survey-April-2020-PIMS5073_8677_319.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 8:26:00 AM |
| 2 | 2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS5073-GEFID5052_8677_319 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS5073-GEFID5052_8677_319.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS5073-GEFID5052_8677_319.pdf</a> )  | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 8:26:00 AM |
| 3 | 5073_PBDEMTRreport_FINAL_8677_319 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5073_PBDEMTRreport_FINAL_8677_319.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5073_PBDEMTRreport_FINAL_8677_319.pdf</a> )   | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 8:30:00 AM |
| 4 | PAR_2020_02_PBDEUPOPs-Dec2020_8677_319 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PAR_2020_02_PBDEUPOPs-Dec2020_8677_319.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PAR_2020_02_PBDEUPOPs-Dec2020_8677_319.pdf</a> )  | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 8:18:00 AM |
| 5 | 5073IndonesiaPBDEs-uPOPsTereport-FINAL1_8677_319 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5073IndonesiaPBDEs-uPOPsTereport-FINAL1_8677_319.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5073IndonesiaPBDEs-uPOPsTereport-FINAL1_8677_319.pdf</a> )                      | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 8:33:00 AM |

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.*
- ☐ 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

Evidence:

Yes, the transition and phase-out arrangements were discussed with the Implementing partner and its relevant stakeholders through the Project Board meeting and other relevant activities during the project implementation. Local government agencies and communities who received and assigned to manage the Mini Depo, for instance, were trained by the Implementing Partner (and PMU) to understand how to operate the mini depo properly. They were trained to have understanding, awareness and knowledge on the importance of allocated capital fund for initial costs of the mini depo operations.

List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name  | Modified By                 | Modified On          |
|---|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | PBDEEv evidencesustainability_8677_320 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEv evidencesustainability_8677_320.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBDEEv evidencesustainability_8677_320.pdf</a> ) | anton.probiyantono@undp.org | 6/16/2021 4:13:00 PM |

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

UNDP and GEF-OFP appreciated the efforts of Ministry of Industry, manufacturing and recycling industries, and other relevant stakeholders in the country to reduce the impacts of PBDEs and UPOPs in plastic manufacturing, recycling and disposal. In general, the Government of Indonesia has regulatory framework, National Standards, and appropriate technical guidance to assure that PBDEs are not being used (consumed) in manufacturing and recycling industries. It worked closely with the stakeholders to assure proper management of disposed plastic wastes. It facilitated the efforts of Indonesia to undertake necessary actions to reduce any other types of toxic and hazardous substances being used or reused.

The project supported the efforts of the Government of Indonesia to achieve national priorities in industrial sector and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), especially #12 on Responsible Consumption and Production. It encouraged people to pay more attention to any product that they purchased and used. It helped them how to be aware of adverse effects caused by the product that might contain hazardous and toxic substances. It also supported the efforts of Indonesia to perform its laboratories' quality defending the country from the consumption of unsound environmentally-friendly electronic products. It facilitated the government to strengthen the Indonesian laboratories to analyze substances or chemicals being used by the exporting countries whether the products imported to Indonesia contained substances restricted or banned by the UN Stockholm Convention. It helped Indonesia to safe its health and environment from irresponsible imported products (not to become a dumping country from products considered unhealthy).

The project helped Indonesia to encourage economic development that paid serious attention to the importance of environmentally-friendly processes in manufacturing and recycling. It helped the country to produce goods in accordance with international standards (or standards that had been established by designated countries, such as UK, EU, North America, Japan, Korea, etc.). Therefore, it helped Indonesia to achieve SDG#1 (No Poverty), SDG#2 (Zero Hunger), SDG#3 (Good health and well-being) and SDG#5 (gender equality).

When the President of Indonesia joined International Women's Day, the project provided one of gender equality champions, Ibu Nurul Latifah from Mojokerto (East Java) to meet the President in his presidential palace. It facilitated Ibu Nurul (a plastic recycler) to get together with other women and be one of role model in plastic recycling actions.

In coordination with relevant stakeholders at national and local levels, the project facilitated the development and establishment of Mini Depo facilities in (1) Desa Babakan, Caringin Cirebon; (2) Kota Depok; (3) Kota Malang; (4) Kab. Malang; (5) Kota Bandung; dan (6) Muncar, Banyuwangi. It encouraged these local communities to carry out PBDEs -UPOPs reduction even further to assure the circular economy to happen.