

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility
(Version 5)

STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: March 02, 2016
Screener: Christine Wellington-Moore
Panel member validation by: Ricardo Orlando Barra Rios
Consultant(s):

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL SIZE PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9203
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Ecuador
PROJECT TITLE:	National Program for the Environmental Sound Management and Live Cycle Management of Chemical Substances
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	
GEF FOCAL AREA:	Chemicals and Waste

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the proposed project which seeks to protect human health and the environment by adopting an environmental sound management and live cycle management approach of chemical substances in Ecuador. Activities include addressing stockpiles and reducing releases of POPs (including the "new" POPs), promotion of less harmful products, and increasing capacity for contaminated site identification and remediation (for POPs, Mercury and other chemicals contaminants). Included (output 2.3.4) is an analysis of co-processing of hazardous wastes in cement kilns, complete with test burns, revision of emission standards, policy etc.

The STAP suggests that related literature, such as the EU Commission Report on Refuse Derived Fuel, Current Practice and Perspectives (<http://docplayer.net/10821846-European-commission-directorate-general-environment-refuse-derived-fuel-current-practice-and-perspectives-b4-3040-2000-306517-mar-e3-final-report.html>), and work by the Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives (GAIA) (<http://www.no-burn.org/downloads/RDF%20Final.pdf>) be considered as a start, noting that these reports themselves can further act as a source for information on experience in this area. Note also that the USEPA (<http://www3.epa.gov/warm/SWMGHGreport.html>) has created the Waste Reduction Model (WARM) to help solid waste planners and organizations track and voluntarily report greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions from several different materials management practices, thereby providing some objective way of calculating the best waste management strategy. WARM calculates and totals the relative GHG emission and energy impacts of baseline and alternative materials management practices—source reduction, recycling, combustion, composting, and land filling using emission factors that EPA has developed based on a materials life-cycle approach.

STAP also suggests a deeper investigation in the area of sustainable hazardous waste management/disposal/destruction as the project develops (e.g., consider the toxic residues, the extra energy required to make RDF pellets, the inefficiency of burning waste - taking into account material and energy

wasted from manufacture of the products before they became waste). Comprehensive review of the literature on this topic is encouraged.

Finally, attention should be paid to post project sustainability, with creation of a replication mechanism to sustain the efforts to form cooperatives amongst the small miners, and the incentives created by the revolving loan financing that will also address access to new technologies, to acquire land titles etc. The document admits that the challenges of formalization of the ASGM sector are significant, so there should also be thought given to sustaining any gains post project. Attendant to this, the risks to formalization should be rated higher than "L" (perhaps "M"?) in the risk table given the current atmosphere of mistrust between miners and authorities. Also, the use of economic approaches such as financial lending should be juxtaposed with good taxation arrangements, and an overall comprehensive identification of sources of associated revenue generation. This could be explored during project preparation.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple "Concur" response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised. (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP's concerns.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>