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: April 24, 2015 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: 9078
PROJECT DURATION : 5
COUNTRIES : Philippines
PROJECT TITLE: Implementation of PCB Management Programs for Electric Cooperatives and Safe e-wastes Management
GEF AGENCIES: UNIDO
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR- EMB Lead Executing Agency); National Electrification Administration (NEA); Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA)

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):
Minor issues to be considered during project design

III. Further guidance from STAP

The project objective states that the project seeks the "protection of human health and the environment through sound management of PCBs and PBDEs in e-wastes". The design of the project is logical with a fair assessment of barriers and baseline scenario. It seeks to improve the institutional capacity to implement PBDE and PCB environmentally sound management plans, including identification of appropriate facilities and infrastructure for waste management (with recommendations for additional facilities where needed), appropriate training of relevant stakeholders, awareness raising of best practices, and demonstration of BAT/BEP for sustainable management of Waste Electrical and Electronics Equipment (WEEE) to reduce the current hazardous recycling practices in both the formal and informal sectors. There is also hope to improve the current oversight and monitoring of waste management in the Philippines through the project.

The baseline situation indicates that there are several developments creating the waste problem I n the Philippines including, inter alia, the import of used and/or relatively cheap electronic equipment from Japan and Korea in particular, rapid growth in the Information Technology and Business Management (IT-BPM) industry in recent years, and technology-driven export (semi-conductor) sectors in Special Economic Zones throughout the country. There are informal and formal e-waste recyclers in the country, with 109 registered Treatment, Storage and Disposal (TSD) facilities only 14 of which are authorized to handle WEEE, and as such are classified as formal recyclers engaged in total recycling and recovery. TSDs are required to secure an Environmental Clearance Certificate (ECC) from the Environmental Management Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), and continued operation is subject to compliance of conditions in the ECC and submissions of a quarterly Self-Monitoring Report (SMR), through which they should report on materials processed and emissions generated.

PCB management in the Philippines has been lacking, with previously elaborated plans often omitting facility closure procedures and post-closure conditions and monitoring processes. Stockpiles targeted for disposal are often left standing, and there are inspection reports showing poor storage practices, no lab analysis, incidents of leaks, spills and improper labelling, no pollution officers on-site, PCB oils going through non-registered facilities, and generally poor tracking of transactions and waste inventories.

STAP Comments:

The STAP thinks that overall the approach laid out in the PIF is feasible, but would make a few points for consideration in the project design:-

1) There needs to be sound elaboration of a strategy for the alternative livelihoods creation need that will certainly arise if much of the environmentally hazardous, informal sector activity is to be eliminated. There is a large social component to this project that should be appreciated and the knowledge and lessons learned from the process would add significant value to the project. Indeed even the risk table acknowledges a moderate risk of resistance from the informal sector, but the PIF does not seem to put forward any preliminary ideas towards tackling this issue.

2) There needs to be assessment of the current environmental and human settlement threats posed by the locations of the current registered TSDs and recycling/recovery set ups overall. This includes threats to the water table, flooding (from typhoons), and overall threat of broader contamination to the environs around the facilities. Rigourous environmental impact assessments should also be utilised should the need for additional facilities be identified.

3) Though there is no elaboration of detail in the early part of the PIF, it is hoped that improvement of the monitoring of recycling/recovery processes will include moving beyond self-reporting alone, since there is currently no way to verify performance and practice of facilities to ensure safe operation for environmental and human health.

4) With this said, the risk table of the PIF will need to be revisited in the course of project development. As aforementioned, risks from resistance from the informal sector, and the risk from typhoons etc does not seem to be fully considered (the latter only focuses on risk to collection and operations, but thinks nothing of wider contamination to areas around the facilities).

STAP advisory response	*Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed*
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	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: (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. 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.
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	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: (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. The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP's concerns. 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.