

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: May 03, 2010

Screeners: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Bo Wahlstrom
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 3803

PROJECT DURATION :

COUNTRIES : India

PROJECT TITLE: Environmentally Sound Management of Medical Wastes in India

GEF AGENCIES: UNIDO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment and Forest (MOEF), India

GEF FOCAL AREA: POPs

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: POPS-2;POPS-1;POPS-3;

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): **Consent**

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP has no comments on the feasibility and logical framework proposed in this project dealing with environmentally sound management of medical waste in India. As the project contributes to sound chemical management beyond POPs, STAP would appreciate when project proponents provide more explicit information about the impacts of project interventions on management of mercury, photo-chemicals, pharmaceutical and radioactive waste.

2. Promotion of public-private partnerships (PPPs) to deal with different phases of medical waste management chain in this project is encouraging, but there are many risks and uncertainties involved that has to be analyzed and presented. In practice, introduction of PPPs does not necessarily guarantee effectiveness and lower costs for delivery of public service. A number of factors have to be met in designing and implementing such instruments such as open and competitive bidding, competition among service providers, short-term contracting, strict monitoring, contractual enforcement, public sector training and effective stakeholder consultation process (E.g., Awortwi N. Getting the fundamentals wrong: Woes of public-private partnerships in solid waste collection in three Ghanaian cities. Public Admin. Dev. 24: 213-224 (2004); Massoud M and El-Fadel M. Public-private partnerships for solid waste management services. Environ. Management 30(5): 621-630 (2002)). Enforcement of these principles in the context of resource-poor countries is challenging and the outcome is not always obvious, particularly for such a complex issue as medical waste management that involves heterogeneous substances, processes and stakeholders. STAP recommends presenting at the CEO endorsement phase a cost-benefit analysis for the whole management chain justifying selection of PPPs in the first place and support for particular form of PPP as the most effective and cost-saving mechanism.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor revision required.	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing 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 revision required	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement. 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.