

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: October 01, 2011

Screeners: Christine Wellington

Panel member validation by: Hindrik Bouwman
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4617

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : China

PROJECT TITLE: Municipal Solid Waste Management

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Foreign Economic Cooperation Office (FECO) of the Ministry of Environmental Protection (MEP)

GEF FOCAL AREA: POPs

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 revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

In the face of rapid urbanization and economic development, China is seeing a 5-fold increase in municipal waste over the last 20 years or so. This proposal seeks to reduce uPOPs in pilot municipalities by applying BAT/BEP to MSW management, and to establish favourable conditions for replication of demonstrated BAT/BEP, including a stronger policy and regulatory framework, and increased awareness among city administrators and MSW management professionals.

The PIF appears quite comprehensive and the intention to apply modern waste management techniques is often mentioned. Yet explicitly, there is little reference towards increased awareness campaigns to target public consumption patterns. Intent to enhance sustainable consumption behaviours is mentioned in the first paragraph on page 10 of the PIF, and in the last paragraph of the same page, mention is made of producer stewardship guidelines. But the activities in Component 1 within Table B Project Framework do not speak to these. There is instead an emphasis on public awareness on the social benefits of source separation. Effectively then the PIF reads with an emphasis on end of pipe actions as opposed to tackling minimisation of waste at source through change of consumption patterns. Taking this track could result in GEF funding being used to help set up waste plants that need high levels of waste to remain financially viable. As such an upstream reduction in waste through more sustainable consumption could be detrimental on the investment. There is BAT/BEP mentioned in the document, but it was not clear to the reviewers if perhaps waste reduction fell under this umbrella terminology. Waste reduction is mentioned but only in the context of championing reduction of waste destined for destruction or landfilling through the process of separation for recycling/reuse.

In addition, waste producers are not explicitly mentioned as key stakeholders and partners for active participation in waste management (outside of the aforementioned separation for recycling).

Taking into consideration all of the above, the recommendation, therefore, is that in preparing the project document, there be:-

- a) Serious attention paid to tackling ways to impact on public consumption choices and patterns. There is plenty of project evidence that updating waste treatment facilities without fully tackling ways to curb growth in consumption and waste generation, will only result in a shorter life of the new facilities implemented. Concrete activities related to this should be developed for the public, also complementing the private sector stewardship programme.

b) Related to this, in Table B.5, the Government Public Information Service, normally charged with educating the public to compel compliance with government policy, should be mentioned. Surely there is some section of government with a mandate of carrying out public awareness, and they should be a part of the key stakeholders group that might help influence public uptake of waste reduction principles.

<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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.