

**Peer Review Report
for
IGES LTP 3R Project (FY 2005-06)
and
Integrated Waste management and Resources Efficiency
Project (FY 2007-contd.)**

June 2008

Prepared by:

**Dr. Surya Chandak, Deputy Director & Officer-in-Charge
International Environmental Technology Centre
Division of Technology, Industry & Economics
United Nations Environment Programme**

&

**Dr. Naoya Abe, Associate Professor
Department of International Development Engineering
Tokyo Institute of Technology**

**Peer Review Report
for
IGES LTP 3R Project (FY 2005-06) and Integrated Waste management and
Resources Efficiency Project (FY 2007-contd.)**

Introduction

The Peer Review of the IGES Long-Term Perspective and Policy Integration Project (LTP) which includes the projects on 3R Initiative for Sustainable Development (FY 2005-06) and Integrated Waste Management and Resources Efficiency Project (FY 2007) was carried out on 6 June, 2008. The two peer reviewers were:

- **Dr. Surya Chandak** (*Head of Review Panel*), Deputy Director & Officer-in-Charge, International Environmental Technology Centre, Division of Technology, Industry & Economics, United Nations Environment Programme
- **Dr. Naoya Abe**, Associate Professor, Department of International Development Engineering, Tokyo Institute of Technology

Mr. Hideyuki Moricoordinated the Peer Review process

The Agenda of the Peer Review consisted of:

- Opening Remarks from IGES and introduction of the participants
- Presentation on Objectives, Scope of the Review, and Background of the 3R Initiative/WMR Project by Dr. Akira Ogihara
- Presentation on Project structure, goal and linkages with other projects by Dr. Akira Ogihara
- Presentation on 3R Initiative for Sustainable Development by Dr. Yasuhiko Hotta
- Presentations on Progress report on the Waste and Resources Project;
 - Research on Local Initiatives by Mr. Toshizo Maeda
 - Research on Industrial Recycling and Industrial Development by Prof. Toru Matsumoto
 - Research on Regional Recycling Framework by Dr. Yasuhiko Hotta and Ms. Chika Aoki.
 - Research on upstream and downstream life-cycle related issues of resource use by Dr. Magnus Bengtsson

The presentations were followed by general discussions and a question & answer session. The Peer Reviewers then presented their Review Report. The closing remarks were given by Prof. Hironori Hamanaka.

The following topics are covered in the Peer Review Report:

- Mission, Strategy and Priorities
- Quality and Policy relevance
- Effectiveness and Efficiency of the Project
- Accomplishments and Impacts

The two Peer Reviewers prepared a combined Peer Review Report with full consensus between the two of them.

Conclusions of the Peer Review

General Comments

These comments are mainly on the preparatory and the organisational process of the review.

1. The reviewers thanked the entire IGES team for the warm reception accorded to them during their visit. The arrangements made for accommodation etc. were excellent.
2. The basic documents provided – Overview of LTP 3R Project and WMR project – were not properly compiled. The first Appendix III (by the way, there were two documents labelled Appendix III) was especially confusing. The Research Plan (surprisingly starting at page 87!!) consisted of several projects, wherein some were not very intimately linked with the projects under review (page 113 onwards). The specific Research Plan for WMR Project was not included and was given on the day of the review.
3. Annex 3 of the Project Budget was rather confusing. It was not expressed in terms of Project design (i.e. for LTP 3R Project and WMR Project respectively) but instead was a mix of project components, making it impossible to judge the efficacy of resource usage. There also seemed to be some inconsistency in the Overview document. While Section 6.0 listed 4 components as ‘Ongoing Activities in 2008 and Future Plans’, the same 4 components were listed against Project Budget FY 2005-FY 2008 in Annex 3. There were even petty mistakes like no mention of currency.

A. Review of LTP 3R Project

1. Mission, Strategy, and Priorities

The project fits very well and contributes towards meeting IGES’s goal (of designing policies for protecting the environment to ensure sustainable development in Asia and the Pacific). The theme of the project addresses important environmental as well as developmental issues in the Asia-Pacific region. The project priorities and research strategy responds to the needs of policy makers in the region, though not comprehensively, as the research seems to have addressed only some of the needs. IGES is very appropriately placed for this research and one looks for more comprehensive and robust outputs from IGES. At the regional level, the partners are well selected, however, there needs to be more involvement of some partners at the national level to ensure relevance and applicability of research at local level – keeping in mind the range of diversity within the region.

2. Quality and Policy relevance

The upfront reason given for starting the project (Quote “the direct reason why IGES started working on waste management and resource efficiency with an emphasis on

Reduce, Reuse and Recycle (the 3Rs) was the 3R Initiative. This Initiative was endorsed at the G8 Summit... ”) does not fully justify why the project is relevant to the Asia-Pacific region. The mandate for the project is better drawn from deliberations at various regional forums (ASEAN, SAARC, ESCAP etc.) and also from the prevailing situation in the region (rapid industrialisation and increasing population leading to increasing resource consumption, further urbanisation etc.)

The first two components of the project – supporting the 3R Initiative and promotion of networking and collaboration with Asia-based international and regional organizations – were very well served. The policy dialogues carried out under the project through contribution to and participation in a number of international and regional conferences were good. In particular, the regional conferences not only helped in gaining the interest of the regions in 3R but also resulted in identifying region-specific actions and priorities for promoting 3R. The momentum created at regional level now needs to percolate down at the national level and towards that in the next phases, the project needs to focus on national level.

The component on 3R strategy-making in six countries is very important and the output was quite good. It remains to be seen how well the strategies are adopted and implemented by respective countries. It was not clear why 3R strategy development work was limited to South-East Asian countries, and other regions such as West Asia, Central Asia and Pacific islands were left out. Again, further facilitating and supporting this work could be an important area of work in the next phase. It is interesting to note that a practical 3R pilot project is planned for implementation at local government level. This should be expanded to cover more local level implementation. Coordinating a meeting of the Steering Committee for international promotion of 3R was a good strategy to get expert advice and wider recognition.

Comparatively, the work done towards the third component – research promotion on regional sound material cycle society in Asia was rather weak. The work mainly centered on Extended Producers Responsibility (EPR) through two workshops. The ADB/IGES report on “Towards resource efficient economies for Asia and the Pacific; Reduce, Reuse, Recycle”, and the study on the “Multi-stakeholder Approach and key for success in 3R activities” were still mainly on 3R.

The methodology adopted for carrying out the project was good.

3. Effectiveness and Efficiency of the Project

The effectiveness of the Project with respect to the relationship with research partners and other stakeholders was quite high. The project succeeded in getting several international and regional organisations on board. Comparatively, the involvement of national level partners was rather weak. The project also did not effectively reach out to regional political forums (e.g. ASEAN, SAARC etc.).

The overall effectiveness of the project seems to have suffered due to considerable resources and efforts having been spent on non-research activities such as organisation of meetings and conferences. If these resources were directed towards core research work then the project could have produced additional comprehensive and useful outputs. At the same time, from the given documents and presentations by the IGES team, it is not easy to distinguish those substantial activities of coordination such as drafting policy

papers for an international conference, which must have been indispensable for “strategic” research activities by IGES, from those activities that are simply logistic works. It is strongly recommended that IGES establish its own consistent performance review framework for all projects, keeping in mind that various coordination and preparatory activities for conferences and meetings are often prerequisites to conduct policy-relevant or “strategic” research. Since IGES had conducted a number of activities which are associated with LTP (and WMR), it was sometimes confusing to see ad-hoc presentations about the projects.

The reviewers agree with the self-evaluation that the project has been highly effective in the way it promoted 3R Initiative in the Asia-Pacific Region – mainly in South and South-East Asia – by involving relevant international and regional organisations in the process. IGES has also been able to establish its presence by making intellectual contributions in various forums and to various documents. Collaboration with international organisations enhanced the efficiency of the project through pooling of human and financial resources as well as role sharing.

The effectiveness of the project was weaker at the national level as the only major activity at the national level was on 3R strategy development in 6 countries. Even in this, the level of achievement in different countries varied widely and the work done in two countries was far ahead of that in others. The necessary follow-up to ensure country-level adoption and implementation was weak. The geographical coverage of the project was rather limited as most of the activities/events/consultations focused around East, South and South-East Asia. There was in fact no coverage of West Asia, Central Asia, and Pacific islands.

4. Accomplishments and Impacts

There was no distinct documentation made available to the reviewers which describes the expected achievements set out in the initial plan. Hence it is not possible to compare the achieved results with those set out in the initial plan.

Nevertheless, the achievements of the project have been good when viewed in absolute terms. The project has contributed to a number of international and regional forums/events and has helped to raise the profile of IGES in the field of 3R. Good quality publications, reports and research papers have been produced. In line with the objective of the action-oriented research, six country level 3R strategies have been prepared. As already mentioned, the project was able to bring together several international and regional organisations.

The achievements of the project are timely as Asia is emerging as the manufacturing hub of the world, thus a rapidly increasing demand for resources. With a large population and rapidly improving living standards, the consumption of goods and services is also increasing. Thus promoting 3R in Asia is very timely and appropriate.

The impact and contribution of the project to the overall goal of IGES has been significant. The impact could be more pronounced if (a) greater efforts were put in to get policies institutionalised and implemented at the country level; (b) the coverage would have been extended to the whole of Asia; (c) the regional political set-ups could have also been included in the project network of organisations. It is hope that IGES will continue

to work on developing and implementing policy actions to promote greater adoption of 3R in countries in Asia-Pacific region.

B. Review of WMR Project

1. Mission, Strategy and Priorities

The project fits very well and contributes towards meeting IGES's goal (of designing policies for protecting the environment to ensure sustainable development in Asia and the Pacific). The theme of the project addresses important environmental as well as developmental issues in the Asia-Pacific region. The project priorities and research strategy responds to the needs of policy makers in the region, though not comprehensively, as the research seems to have addressed only some of the needs. IGES is very appropriately placed for this research and one looks for more comprehensive design of the project from IGES. The rationale of the project is very sound and reflects some of the pressing issues in developing countries in the Asia-Pacific region. The overall goal of the project is highly justified and needs to be adopted by all the economies in the region. The overall policy relevance is fine except that for Component 1 (capacity development for community based waste management) which in the opinion of the reviewers should be expanded to cover all organic wastes and/or all wastes in urban areas.

2. Quality and Policy relevance

The project is well designed to cover the contextual issues at the national and regional level. Specific emerging issues such as WEEE/E-Waste have also been incorporated. By including Component 4 (Upstream Policy Development for Resource Efficiency) the project also effectively integrates the life cycle management aspects. However, Component 1 needs to be modified and expanded as mentioned earlier. The project also should take note of other international initiatives particularly the International Resource Panel set up by UNEP & EU. Component 2 also would probably do better if extended beyond Eco-industrial Parks as this will limit the research to developing approaches and policy measures within industries – in a way repetition of the work done under industrial ecology and industrial symbiosis. The project could therefore consider including the communities near/around the industrial parks and thus truly promote the Japanese eco-town concept. It may also be worthwhile to include India and Indonesia as industrial parks in these countries are fast developing and efforts are already being put in to make them more eco-friendly.

As the project has recently started (the major output has been the paper on urban organic waste) it may be too early to comment on the quality and policy relevance of the research done at the project. It was made known that Component 1 has been recently revitalised and new work on urban organic waste composting has been taken up in place of the previous work on scavengers and social aspects of waste management. It was also mentioned by the project personnel during the discussions that the deliberations are going to expand the content of this component, which is a welcome development. The review has already made some suggestions in this regard, such as: covering all waste streams in the urban context; expanding the field of organic waste to include waste agricultural bio-

mass; extending the technology consideration beyond composting to include bi-methanation, and refuse derived fuels.

For Component 2, it was mentioned during discussions that due to lack of confirmed funding, the work is on hold. The work done so far represents (a) making existing industrial parks more eco-efficient and (b) establishing industrial parks for recycling industries. This may not fully serve the 'Purpose' of this component. The coverage and perspective of this component could be expanded from industry-industry perspective to industry-society-industry perspective.

For Component 3, the purpose is well-articulated and important. It was also encouraging to note that IGES has been able to collaborate with and draw upon the expertise of other institutions to provide a more sound and scientific basis for their work as reflected in the support drawn for the modeling exercise. The Future Plan of further collaboration with the Economic Analysis team to reflect resource scarcity issues in modeling is a good essential point, but not enough. The project should also include other issues such as business and political implications of regional recycling mechanisms. Considering WEEE/E-Waste as an important emerging area for regional recycling is appreciated and work should be continued in this area.

The topic of the Component 4 is very important and the reviewers appreciate that this has been included in the research programme. It is also encouraging to note that the component has stable resources both in terms of manpower and funds. However, in the gamut of information sharing, it is crucial to determine beforehand the mechanism through which the information will actually be transferred and made use of by the end-users. The project needs to urgently address this issue. The impacts and achievement of existing Recycling Information Sharing System (RISS) and how these could be improved upon to develop region-wide RISS needs to be emphasised.

3. Effectiveness and Efficiency of the Project

The reviewers feel that it is too early to comment on these aspects as we are still in the beginning phase and concrete outputs are yet to be delivered. In fact, in some areas even the project design is yet to be finalised.

4. Accomplishments and Impacts

The reviewers feel that it is too early to comment on these aspects as we are still in the beginning phase and concrete outputs are yet to be delivered. In fact, in some areas even the project design is yet to be finalised.

Overall Conclusions

1. The reviewers thank IGES for giving them the opportunity to be able to participate in the review and share their views.
2. IGES has done excellent work in both projects, and the reviewers strongly recommend IGES to continue the work. It would be appreciated if the comments provided are considered and included by the project managers.

3. For the sustained success of the project, the role of project staff is unquestionably important. IGES should strive to avoid frequent turnover and ensure long-term availability of key staff.
4. It was very encouraging to note that the perspective (and accordingly the support) from funding agencies has changed and there is increasing realisation of IGES as a capable, professionally competent research organization, not just a conference secretariat. The reviewers strongly recommend to IGES to continue to put in efforts in this direction.

_____XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX_____