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

Date of screening: 22 February 2008  
Screener: Douglas Taylor, STAP Secretary  
Panel member validation by:  John Buccini (Consultant)

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3614  
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:  
COUNTRY(IES): Georgia, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan  
PROJECT TITLE: Demonstrating and Scaling Up Sustainable Alternatives to DDT for the control of vector borne diseases in Southern Caucasus and Central Asia  
GEF AGENCY(IES): UNEP (IA)  
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: WHO-Europe Office, Milieukontakt International, Green Cross International, local relevant Ministries (Health, Agriculture, Environment, Emergency Situations, and others) and local NGOs in the participating countries  
GEF FOCAL AREA(S): Persistent Organic Pollutants,  
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): OP 14, SP 2 and 3  
NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:

Full size project GEF Trust Fund

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

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP’s advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):
   Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP screening comments have been provided in response to the UNEP/WHO "Demonstrating and Scaling-up of Sustainable Alternatives (DSSA) to DDT in Vector Management: Strategic Programme", and those comments also apply to this project proposal. STAP can suggest regionally qualified expertise to provide further detailed suggested improvements to the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAP advisory response</th>
<th>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consent</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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. |