

# Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel



The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility

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

Date of screening: 11<sup>th</sup> May 2009

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Bo Wahlstrom

### I. PIF Information *(Paste here from the PIF)*

**Full size project**      **GEF Trust Fund**

**GEFSEC PROJECT ID:** 3968

**COUNTRY(IES):** REGIONAL AFRICA: ANGOLA, BURUNDI, COMOROS, DJIBOUTI, D.R. CONGO, ERITREA, ETHIOPIA, RWANDA, SUDAN, UGANDA.

**PROJECT TITLE:** CAPACITY STRENGTHENING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STOCKHOLM CONVENTION NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PLANS (NIPs) IN AFRICAN LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs) OF THE COMESA<sup>1</sup> SUBREGION

**GEF AGENCY(IES):** UNEP, UNIDO

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):** REGIONAL STOCKHOLM AND BASEL CONVENTION CENTERS; REGIONAL, SUB-REGIONAL AND NATIONAL CENTRES FOR CAPACITY BUILDING TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND CLEANER PRODUCTION

**GEF FOCAL AREA (S):** Persistent Organic Pollutants

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S):** POPs-SP1, POPs-SP2

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:** CAPACITY STRENGTHENING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STOCKHOLM CONVENTION NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PLANS (NIPs) IN AFRICAN LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs) AND SMALL ISLANDS DEVELOPING STATES (SIDS)

### 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

1. STAP welcomes this UNEP/UNIDO proposal aimed at capacity strengthening and technical assistance for the implementation of NIPs in LDCs of the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa. Project employs regional approach and, what is exemplary, is expected to build national capacity for chemicals management beyond POPs.
2. The PIF falls short of explaining baseline situation in targeted LDCs (existing legislative and regulatory frameworks, amount and sources of POPs, trade in POPs, pesticide use in agriculture, Annex C sources and etc.). There will be a need for a differential approach reflecting upon country-specific baselines and circumstances. Project proponents are advised to develop country-specific baselines and use them for justifying interventions at the project submission phase.
3. Many LDCs in the region indicated the lack of analytical capacity to detect and monitor POPs in their NIPs. PIF mentions strengthening of monitoring and enforcement capacity as one of its interventions (p.6), however, neither of the proposed project components deals with analytical capacity gaps. Project executive partners such as Regional Stockholm and Basel Convention Centers could have an impact on national capacities for monitoring and measurements. STAP recommends including strengthened regional/national capacity for POPs measurements and monitoring as a separate project component.
4. Most of POPs source categories in African LDCs (e.g., pesticides in agriculture and trade, open burning of waste, electronic waste, PCB in transformers and etc.) are in the informal sector of the economy. STAP recommends conducting a survey of the informal sector involved in POPs management and develop a set of recommendations how to limit unsustainable environmental practices by addressing root causes of "informalization" of employment.

<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.

<sup>1</sup> COMESA: Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa

<p><b>2. Minor revision required.</b></p>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>3. Major revision required</b></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>