

# 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 13, 2013

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Jakob Granit  
Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT    GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5269

**PROJECT DURATION :** 3

**COUNTRIES :** Regional (Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia)

**PROJECT TITLE:** Adriatic Sea Environmental Pollution Control Project (I)

**GEF AGENCIES:** World Bank

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Hrvatske Vode, Croatia; Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, Croatia; Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of Bosnia and Herzegovina; and Municipality of Mostar.

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** International Waters

### 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 welcomes this project with a focus on scaling up investment into reducing nutrient flow to the transboundary Adriatic Sea. Agreements and approaches to reduce nutrient flow are identified in the in the regional TDA (MAP, 2005) and the preparatory work of for the Adriatic Sea Environment Program (ASEP). The project is further in alignment with the WB's Country Partnership Strategies (CPS) and coordinated with the activities of the World Bank-MAP GEF Strategic Partnership for the Mediterranean Large Marine Ecosystem (the MedPartnership). The overall Barcelona convention and its instruments act as a generic framework for the protection and the sustainable management in the region.

Of critical importance to Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina will further be the transposition and implementation of the EU Acquis which this project will support (e.g. the Marine Strategy Directive, ICZM policy and other freshwater directives). With Croatia due to accede to the European Union 1 July 2013 all activities that can support this transition in the area of sustainable development will be of critical importance. The scaling up of investments and seeking coherence with other agreed regional governance and management frameworks are described as the two key global environmental benefits.

2. The project is straightforward and consists of two major components that are described in the project framework: (i) construction and upgrading of two wastewater and solid waste treatment plants and provision of equipment for monitoring, serving as pilot projects fostering innovation and subsequent replication and (ii) conducting assessments, preparing project tender documentation for waste water and solid waste treatment plants in order to access additional financing. STAP recommends that the project considers including one additional project component(3) that would address project management and coordination with other actors seeking policy coherence and building capacity for implementation of joint governance and implementation frameworks including leveraging investment into the reduction of nutrients flow.

3. STAP recommends that the selection of the two specific hot-spots for improved treatment in Croatia is carefully justified in the full proposal from technical, institutional, social, financial and broader sustainability perspectives. While local benefits of these actions could be tangible, the long-term impact of reducing nutrient discharge at the two selected sites may not have a significant impact on the coastal environment in the Adriatic Sea. However, the lessons learned from these two pilot projects in Croatia may justify their choice if properly captured in component two. The choice of anaerobic bio-treatment of high-load activated sludge from a solid waste landfill in Bosnia and Herzegovina is justified. STAP recommends that project proponents carefully consider and present a strategy for utilizing potential multiple benefits of the proposed anaerobic digestion technology as well as address potential environmental risks.

4. STAP recommends that project component two is further detailed during the full proposal development phase specifically in relation to EU Directives that needs to be met. The PIF provides little information about specific policy approaches to address nutrient pollution including analysis of policy, legal and institutional reforms to address nutrient discharge, ICZM principles, and EU Marine Framework Directive.

5. Project proponents are recommended to explore lessons learned and recommendations of the recently completed European Nitrogen Assessment (2011) and latest global report "Our nutrient world: The challenge to produce more food and energy with less pollution" (2013). Both assessments argue that focus of the integrated nutrient management should be on the improved full-chain nutrient use efficiency (NUE). In the European context there are three key needs for future policies including reducing nutrient surpluses and increasing NUE in agriculture, recycling of N & P in waste water, and reducing per-capita over-consumption of animal products.

6. Finally STAP recommends the project proponents to explore the utility of tools and guidelines being currently developed by the GEF project ID4212 "Global foundations for reducing nutrient enrichment and oxygen depletion from land-based pollution, in support of Global Nutrient Cycle" executed by UNEP and UNESCO.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:            (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions.            (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</p>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:            (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP.            (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>