

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: November 08, 2017
Screener: Sunday Leonard
Panel member validation by: Ricardo Orlando Barra Rios
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9412
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Brazil
PROJECT TITLE:	Environmentally Sound Management (ESM) Of Lindane In Brazil
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Stockholm Convention Regional Centre for Latin America and the Caribbean. (Cetesb), FAO,
GEF FOCAL AREA:	Chemicals and Waste

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):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. This project aims to develop and implement the technology and infrastructure needed to properly manage at least three highly contaminated sites where lindane has been produced in the past in Brazil. It will also develop policies to facilitate the management of other sites to be identified through the project.
2. The project will assist Brazil to focus on the development and demonstration of national strategies for the environmentally sound management of lindane and associated isomers and wastes, and will also address the existing lack of awareness among some key stakeholders. It will also address the general lack of knowledge of the importance of managing chemicals in an environmentally sound manner to improve life quality.
3. The project is well conceived, and the identified solutions are well articulated and seem adequate to overcome the identified barriers. Several relevant scientific publications exist on the issue, for example, Torres et al., 2013: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11356-012-1089-4> and Vijgen et al., 2011: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21104204>. These publications should be reviewed for the latest knowledge.
4. Findings in some scientific publications including Torres et al., 2013: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11356-012-1089-4>, have highlighted the challenges related to this type of clean-up project in Brazil, including the fact that some of the sites are not only contaminated with lindane but also contain other chemicals some of which are also POPs. Therefore, care needs to be taken in the design of the project activities to ensure that appropriate measures for handling this complex situation are selected and the required expertise for effective implementation developed.
5. A public-private partnership is envisaged in the development of the technological tools to be used. Probably the only drawback is the lack of experience in the proper technology in Brazil. The appropriate

technology will be defined in the PPG phase of the proposal. STAP recommends reviewing the advisory document on "Selection of Persistent Organic Pollutant Disposal Technology for the GEF": https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/POPs_Disposal_Final_low_1.pdf, as a guide to inform the criteria to be used for selecting the adequate technologies for the final chemical disposal.

6. The study concentrates on three major regions in the country; however, some reports have indicated other potentially contaminated sites in southern Brazil, not mentioned in the proposal. STAP advise that this project should be used to develop the necessary capacity and resources for managing these other sites.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised. (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</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>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</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>