

# 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 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:	9076
PROJECT DURATION:	3
COUNTRIES:	Bangladesh
PROJECT TITLE:	Pesticide Risk Reduction in Bangladesh
GEF AGENCIES:	FAO
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Environment and Forests, department of Environment (DoE), Bangladesh
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):  
**Minor issues to be considered during project design**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

The proposed project seeks "to reduce risks to human and animal health and the environment from stockpiles of POPs and other obsolete pesticides and from ongoing excessive use of new POPs and other highly hazardous chemicals". The project is subdivided into four components:

1. POP pesticide management
2. Regulation and enforcement
3. POPs pesticide uses addressed
4. Awareness and communication

The STAP thinks that this a good project and has the potential to deliver the promised global environmental benefits related to disposal of POPs as well as a reduction in current use of POPs, if well implemented. STAP however suggests a few minor issues that should be improved in the project document.

1. To give a clearer understanding of the project components, it is suggested that the title of component 1 be revised to reflect clearly the focus on the disposal of legacy stockpiles of POPs, which is different from component 3 which will seek to reduce ongoing use of POPs pesticides.
2. In component 1, it was stated that the project will propose environmentally sound options for managing waste from stockpile of POPs. It was stated that the management options will focus primarily on recycling options including energy recovery as a secondary option. Details of the possible recycling options should be provided. Given this is very toxic waste, it is important to assess environmentally friendly options, which avoid transferring toxicity from one medium to another. If the potential recycling option is yet to be identified, at the minimum, there should be a set of selection criteria. The project proponent should consult the STAP advisory document on the Selection of Persistent Organic Pollutant Disposal Technology for the GEF: [https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/POPs\\_Disposal\\_Final\\_low\\_1.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/POPs_Disposal_Final_low_1.pdf). Other guidance that

can be consulted also includes the Stockholm Convention guidance ([https://www.unido.org/fileadmin/user\\_media/Services/Environmental\\_Management/Stockholm\\_Convention/Guidance\\_Docs/UNEP-POPS-GUID-NIP-2012-BATBEPPBDEs.En.pdf](https://www.unido.org/fileadmin/user_media/Services/Environmental_Management/Stockholm_Convention/Guidance_Docs/UNEP-POPS-GUID-NIP-2012-BATBEPPBDEs.En.pdf))

3. The assertion in Component 3 about the "widespread concern about pesticide residue in food, reduced biodiversity in agricultural areas, and environmental contamination from pesticides" should be supported by some scientific backing. Has there been a baseline study on the level of pesticides in food and in other environmental media, maybe from the ongoing studies mentioned under Output 3.1.1?
4. Output 3.2 have some elements of scientific and technical focus including on monitoring the impacts and presence of pesticides in food and detecting the sources of POPs residue in food, feed and environment. What methodologies will be used in implementing these activities?
5. Output 3.3 will focus on promoting low risk pest management options in both agriculture and public health to replace POPs. What low risk pest management options will be promoted? What is their effectiveness and efficacy? Integrated pest management (<https://www.epa.gov/safepestcontrol/integrated-pest-management-ipm-principles>) and non-toxic pest control measures have been highlighted as measures that can reduce the impacts of chemicals on human health and the environment.
6. The current project description does not include information on incremental cost.
7. Global Environment Benefits: it was indicated that the project will generate a global environment benefit of disposal of 1000 metrics tons of POPs. For proper accounting and inventory purposes, the specific POPs to be targeted should be identified. Detailed information about the environmental benefits has not been provided. Beyond disposal of POPs, the project has the potential to provide biodiversity benefits as well as human health and food safety benefit. However these are not clearly presented because the global environment benefit section is missing.
8. Scientific and technical innovation - no information provided.
9. Incremental reasoning, sustainability - no information provided.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.</li> <li>(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.</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>
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</li> <li>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</li> </ul> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal</p>

<p>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>
---	---