

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: March 02, 2016
Screener: Christine Wellington-Moore
Panel member validation by: Ricardo Orlando Barra Rios
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	8017
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Belarus
PROJECT TITLE:	GEF-6 POPs Legacy and Sustainable Chemicals Management
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection
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 promote protection of health and environment through elimination of retained POPs legacies and development of sustainable POPs management capacity within a sound chemicals management framework in the Republic of Belarus. The project is to be commended on generally following Basel and Stockholm BAT/BEP and STAP POPs disposal advice, as well as experience of previous projects, in that it considers disposal and destruction in the overall context of an environmentally sound management framework. So for example, it considers upstream investigation of sites BEFORE excavating stockpiles, making interventions more targeted. The STAP would recommend that if possible, where/if PCBs are concerned, congeners be adequately identified in the process as this can affect the specifics of tackling a clean up. The alternative project scenario and incremental reasoning is sound, and there is no question of the need for this type of project.

Where the PIF is weak, however, is in its description of the baseline (pages 8 and 9). It is hard to follow, and only after careful back calculation of numbers and matching descriptions in the text could one fully understand priority areas, and how totals were calculated. Tables need to be labelled carefully, and the text should describe what is in the tables. So for example, the text speaks to there being 984.1 t of stockpiled PCB equipment containing 321 of PCBs being available for immediate elimination. But a) one has to assume the first table is the source of this data (since the headers of columns is not altogether clear either), and b) it is not clear which numbers in that first table need to be added to come up with the figures in the text.

Another anomaly is the text indicating that there are 4 unaddressed burial sites, but the table indicating burial sites shows what looks like 5 burial sites (Brestsk and Slonim appear to be free and clear). Further some of these, Postav and Gordok, appear to have no tonnages of non-POPs or POPs wastes, but the total OP(t) is listed at 100t and 411.4 t, respectively. Then there is the issue of geographical description of sites. The text repeatedly refers to the Chechersk facility, and this name does not appear in any of the tables. Only

in poring back over the background on page 7, does one discover that Chechersk is a district in the Oblast of Gomel, and one then associates Gomel in the table with the Chechersk references in the rest of the text.

There is little doubt that there are chemicals to be dealt with under this project, but this baseline description is extremely unclear, making GEB's hard to estimate. The whole section should be reworked so that baseline and potential GEB's can be clear. This kind of project should rely on sound baseline inventories and monitoring, with clear targets to measure impact of site clean ups. This proposal as it stands, does not contain clear data to give a convincing baseline, nor give confidence of the extent to which the GEF intervention will improve the environmental situation and generate GEBs. This should be resolved in the project preparation stage, so that at CEO endorsement, baseline and envisioned project impacts can be clearly articulated.

Finally the risk table should consider climate risks, especially when one is considering excavation of burial sites, stockpiles and the like which may be vulnerable to extreme events.

<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>