

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:	9240
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	China
PROJECT TITLE:	Capacity Strengthening For Implementation Of Minamata Convention On Mercury
GEF AGENCIES:	World Bank
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	
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

STAP welcomes the proposed project which seeks to improve China's capacity to address its challenges in mercury management in priority sectors under the Minamata Convention. The logic of the proposal is sound, and one can see the rationale for investment in this activity. China is one of the largest emitters of mercury globally, and so this project is an important step to delivering the assistance needed to mitigate this current situation. Given the statement on page 6 of the project concept note that there are several industrial boilers emitting mercury, and that specific releases of mercury to water bodies from the numerous ferrous and non-ferrous sources is currently unknown, stakeholder engagement and mapping will be particularly important in this project to find ways to identify and quantify these pollution sources. This will mean enhancing the coordination of provincial, municipal and umbrella government bodies.

Also, while this project focuses on strengthening capacity to address mercury contamination and remediation, and so will not directly trigger the international waters safeguard policy listed in the Safeguards and PID documents, given the specific focus on sources to waters mentioned in the project background, there could still be some thought of implications of sectoral actions (positive or negative) on waters, national or international.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
I. 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.

<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<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>
<p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p>	<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>