

# 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:	9771
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Global
PROJECT TITLE:	Global Best Practices on Emerging Chemical Policy Issues of Concern under the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM)
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	SAICM Secretariat
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):  
**Major issues to be considered during project design**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

The overall goal of the project is a coherent approach to accelerating the adoption of Emerging Policy Issues for achieving the 2020 implementation of the SAICM goals and support early planning for chemical management in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The project have four components which would contribute to achieving the project's objectives including:

- a) Promoting regulatory and voluntary action by governments to phase out known toxic chemicals;
- b) Life cycle management of chemicals present in products;
- c) Knowledge management and strategic planning; and
- d) Monitoring and evaluation.

Overall, this policy agenda needs to be advanced in order: to improve awareness of chemical issues, to improve policy making on chemicals, and to encourage action to reduce impacts on environment, and human health. However, the document needs to provide a better understanding of how the project's objective and its associated outputs and outcomes would be achieved. Below are STAP's specific comments and further guidance on different aspects of the project document.

1. Project Objective: the STAP advise that the current project objective should be made simpler and clearer. It is difficult to understand what is meant by "measure adoption of national activities to control Emerging Policy Issues". This suggest that the project will be measuring the adoption of national activities related to the EPIs identified under SAICM (which is not the case based on the project components, outcomes and outputs), rather than supporting countries to adopt the EPIs and take action to accelerate their implementation. We therefore suggest that the objective should be revised along these lines.

2. Project components: the titles of project components 1, 2 and 3 in Table B should be aligned with the indicative project description summary in section 3: proposed alternative scenario. The titles in Table B are either broader in scope or different from what is provided in the detailed project description.

3. Component 1 is to focus on promoting regulatory and voluntary action by government to phase out known toxic chemicals, suggesting that several chemicals will be targeted. However the activities deal only with Lead in Paints. STAP suggest that the component should be revised to reflect this.

- The idea of a demonstration pilot could be useful and should ideally help strengthen public-private partnerships. However, more information is needed on what this particular pilot demonstration is about. Would it be a "leadless" paint manufacturing process? Would it be identifying a new BAT/BEP? And if so, how would the effectiveness be measured? Or would it be based on an existing chemical production process already in use? If so, it would be useful to provide information on such a process in the project document in order to be able to certify its environmental friendliness and sustainability. Also, given that this is a global project, it will be important to ensure that the demonstration project sites are selected in different places with differing circumstances, in order to ensure that the final output and advice is applicable to different national situations.

- Component 1 would also develop "global technical guidelines on BAT/BEP for manufacturers". We believe this could be a useful output to help countries take action. But the STAP also believe that examples of guidance exist from countries like the United States (<https://www.epa.gov/lead/lead-laws-and-regulations>), the EU ([http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/pollutants/stationary/paints/paints\\_legis.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/pollutants/stationary/paints/paints_legis.htm)), as well as Uruguay (<http://www.unep.org/sites/all/themes/noleadpaint/docs/Module%20Hiii%20Uruguay%20Case%20Study%20FINAL.pdf>), and the Philippines ([https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-11/documents/philippines\\_case\\_study\\_presentation.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-11/documents/philippines_case_study_presentation.pdf)). It is therefore important that the planned global guidance build on what already exists and takes into consideration the circumstances of developing countries in its design - to ensure usefulness and applicability. It is also important that the guideline include sections on implementation, enforcement, monitoring and reporting. More information on what the guidance would set to achieve and a roadmap would be useful.

- Component 1 also includes the development of an online toolkit with a guide for regulating lead in paint. The STAP however noted that a "Toolkit for Establishing Laws to Control the Use of Lead in Paint" is currently available on UNEP's website developed by the Global Alliance to Eliminate Lead in Paint (<http://www.unep.org/chemicalsandwaste/noleadpaint/toolkit>). It would be useful to provide information on what this new toolkit would do in addition to this. A better description of the toolkit is needed too, including its contents, how to ensure usability, and lessons learnt from the demonstration pilot.

4. Component 2 focuses on Chemicals in Products with specifically on toys, building products, and electronics. This is a less developed, we think it needs a conceptual map on what elements of the life cycle would be considered, and what type of green economy tools will be developed. Output 2.1 will establish a platform to identify and quantify chemicals in products present in supply chains. This is an important output, however a better description of the activities that will deliver this is needed. There is an indication of a coordinating "mechanism" to share existing information on companies and initiatives but we think more is needed, in order to ascertain its ability to deliver. There is also mention of a platform which needs to be explained. The same output also includes the "facilitation of the expansion of information collection on additional chemicals and new companies or stakeholders", but no information on how this will be done. Furthermore, getting companies to share information especially on a platform available to their competitors would be face many significant barriers, but there is no indication of how these would be overcome.

- It is difficult to understand Output 2.2 on green economy tools and guidance. Is this going to be another toolkit or guidance containing green economy tools? What are the green economy tools to be promoted? Are green economy tools to be developed for each targeted product types "toys, building products, and electronics? How will expertise from UN Environment be shared, seminars, training, capacity building initiatives etc.? What effort will be made to ensure that companies adopt the promoted green economy tools? More information needs to be provided.

- For chemicals in electronic products, the project would be "focusing solely on upstream challenges, to efficiently reduce the amount of hazardous substances at source". However no information was provided on how this will be done. How would the project work with electronic manufacturers in developing countries to change their current practices? How would lessons from giant electronic manufacturers in developed countries be incorporated into the project? Companies like Apple are pushing efforts to reduce toxic chemicals in their products and are working to improve the sustainability of their supply chain (see their

annual report:

[http://images.apple.com/environment/pdf/Apple\\_Environmental\\_Responsibility\\_Report\\_2016.pdf](http://images.apple.com/environment/pdf/Apple_Environmental_Responsibility_Report_2016.pdf)). How will the project engage and glean lessons learnt from this and other similar efforts?

- Regional focus of the project. There are several references to regional activities without the region being specified, or the criteria for selection, and how these activities would feed into the overall global objective of the project. It will be important to target developing countries where electronics products are being produced in significant quantities.

5. Component 3: Output 3.1 includes "new mechanisms" to communicate science and best practices in management. A description of the mechanism needs to be provided, and an explanation of how this will be different from what currently exists.

- It would be useful to provide some information on how the project will "support early planning for chemical management in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development". What are the specific planned activities for achieving this?

<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>	<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.</p> <p>(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>
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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>