

# 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)*

<b>FULL SIZE PROJECT</b>	<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>
<b>GEF PROJECT ID:</b>	9214
<b>PROJECT DURATION:</b>	5
<b>COUNTRIES:</b>	Mexico
<b>PROJECT TITLE:</b>	Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of PCBs in Mexico: Second Phase
<b>GEF AGENCIES:</b>	UNDP
<b>OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:</b>	SEMARNAT
<b>GEF FOCAL AREA:</b>	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 initiative. The project is very well considered, and seeks to minimize the risk of exposure from PCBs to humans and the environment, while promoting Mexico's timely compliance with the Stockholm Convention requirements for PCB management, including convention decommissioning and destruction provisions. The project is expected to eliminate 5,000 MT of oils and PCB containing equipment, and is a follow-on project of a previous UNDP project that ended in August 2015. This previous experience results in a properly baselined PIF with a clear understanding of remaining barriers, and what remains for disposal.

The STAP would suggest that there be particular thought given to post-project sustainability mechanisms to incentivize small repair and maintenance service shops to systematically comply with those standards of operation that prevent cross-contamination of equipment at time of service. Indeed there could be some thought to expanding services in the long term to Central American PCB elimination, since not every country in the sub-region is able to develop such advanced facilities.

<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</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

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