

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:	9236
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Nigeria
PROJECT TITLE:	Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal of PCBs
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
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 reduce exposure of the Nigerian population from PCB, through a combination of enhanced institutional capacity and training, expansion of inventory exercises across the country, and establishment of a PCB Collection and treatment centre, including feasibility analysis to generate the specs for procurement of ancillary technologies.

One small comment, as relates to the statement on page 8 of the PIF, which states that cement kilns may be considered BAT/BEP compliant provided that they are equipped proper pre-treatment and storage facilities for hazardous wastes. The STAP is happy to see (page 11) that they will be looking at STAP guidance, but as this is an area of ongoing research and development, would also suggest that this might be supplemented by more recent literature review in a wider range of contexts based documentation on the topic as deemed fit.

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
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	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: (i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.

	<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>
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>