

# 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 07, 2013

Screener: Christine Wellington-Moore

Panel member validation by: Hindrik Bouwman  
Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5179

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Mexico

**PROJECT TITLE:** Sound Management of POPs Containing Waste

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales, SEMARNAT)

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** POPs

### 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): **Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

PIF Information: The project objective is stated as "To minimize impacts on health and the global environment through sound chemicals management and reduction of POPs releases and exposure to POPs from e-waste and pesticides management operations in Mexico."

STAP Comments:

It is to be commended that this project will address both POPs pesticide waste and e-waste. Careful documentation of opportunities, lessons learned, and challenges should be kept, as this project presents a well-motivated base for future, multi-source interventions.

The PIF is quite comprehensive and appears sensitive to the unique issues and circumstances in Mexico.

Please consider the following in the PPG phase:-

- a) Mexico has some good laboratory capacity, and the project should consider using them for monitoring and opportunities for capacity enhancement to address newer POPs. This will also offer opportunities to improve the capacity of female laboratory workers and executives.
- b) The risk of climate change should be considered in the context of the risk climate change may have on the project, not vice versa. Climate change may affect the operations of the project.
- c) There could be a better emphasis on waste minimization in the project as it attempts to overcome fragmented coordination of waste management (in Component 2).
- d) The description at para 12 of the PIF that describes the classification of e-waste as "special handling waste", vs "hazardous waste", conferring upon it the necessity for a waste management plan and special reporting of waste volumes to state governments in order for enforcement of regulations, suggests that part of the legislative exploration might be to assess the pros and cons of re-categorization of e-waste, since with its current legal status it is subjected to many special steps before regulation can be implemented. Additionally, when one also considers that only 8 of the 32 states of Mexico have state laws governing special handling waste, then it seems that perhaps there could be elaborated in the eventual project document consideration of the implications of changing the legal status of e-waste to being a hazardous waste to help justify all the effort that will have to be put into special waste plans and state reporting in order

get it regulated. It is of course recognized that e-waste recycling is an important revenue stream, and so there is surely additional reasons why it falls in the "special handling" vs "hazardous" categories, but this at least might be articulated to justify the project approach.

d) As a reminder, the STAP hopes that the eventual project document will also consider all of the elements that constitute environmentally sound disposal. The STAP Advisory document on POPs Disposal Technology in GEF Projects focuses on what exactly constitutes environmentally sound disposal of POPs, and what disposal technologies can achieve it.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.  Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.  Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.  Follow-up: (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.