

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: January 23, 2012

Screeners: 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: 4738

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Morocco

PROJECT TITLE: Disposal of Obsolete Pesticides including POPs and Implementation of Pesticides Management Programme

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministries of Agriculture, Environment and Public Health

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

STAP welcomes this proposal which focuses, inter alia, on interventions related to safe disposal of pesticide POPs and other obsolete pesticides, remediation of contaminated soils, strengthening management of empty pesticide containers (including the control of inappropriately repurposed containers), promotion of alternatives to POPs pesticides (including IPM promotion), and supportive institutional and regulatory frameworks. The agricultural sector is of socio-economic significance, involving about one third of the population, and generating significant foreign exchange through export of goods to the EU. However there is a poor history of uptake of IPM, with pesticides being heavily favoured and stockpiled, particularly in the last two decades, for the control of transboundary pests (locusts, significantly), crop protection, hygiene and vectors in public health. The components of the PIF do seem more or less appropriately designed to tackle the problems, with good building on, or complementarity with related projects and initiatives.

STAP's comments:

The PIF is quite comprehensive and appears sensitive to the unique issues and circumstances in Morocco. However, there are a number of issues that should explicitly be address in future project development:

a) The document recognises the role of women in agriculture, and addresses the repurposing of pesticide containers for domestic uses. It appropriately targets men AND women in planned Farmer Field School activities. The STAP also hopes that care will be taken to identify specific differences in the roles of men and women in the crop cycle, and related chemicals use. For example, men may administer the pesticides to crops, and be recipient of safety equipment, but women may do more weeding and gathering of crops after pesticide treatments have been carried out, increasing their exposure, and calling for specific guidance on how best to protect themselves, and any juveniles that may accompany them in the fields. This latter comment is only offered as a thought-starter, as the STAP does NOT have a social scientist onboard, and so does not claim authority on gender roles in Morocco. Still, extension training might consider these things. Also, the dangers of informal, repurposed use of POPs containing containers are indeed acknowledged, and targeted awareness in communities may have a large gender component, such that mechanism of delivery of message should take culturally-specific best practices in delivering key information to men or women (eg if women do water collection and other gathering of food etc using repurposed containers).

b) The document acknowledges that IPM has been largely unsuccessful in uptake, but this may be because apart from poorly coordinated previous efforts, and incomplete buy-in from stakeholders, IPM efforts may not have satisfactorily addressed the very real threats experienced from the desert locust, phytosanitary-related pest control demands etc. The

document is not clear about the full range of possible reasons for previous failures, nor does it elaborate what differences will be made in the project's approach to IPM. But given FAO's extensive field experience in Africa and the rest of the globe, and the undoubted plan to apply lessons learned to improve IPM uptake this time round, the STAP would like to see FAO include its achievements, and how they will be applied in Morocco, in the eventual project document.

c) Hopefully issues such as climate change impacts on pest species, their prevalence and range of impact and the like, might be overtly considered as the agency designs the IPM programme under the project (eg. Are extreme El Nino and La Nina events indicators for the likelihood of locust invasions?). Clearly laying out how this was done would then serve as a template for subsequent projects in the portfolio, making for better streamlining of similar activities based on FAOs extensive experience.

d) Morocco has a number of laboratories that could play a bigger role, especially in characterising and prioritising contaminated sites, and monitoring remediation using the local technologies for remediation. Remediation might take longer than the project duration, and by establishing a monitoring programme based on these laboratories will support ongoing remediation efforts and provide impetus for further initiatives.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor revision required.	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review 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.
3. Major revision required	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement. 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.