Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility

STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: 21st January 2010 Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Bo Wahlstrom

I. PIF Information
GEF PROJECT ID: **4074**
COUNTRIES: **REGIONAL (MALI, TUNISIA)**
PROJECT TITLE: **AFRICA STOCKPILES PROGRAMME - PROJECT 1 –SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS FOR DISPOSAL AND PREVENTION**
GEF AGENCY: **WORLD BANK**
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: **DIRECTION NATIONALE DE L'ASSAINISSEMENT ET DU CONTROLE DES POLLUTIONS ET DES NUISANCES (MALI), AGENCE NATIONALE DE GESTION DES DECHETS (TUNISIA)**
GEF FOCAL AREA: **POPS**
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: **POPS-SP1-CAPACITY BUILDING; POPS-SP2-INVESTMENT**
NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: **AFRICA STOCKPILES PROGRAMME - PROJECT 1**
PROJECT PROMOTES SOUND CHEMICAL MANAGEMENT: **YES**

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies): **Consent**

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. The project requests additional funds for POPs clean-up and disposal and prevention of accumulation of obsolete pesticides in Mali and Tunisia within the first phase of Africa Stockpiles Programme. The proposed approach is scientifically and technically sound and STAP expresses its consent.

STAP advisory response	*Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed*
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: (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.