

# 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

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:** 4740

**PROJECT DURATION :** 4

**COUNTRIES :** Regional (Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Chad)

**PROJECT TITLE:** Disposal Of Obsolete Pesticides Including POPs And Strengthening Pesticide Management In The Permanent Interstate Committee For Drought Control In The Sahel (CILSS) Member States

**GEF AGENCIES:** FAO

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** CILSS Executive Secretariat

**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

The project focuses, inter alia, on interventions related to safe disposal of pesticide POPs and other obsolete pesticides, and remediation of contaminated soils, on strengthening management of empty pesticide containers, promotion of alternatives to POPs pesticides (including IPM promotion), and supportive institutional and regulatory frameworks. The population across countries is heavily dependent on agriculture (with large involvement of the female population), with poor storage and management of pesticide stocks and empty containers (including domestic repurposing of containers and intoxications), poor management of contaminated sites (with evidence of stocks already impacting soil and groundwater), regulatory/legislative gaps, weak technical and institutional capacities for sound management of pesticides throughout their life cycle, poor stakeholder awareness of impacts, and a lack of coordinated strategy in the area of development and implementation of alternatives, including IPM. The components of the PIF do seem 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 the Sahel. Building on ongoing and past regional initiatives, there is a sound cooperative and scientific base upon which to build the incremental activity of this project. However, there are a number of issues that STAP suggests should explicitly be addressed:

a) The document recognises the role of women in agriculture, and the repurposing of pesticide containers for domestic uses. The STAP also hopes that care will be taken to identify specific difference 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. The latter comment is offered as a thought-starter, since the STAP does not purport to have authority of gender role differentiation in the region, but still feels that extension training should consider these sorts of possible issues, as appropriate to the project environment. It is commendable that the gender aspects as relates to the dangers of informal, repurposed use of POPs containing containers is recognised.

b) In putting together IPM strategies, as well as the site remediation work, seasonality and climate vulnerability should be taken into consideration. There is some acknowledgement in the baseline description of the interaction between Sahelian climate conditions and pest, disease and crop losses, as well as recognition of climate change induced

increases in desertification. Yet the project components themselves show no effort to explicitly state intent to address climate resilience mechanisms, nor enhance capacity to identify climate vulnerability and develop and implement resilience strategies. The Risk table in section B.4 also alludes to risks associated with weather extremes, but stops short on addressing climate change variability risks and incorporating climate resilience, risk reduction mechanisms. This should be addressed as a priority in the project.

c) It is suggested that the regional lab capacity identified under the USAID project "Locust Emergency Prevention and Mitigation" be further maximised and utilised within this project, whether for monitoring, characterisation and prioritisation of contaminated sites, etc.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	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"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> 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.
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	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.