

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 01, 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: 4894

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Regional (Indonesia, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Philippines, Vietnam)

PROJECT TITLE: Implementation of the POPs Monitoring Plan in the Asian Region

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Vietnam Environment Administration

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 Extract:- This is part of the Global Programme on Capacity Building for POPs Analysis to Support the Global Monitoring Plan of POPs for effectiveness evaluation of the Stockholm Convention. This project will assist participating countries to overcome difficulties associated with lack of human resources, technical capacity, analytical skills and know-how. With regional cooperation to help address the capacity gaps, the project should permit them to participate fully in the current GMP programme whilst aiding in the development of a long-term POPs monitoring plan that will include the newly added POPs. The Global GMP programme is carried out by the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention and UNEP DTIE (Chemicals Branch), and at present, the GEF is funding regional GMP projects in four different areas: West Africa, Southern and Eastern Africa, Pacific Islands region and Latin America and Caribbean. This project will focus on the Asian region.

STAP Guidance:

The project focuses on strengthening capacity of pre-existing labs which reduces risks in terms of long term sustainability of the capacity built through the project, and its continued application to global POPs monitoring. Still, some attention might be paid to sustainability of networks since any lab will require buy-in from the decision-makers to understand the import of the work being done, how it can feed into national issues of development, human and environmental health, et. al., such that the regulatory/legislative demand generally drives the activity of environmental and other standards laboratories. The emphasis of the utility of the POPs monitoring data in the PIF is solely to the Stockholm Convention. But the Convention buy-in is not what will sustain activity of a lab post project: those line Ministries at the centre of Health and (Economic) Development will have far more influence on providing ongoing support to the continued operation of labs, and in particular, POPs. Therefore, it would be good if the Project Framework include an element that would help generate outreach and buy-in to important national players to show the import of the GMP POPs monitoring to national development (e.g. one could highlight the impact of the GMP to identify POPs source areas (air monitoring) and impacts on human health (breast milk). In addition, the developed capacity can also be employed to monitor POPs in food and feed, and how this translates to food health, trade, and economic losses. If this is not done, the GMP could be seen as marginal and academic with no hope for long-term sustainability.

A secondary point is that this submission includes three countries that are also seeking lab support for POPs detection within other projects of this work programme. Specifically, Cambodia and Laos are part of UNEP project 5148 "Sub Regional Action Plan (Asia) for PBDEs Management and Reduction", of which output 2.1 includes an inventory of PBDE analytical capacity. Whilst this is not a large overlap there may be an opportunity for some sharing of background information on the state of analytical capacity, and perhaps sharing of built capacity (acknowledging that

the PBDE project will likely have the level of resources for more intensive national level capacity building in countries), should alignment of execution of the two projects be favourable to such. Vietnam also has a separate project submission in the work programme, UNDP project 5067 "Vietnam POPs and Sound Harmful Chemicals Management Project", of which component 2 focuses on monitoring and reporting of POPs and PTS. However this latter project makes clear reference of its intent to seek synergies with the UNEP GMP project to prevent duplication of effort. The STAP has made a cross reference to the link to the GMP in the screens of these two other projects.

The Africa GMP project has been running for a couple of years, and lessons learned and experiences may also be gained from this project.

The Asia GMP project may do well to acknowledge these other projects in the work programme to ensure that during project preparation there is optimized use of GEF and human resources on the ground. In the absence of this there is the risk of not only duplication of effort, but reduced efficiency of execution if local agencies are poorly coordinated and burdened with the increased administration of reporting to two different projects for duplicative activities.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
2. Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>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.</p>
3. Major revision required	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>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.</p>