

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: 20th January 2010

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Bo Wahlstrom

I. PIF Information

GEF PROJECT ID: **4066**

COUNTRY(IES): **COOK ISLANDS, FSM, MARSHALL ISLANDS, PNG, SAMOA, TUVALU, PALAU, TONGA, KIRIBATI, NIUE, NAURU, VANUATU, FIJI**

PROJECT TITLE: **PACIFIC POPs RELEASE REDUCTION THROUGH IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTES**

GEF AGENCY(IES): **UNEP**

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): **UNEP (DTIE; IETC), AFD, FAO, SPREP (ASSISTING PERHAPS WITH COORDINATION).**

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): **Persistent Organic Pollutants**

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): **POPs SP-1, SP2 AND SP3**

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT (IF APPLICABLE): **G-PAS**

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):
Minor revision required

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. This ambitious regional projects aims to reduce releases of POPs including unintentionally produced POPs through the introduction of environmentally sound management of solid and hazardous wastes in Pacific Island countries at the national and regional levels. There are a broad range of interventions as well as POPs targeted by the project. For the project of this relatively large geographic scale and issues coverage (solid hazardous waste management, organic waste, unintentionally produced POPs releases, pesticides management, management of PCB-containing oils including export and reuse and etc.), STAP recommends conducting a comprehensive barrier analysis in implementing environmentally sound chemicals management for each of the targeted pollutant source (PCB-containing oils, unintentionally produced POPs, organic waste, obsolete and currently used pesticides, medical waste, school laboratory waste) by the time of the CEO endorsement point. Barriers should be systematically analyzed and interventions aimed at overcoming most common regional/national barriers addressing root causes prioritized. Project framework should be strengthened by promoting "an integrated system approach" to waste management according to the proposed project objective. The concept of hot-spots and development of strategies to address them can be considered. STAP therefore requests that the above information is made available at the CEO endorsement point.
2. The Project should consider reduction of municipal solid wastes at the source in addition to promoting composting for organic waste and waste disposal. More stringent regulations on imported packaging, waste sorting, recycling and illegal dumping may need to be introduced. STAP expects more explicit elaboration of project interventions aimed at each of the three "Rs" approach (reduce, reuse and recycle) at the CEO endorsement point.
3. Disposal of municipal solid waste either in landfills or through incineration is particularly important issue for island states. Most of the landfill sites in Pacific islands are built close to rivers and coast and are very poorly designed leading to escape of leachates. Provided that space is limited, incineration is an option, but strict environmental standards should be observed and the option is costly. Waste export is another opportunity. STAP recommends exploring a possibility of developing a regional strategy for municipal solid waste disposal and conducting a detailed cost-benefit analysis of different alternatives, both at the national and regional levels.

4. DDT stockpiles are a serious problem in a number of island states. How will this issue be addressed in the Project?
5. There is no clear indication in the PIF of potential links between this project and other related projects in the GEF-PAS Initiative, particularly those dealing with integrated water and waste water management and energy (links to unintentionally produced POPs releases) and it's not clear how the potential advantage of the programmatic approach and complementarities/synergies will be utilized?

<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.