

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: February 17, 2014

Screeener: 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: 5407

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Barbados, Bahamas, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Guyana, Jamaica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and Grenadines)

PROJECT TITLE: Disposal of Obsolete Pesticides including POPs, Promotion of Alternatives and Strengthening Pesticides Management in the Caribbean

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Coordinating Group of Pesticide Control Boards of the Caribbean (CGPC)

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 objective is stated as: "To promote the sound management of pesticides in the Caribbean throughout their life-cycle in ways that lead to the minimization of significant adverse effects on human health and the global environment"

This project seeks to meet its objective through execution of component activities associated with: i) Safe disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides and PCBs; (ii) Technology transfer of methodologies for identification and remediation of contaminated sites; (iii) development of systems for the management of empty pesticides containers; (iv) strengthening of regulatory frameworks and institutional capacity for the sound management of pesticides; and (v) promotion of alternatives to chemicals pesticides. There will be a resourceful leveraging of multiple initiatives to support this work, including past initiatives, and the Coordinating Group of the Pesticide Control Boards of the Caribbean (CGPC) will be the main, regional level, coordinating partner for the project.

STAP's comments:

a) A sound regional mechanism is proposed as critical for components (i) and (iv) in particular. The CGPC has been named as having had some influence in historically coordinating pesticides management in the region, and having been involved in previous work on the subject. There is also acknowledgement that in spite of the plethora of chemicals management initiatives that have been carried out in the region, there has been no lasting capacity or framework to successfully manage obsolete pesticides in a safe and environmentally sound fashion. The components of this PIF are certainly what one would expect in such a project, but given that so many have gone before, it would be wise to do a more detailed analysis of precisely why past efforts have failed to leave a sustainable management framework, and to ensure that the current project addresses whatever past element was missed. Else this project will simply be doomed to repeat past failures.

b) To augment the component 5 activities to help support minimisation of pesticide use through uptake of alternatives, there could be some exploration into incentives for pesticide free produce, to help lower demand for pesticides, and prevent a recurrence of stockpiles once more.

c) The potential impact of climate change should be accounted. Changing temperatures and rainfall patterns, as well as possible sea level rises may portend changes in crops and chemicals, as well as possibly affecting storage facilities. The project should therefore try and be forward-looking to anticipate biophysical changes. Table A.3 should also take climate change into account.

<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>