

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: @@@@ @@, @@@@

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: 4668

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Regional (Botswana, Ethiopia, Gambia, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Mozambique, Namibia, Senegal, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe)

PROJECT TITLE: Demonstration of Effectiveness of Diversified, Environmentally Sound and Sustainable Interventions, and Strengthening National Capacity for Innovative Implementation of Integrated Vector Management (IVM) for Disease Prevention and Control in the WHO AFRO Region

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: the World Health Organization " WHO Regional Office for Africa as GEF Executing Agency, in collaboration with the following executing partners:

- Relevant National sectoral Ministries in the 15 project countries,
- Relevant International and National NGOs in 15 project countries,
- University of Pretoria, South Africa,
- London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom,
- Wits University NICD, South Africa.
- the Global Fund to fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria;
- United States Agency for International Development (USAID);
- the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention

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

This proposal is a direct reply to a request of the "African Group" at Stockholm COP V (May 2011, Geneva) for work on alternatives and the introduction and demonstration of alternatives to DDT ahead of any consideration for complete DDT phase out. In the view of STAP it is also timely in complementing the recently approved GEF-funded, DDT phase out project for producer country India, the UNIDO/UNEP/FAO implemented "Development and promotion of non-POPs alternatives to DDT", which seeks to support the end of DDT production. In its review, STAP had flagged the lack of consideration of import countries which depend on DDT (at least in part) for their malaria programmes. The STAP therefore welcomes this project on alternatives for Africa.

The proposal is quite comprehensive in assessing the baseline situation as relates to malaria, vector resistance to alternatives (and the need for DDT in some cases), as well as the scant evidence-base for the effectiveness of non-chemical methods of IVM. It also carefully builds upon knowledge gathered through previous efforts such as the Afro I project, previous DDT project of the GEF, WHO initiatives, et. al., and aims to "demonstrate the evidence and experiences of application of diversified and innovative vector control methods for effective diseases control and to strengthening countries' capacity to effectively comply with the Stockholm Convention according to the needs of the participating countries. Stakeholder analysis appears comprehensive. Awareness raising and NGO/CSO partnerships are to be increased to improve malaria control programmes and their implementation. WHO is the main executing partner, and the project also seeks to collaborate with the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria to assist Parties to make evidence based decisions in the choice and application of insecticides to fulfil their obligations in the implementation of the Stockholm Convention. The incremental activities proposed in the project target the

"contemporary use of limited vector control methods and the evidence/knowledge on efficiency of diverse strategies for ultimate reduction of reliance on DDT in malaria vector control while maintaining current and even enhanced levels of human health protection, through multi stakeholder participation". A resistance monitoring programme will be part of this.

Gender dimensions are also well considered (but see one of the bullets below on this), and there appears to be a good intention to support documentation and knowledge management, including the context of constraints and problems, so that assessment of risks associated with sustainability of alternatives can be supported. The recognition of the impacts of Climate Change on vector range is also acknowledged.

STAP requests that attention should be given to the following during the planning of the project:

- The demands required by certain aspects of IVM on communities should be carefully considered, taken into account, and monitored as part of cost benefit analyses. IRS is a once or twice yearly imposition on households, while IVM may require much more community involvement and time. Poor communities struggling with the exigencies of daily demands may find it difficult to contribute time. Mothers are often the primary caregivers of children and managers of households. Demands on caregivers for additional time may impact on their effective community and family contributions.
- STAP suggests that careful thought be given to (together with communities) potential control failure points, to monitor these parameters, and to have back-up mechanisms in place if a defined failure occurs, possibly even beyond the duration of the project. In South Africa, the failure of alternatives caused an epidemic with thousands of cases of additional infections and hundreds of additional deaths. The lessons learned from the experience in South Africa should be carefully considered as the scaling-up contributed to the problems.
- Thought should also be given to what human safety, and environmental safety (which is not the same), and sustainability means. This should be defined up-front as basis for measuring the outcomes of the project.
- Climate change and the potential for expanding IVM and malaria treatment to new areas would also impose on communities and infrastructure. This project could contribute on how IVM and malaria treatment could best be rolled out to new areas.
- Based on experience from previous GEF projects on DDT alternatives, STAP strongly suggests that careful consideration be given on what evidence-based means, and what is required to gather the evidence. Scientific rigour of evidence gathering and assessment would be a good way forward (possibly as a targeted research component), as it will need to be used to convince communities, governments, NGOs, and MEAs. It may be instructive to note that research is mentioned by five countries in Table 3.

The STAP looks forward to careful documentation of outputs as this project is implemented, as it has the potential to change the face of Malaria control.

<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: (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.

