

# 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: April 24, 2015

Screener: Christine Wellington-Moore

Panel member validation by: Ricardo Orlando Barra Rios  
Consultant(s):

### I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

**FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 9046

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** China

**PROJECT TITLE:** Reduction and Phase-out of PFOS in Priority Sectors in China

**GEF AGENCIES:** World Bank

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:**

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Chemicals and Waste

### 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):  
**Concur**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

This proposal seeks to address PFOS production curbed, and alternatives introduced across the metal plating, pesticide, and fire-fighting foam sectors of use, with attendant management and regulatory framework reforms to support the registration and tracking of PFOS (ie in policies and regulations associated with chemicals registration, import/export, product quality etc.). STAP understands the relevance of the project and welcomes this initiative, but would ask that the following be considered during the full design phase:

- 1) There should be rigorous assessment of the safety as well as efficacy of alternatives (pesticides in particular). The risks overall should be revisited as project design advances.
- 2) Since the Project Concept document indicates that closure of PFOS facilities is possible, as well as resettlement of communities, there should be some thought to developing a significant component for alternative livelihoods and other social support to the affected communities.
- 3) This work is quite new to the GEF portfolio, and indeed the NIP for China will only be completed in 2016 to reflect the inclusion of PFOS. Therefore, the Knowledge Management and Capture, and replication methodologies need to be considered, lest this becomes a one of effort which does little to act as a foundation for any possible follow-on projects tackling similar problems.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple "Concur" response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project</b>	STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:

<p><b>design</b></p>	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.  (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</p> <p>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.</p>