



# Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.22/Inf.11  
November 13, 2003

---

GEF Council  
November 19-21, 2003

## MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL III (STAP III) TO THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF) 6-8 OCTOBER 2003, IN WASHINGTON, DC

(Prepared by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel)

**Minutes of the Third Meeting of the Scientific and  
Technical Advisory Panel III (STAP III) to the  
Global Environment Facility (GEF)  
6-8 October 2003, in Washington, DC**

**STAP Secretariat**

1. The third meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel III (STAP III) to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) was held on 6-8 October 2003, in Room MC4-800 in the main World Bank building at 1818 H Street, NW, Washington, DC. The meeting was preceded by and concluded with closed meetings of the Panel. In addition, working group meetings were held in the margins between Panel Members, the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies, on the main GEF focal areas. The principal outcomes from the closed and working group meeting are recorded in these minutes. Details of those attending are in Annex A.

### **Opening session**

2. The meeting was opened by Julia Carabias, the Chair of STAP, who presented Len Good, GEF CEO and Chairman, with a summary of work done by STAP III since July 2003 and outlined what STAP would deliver by June 2004. These included:
  - Biodiversity: targeted research proposals for protected areas.
  - Biosafety: the development of a source book.
  - Climate Change: new guidance on the Operational Program (OP) 7, “Reducing the Long-Term Costs of Low Greenhouse Gas Emitting Energy Technologies”.
  - International Waters: advice on groundwater.
  - Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs): advice on emerging innovative technologies for the destruction and decontamination of obsolete POPs, and advice on the use of bio-indicators and analytical methods for the analysis of POPs in developing countries.
  - Land Degradation: guidance on best practices in the restoration and rehabilitation of drylands.
  - A strategic view on interlinkages.
3. The STAP Chair noted the importance of STAP addressing demand-driven requests from the GEF, but also of looking ahead to new and emerging issues, in particular, strategic advice on interlinkages between focal areas and the Conventions.
4. In response, Len Good welcomed STAP’s initiative on interlinkages, which could be helpful in strengthening OP12, “Integrated Ecosystem Management”. He said the GEF was a complex organization, and getting more so: the Council would shortly begin to consider the future direction of the GEF, which would have implications for STAP’s future work. For example, should the GEF move from projects to a more programmatic approach, with coherent country-driven strategies, as had happened with overseas development assistance. STAP needed to meet the GEF’s needs,

but should also point out what was not being done. On the role of STAP, there should be transparency in approval of STAP 's work programme and the budget, which were part of the GEF's corporate plan and budget. Finally, he emphasized the importance of maintaining open channels of communication within the GEF family, of which STAP was a part.

## **Reports**

### **A. GEF Secretariat**

5. Ken King, Deputy CEO and Chief Operating Officer said that Ramesh Ramankutty, Strategic Planner and Team Leader for Operations Coordination would be the new STAP focal, replacing Alan Miller, and for the time being he would also be STAP's counterpart on interlinkages.
6. He gave an update on policy papers for the GEF November Council: a) performance-based allocation; b) capacity building; and c) the role of the private sector. At its May meeting, the Council would consider papers on the role of STAP, and the project cycle.
7. The Deputy CEO encouraged further discussion between the GEF Secretariat, Panel members, and the Implementing Agencies to deliver a successful outcome on the role of STAP: he mentioned that the GEF's Business Plan in November and Corporate Budget in May would both include STAP. On the project cycle, he asked for further advice from STAP on how to make the S&T reviews more selective and thereby more effective. He also asked for STAP to be more involved in Targeted Research, as a means to assist the GEF in strengthening its operations and policies.

### **B. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)**

8. Ahmed Djoghlaif, Assistant Executive Director, and Director DGEF, reported that The Executive Director (Klaus Töpfer) had discussed UNEP's paper on the role of STAP with Julia Carabias, STAP Chair. STAP was a full member of the GEF family. He indicated that the agreement reached with the former CEO on 6 March 2003, was a major step in the right direction, and had been confirmed by Len Good, the new CEO in his opening remarks. The paper on the role of STAP was intended to clarify once and for all the role of STAP as a GEF entity. He agreed that the wording may not be perfect but the objective of including this paper as an agenda item was indeed to improve its content.

### **C. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**

9. Delfin Ganapin, Global Manager for UNDP's Small-Grants Program (SGP), made a presentation on "Knowledge Management in the Small Grants Program". This provided an overview of the SGP's progress on knowledge management, and identified ways in which STAP might collaborate with the SGP. STAP was asked for advice on the choice of indicators for ex post evaluations of SGPs, particularly on biodiversity. Additionally, UNDP proposed to build closer ties with the roster experts who are from SGP countries, or who have a particular expertise on SGP projects.
- D. World Bank
10. Robert Watson, Chief Scientist and Director of the Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Network, endorsed the importance of a collaborative review on the role of STAP, as proposed by the GEF Secretariat and the STAP Chair, which identified what was working and was not working well. He thought that STAP's greatest contribution should be on cross-cutting issues, which was the major reason for bringing together such a Panel. On targeted research, he challenged STAP to develop a framework and criteria to help future GEF interventions.
  11. Rohit Khanna, Senior Operations Officer in the Environment Department, announced that Warren Evans had been appointed as successor to Lars Vidaeus. He provided an update on strategic issues in the development of the Bank's GEF programme: incorporating renewable energy as part of the Bank's efforts to scale-up energy access as part of the Millennium Development Goals, in order to reverse the decline in the Bank's renewables pipeline ; identification of options to integrate POPs projects with the energy, agriculture and health sectors; managing production landscapes in support of protected areas' sustainability and assessing the ecodevelopment approach to biodiversity conservation; opportunities for addressing the GEF Operational Program on Sustainable Land Management through the implementation of the Bank's forest, rural development, and water sector strategies; and following up on the annual GEF Project Implementation Review through a Bank-GEF portfolio improvement plan. For the fiscal year of 2004, the Bank's GEF work program was projected between \$300 and \$325 million.

### **The role of STAP**

12. Ahmed Djoghla (UNEP) introduced a draft paper, "The Role of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP)" STAP III/3/12 and 13, opened the discussion and invited STAP members, the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies to comment.

13. The discussion concluded that for the moment there was no need for new TOR for STAP. The 1995 TOR were sufficiently broad and covered STAP's current and planned activities. But whether new TOR were needed should remain open for future review.
14. Julia Carabias summarized STAP's collective view, from the morning's discussion, that it was essential to have rules of procedures clarifying the role of STAP which address inter alia the following issues:
  - the balance of STAP's contribution between focal areas and cross-cutting issues, as well as the need to promote a longer-term strategic vision, and address emerging issues
  - STAP's work programme should be formally endorsed by GEF partners, in order to enhance accountability and transparency
  - implementation of the current TOR on appropriate budgetary procedures to ensure independence of operations for STAP; this should provide STAP with flexibility in the implementation of its work programme, while acknowledging the need to comply with the United Nations financial rules and regulations
  - clarification of the process for the partial reconstitution of STAP through the adoption of staggered terms for members' appointments, as decided by the Council, so as to ensure continuity and balance between focal areas
  - the need to have social science represented on STAP
  - properly defined mechanisms governing the relationship between the working groups of STAP and the GEF Inter-Agency Task Forces
  - the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies to provide feedback on STAP's advice.

(A fuller account of the discussion on the role of STAP is at Annex B – to follow.)

### **Cross-cutting issues**

15. The STAP Chair began by thanking Panel Members for the papers on crosscutting issues: Biodiversity and Climate Change; POPs and Biodiversity, and POPs and International Waters; and Biodiversity and International Waters. She said that they would be useful as a means to clarify STAP's purpose on interlinkages, and in establishing a framework for strategic advice on interlinkages.
16. The Panel Members, GEF Sec and IAs had an extensive discussion on how best to achieve this. The Panel decided that:

- i. their most effective contribution to the GEF would be a single paper on the interlinkages between Biodiversity, Climate Change, Land Degradation, International Waters, and POPs;
- ii. members of the GEF Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies and invited external experts would be invited to join the writing team;
- iii. the paper should build on work already done by, for example, the Interlinkages report (“Protecting Our Planet Securing our Future”), IPCC’s technical paper on climate change and biodiversity, the Ad Hoc Technical Experts Group on Biological Diversity and Climate Change, and the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment;
- iv. an annotated outline would be developed (by Habiba Gitay and Cristian Samper) as a starting point by end October;
- v. a teleconference would be arranged for mid-November to discuss this, and a time-line;
- vi. a first draft for discussion would be developed during January;
- vii. this would be developed further at the next STAP meeting in early March;
- viii. the paper would need to be finalized by mid-March for discussion at a possible high-level session of STAP Members, the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies in late March; and
- ix. the final paper would be submitted to the May GEF Council.

(A draft outline was developed by the end of STAP meeting, and circulated to members – available on request.)

### **Roster of experts**

17. Guadalupe Durón (STAP Secretariat) introduced two papers, “The New STAP Roster of Experts” STAP III/3/3 (rev.1) and “An Evaluation of Reviews of STAP Roster Experts, and some Proposals for Change” STAP III/3/4.
18. The Chair (Julia Carabias) confirmed that final decisions on the roster lay with the Panel, including which experts should be on the roster. She said that decisions made at the March STAP meeting should be adhered to, and implemented.
19. The Panel therefore asked the STAP Secretariat, in consultation with the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies, to draw up new operational guidelines which:
  - i. Allow for reviews to be undertaken earlier in the project cycle at the pipeline entry stage for projects with scientific and technical elements that are particularly broad or cross-focal in scope, complex, innovative, or that address an area that is new to the GEF

- (e.g., POPs, Biosafety, OP12, OP15) to strengthen the scientific and technical quality of the project. Roster reviews at the concept stage should be considered more as advisory than as quality control.
- ii. Allow for the use of two Roster reviewers for projects with scientific and technical elements that are particularly broad or cross-focal in scope, complex, or innovative.
  - iii. Ensure that new roster experts are briefed about the GEF and its operations before undertaking reviews.
  - iv. Advise Implementing Agencies that if they wish to use an expert who is not on the roster, for example to tap into a particular sort of expertise, then they should seek agreement from the Panel before doing so.
20. It was also agreed that the GEF Secretariat would consider further streamlining of the STAP roster review in the context of the proposed streamlining of the GEF project cycle.
  21. The Panel asked the STAP Secretariat to look again at the reasons why 15% of project evaluations were rated as less than good by Implementing Agencies, and to report back.
  22. The Panel decided:
    - i. To establish the new roster by 1 November; and
    - ii. To undertake a comprehensive review of the roster of experts after each GEF replenishment.
  23. The Panel invited the Implementing Agencies to submit new nominations for the Panel any time, and in particular on land degradation.
  24. The Panel asked the STAP Secretariat to continue to conduct an annual survey of the quality of expert reviews, and to report back in October 2005.
  25. The Panel reaffirmed that final decisions on the roster of experts were for STAP.
  26. The Panel discussed but did not reach a decision on three further points:
    - i. Reviews to be done only where projects raise new or contentious S&T issues, for example, novel technological applications, new focal areas, on a set of criteria to be drawn up by STAP, in consultation with the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies.



- ii. STAP to be consulted on the choice of reviewer, to consider whether the repeated use of an expert was warranted, and to comment on the review.
- iii. If a reviewer is not of good quality, STAP to consider whether the reviewer should be used again.

## Targeted Research

- 27. The STAP Vice-Chair, Habiba Gitay introduced STAP III/3/5 “Clarification of the procedures for reviewing Targeted Research Projects and the role of STAP in Targeted Research”. After discussion, STAP decided to develop a note, in consultation with the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies, which outlined a framework for targeted research. This would draw on the Terms of Reference approved in 1997, and focus on the criteria for selecting Targeted Research interventions that would best assist GEF operations both short and long term, and the barriers to successful take-up of Targeted Research. The framework would consider what interventions and strategies might enhance thinking on interlinkages. The note would also include an assessment of the impact of Targeted Research and suggest how potential conflicts of interest for STAP Members might be dealt with.
- 28. Several STAP members said there was an important and unresolved issue concerning targeted research on biodiversity, in particular on invasive species, plant conservation and taxonomy: STAP members believed there were important opportunities here. The international scientific community, with which the STAP biodiversity team was in continual contact, were also urging the GEF, and its Implementing Agencies, to show leadership in these areas. The World Bank took a different view. It was agreed that Dennis Anderson would draft a short note setting out the issue.
- 29. It was also decided that:
  - i. The Research Committee would have 15 working days to review a project, and could seek an extension if necessary.
  - ii. IAs should send TR project proposals to the GEF’s STAP focal point (Ramesh Ramankutty) who would consider whether a proposal was in accordance with the GEF’s strategy, with a copy to the STAP Secretariat for information.
  - iii. TR projects would then be sent to the STAP Secretariat.
  - iv. To give the Research Committee sufficient notice of forthcoming projects, IAs should alert the GEF STAP focal point at an early stage and advise on the likely timing of submission, who would inform the STAP Secretariat.
  - v. The STAP Secretariat would serve as the Secretary to the Research Committee.

- vi. The STAP Chair would select the members of the Panel to review the project, and advise the IAs and GEF Secretariat who they are, and also about any other selected experts.
- vii. The chairs of the subsidiary bodies of the principal Conventions would be included as ex officio members of the Research Committee.
- viii. The Research Committee would review the project and send comments to the GEF Secretariat and nominated IA contact points by the agreed dates.
- ix. The IAs should respond to the review by letter to the Research Committee.

(It was subsequently agreed that it would be preferable to follow the normal procedure for submitting projects, viz targeted research projects should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat for concept eligibility review by the relevant focal area team, i.e., not the GEF Sec STAP focal point, and copied, as were all other concepts, to the STAP Secretariat. When eligibility and consistency with strategic priorities had been confirmed the GEF Sec would refer the targeted research concept to STAP.)

#### **STAP's participation in M&E**

- 30. The STAP Chair introduced the item by referring to the assistance STAP had offered to the M&E unit in the Secretariat's letter of 22 July.
- 31. In response, Jarle Harstad (Team Leader, M&E) commented on progress:
  - i. SMPRs would be discussed in January. STAP participation in field visits would not be required, but STAP could be helpful in clarifying approaches.
  - ii. On Knowledge Management (KM) in climate change, STAP III/3/10 (rev.1) would be useful in setting point for discussion, but the GEF now had a reduced capacity in climate change and would therefore be looking at KM in the GEF as a whole, not just in climate change;
  - iii. The STAP Chair is a member of the Advisory Group on the Local Benefits Study;
  - iv. Indicators of Stakeholder Involvement was delayed until March 2004;
  - v. Indicators for bio-sustainable use will be discussed further at a peer review workshop in late October in Cambridge, UK. Two papers had been finalized for the November Council: "Measuring Results of the GEF Biodiversity Program", and "Program Performance Indicators for GEF International Waters Program". STAP had submitted comments on the latter;
  - vi. Three programme studies (biodiversity, international waters and climate change) were being undertaken. A teleconference had been

- held to discuss the biodiversity programme, in which STAP had participated. STAP would be invited to participate in specific tasks, but not field visits, for example, to consider whether the GEF's biodiversity strategy followed guidance from the Convention on Biological Diversity, and targeted research.
- vii. The STAP Chair and Vice-chair would both be involved in the Third Overall Performance Study (OPS3) which would continue until summer 2004.
32. Panel Members reiterated their willingness and enthusiasm for contributing to M&E work, but were concerned about: the lack (or lateness) of information, e.g., documents, requests to attend meetings, and participation in teleconferences; being asked to comment too late in the process; the account taken of comments made; lack of clarity in the M&E agenda; and the need for proper feedback. Several members again offered to help with fieldwork.
33. In response, Jarle Harstad said that STAP could best help M&E by addressing science and technology issues, for example, terms of reference for studies, and research, corporate and institutional matters. On the biodiversity programme study, STAP could help: to make sure that the GEF had reached out to all the relevant scientific networks; to provide guidance on the Conventions and how the GEF has responded to them; and to look at projects which have had an impact, and to assess their scientific standing.
34. It was agreed that:
- i. The Secretariat would write to the M&E Unit reconfirming STAP's interest, setting out what STAP would offer until June 2004, and to agree better and earlier communications with the Panel.
  - ii. If any problems rose M&E would contact the STAP Chair direct;
  - iii. STAP IV would reconsider involvement with M&E;
  - iv. Peter Hennicke, Anne Kapuscinski, and Anjali Shanker (added subsequently) would take part in the Inter-Agency meeting on the Project Performance Report (PPR) 13 and 14 January in New York;
  - v. STAP would participate in the Task Force reviews of focal areas for the PPR as follows:
    - Climate change, November 12 and 13 (Washington), Peter Hennicke (agreed subsequently)
    - International waters, November 14 (Washington), Leonard Nurse
    - Biodiversity, November 17 and 18 (Washington), Peter Schei, and Cristian Samper.

- vi. In future, M&E would deal direct with designated Panel Members for the various activities, with a copy to the Secretariat who could advise where it was unclear who was the most appropriate Member. All papers for the STAP Chair should be sent to the Secretariat.

## Knowledge Management

35. Two presentations were made and discussed: Peter Hennicke, “Knowledge Management at the GEF”; and “Knowledge Management: What is it? What does it mean for the GEF?” Siv Tokle.
36. Panel members voiced concern about the information which is needed for target groups and suggested that it would be helpful for M&E to provide more specific details about the kinds of knowledge M&E was interested in. They also asked for further details about what was happening at the country-level. Without this, STAP Members thought it would be difficult to comment further. Members also recommended that information be developed which would be useful to countries, and to the Conventions.
37. Jarle Harstad said that M&E were preparing a segment on knowledge management in the Business Plan which would be presented at the Council meeting in November. The Council would be asked to decide what further action should be taken.
38. It was agreed that the Secretariat would circulate the Business Plan to Panel Members.

## Sustainable Consumption and Production, and Sustainable Use

39. Presentations were made and discussed on: “Contributing to Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns (SCPP): A new Challenge for the GEF Family”, Peter Hennicke; and “Sustainable Use Scorecard”, Claudio Volonte.
40. STAP were invited to comment on the latter by 20 October. STAP Members were also welcome to participate in the peer review workshop to be held on 20-21 October in Cambridge, UK.

## Other Matters

41. UNEP Science questionnaire

The Panel agreed a draft letter to Klaus Töpfer setting out STAP’s views.

42. Date of next meeting

The Panel agreed to meet 1-4 March 2004 in Mexico (at a location to be confirmed). The meeting might be structured: ½ day Members' internal meeting; 2½ days "brainstorming" on interlinkages; and 1 day for STAP/GEF family working groups. A separate following site might be arranged (at Members' own expense).

43. Communications

It was agreed that the Chair would write to Len Good about communications (circulation of papers, meetings, etc.) between the GEF Secretariat and the Panel.

44. Relations with other bodies, e.g., the Conventions.

The Panel agreed in principle that more contact was desirable.

45. Circulation of project documents and requests for advice.

It was agreed that the Secretariat would place GEF project documents in a password-protected part of the STAP website. The Panel were content to receive additional ad hoc requests for advice on projects from the GEF Secretariat, and Implementing Agencies.

46. Formal clearance of STAP advice

The Panel agreed that before STAP advice was submitted, it would be circulated to Members two weeks in advance for any final comments.

## Workshops

47. It was agreed that the following would go ahead:

- i. workshop on bioindicators and analytical methods for the analysis of POPs in developing countries, Tsukuba City (Japan), 10-12 December;
- ii. best practices in restoration and rehabilitation of drylands, resumed writing group, Washington, April?, 2 days?
- iii. workshop on biofuels for both transportation and stationary use, back-to-back with international biomass conference, Rome, 10-14 May, 1 or 2 days.
- iv. workshop on groundwaters, Paris (UNESCO), April? 3 days?
- v. workshop on mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes, Cape Town, September, 5 days?

48. It was decided that the timing of activities on POPs capacity building, upstream-downstream linkages, food production and land management in drylands would be discussed later.

#### Budget

49. The Secretariat was asked to draw up a budget for FY04 to assess whether all planned STAP activities were affordable.

Those attending (throughout or in part)

STAP Members

Julia Carabias, Chair  
Habiba Gitay, Vice Chair  
Dennis Anderson  
Peter Hennicke  
Brian Huntley  
Anne Kapuscinski  
Alexei Maximov  
Leonard Nurse  
Cristian Samper  
Peter Schei  
Anjali Shanker  
Shinsuke Tanabe  
Xu Xiao-bai

(Apologies for absence were received from Tim Williams and Saleem Huq who were unable to attend because of visa problems.)

GEF Secretariat

Len Good, CEO and Chairman, GEF  
Ken King, Deputy CEO, GEF  
Ramesh Ramankutty, Executive Coordinator  
Herbert Acquay  
Hutton Archer  
Patricia Bliss-Guest  
Gonzalo Castro  
Al Duda  
Laurent Granier  
Jarle Harstad  
Kanta Kumari  
Andrea Kutter  
Andrea Merla  
Frank Rittner  
Siv Tokle  
Claudio Volonte  
Aaron Zazueta

## UNEP

Ahmed Djoghlaif, Assistant Executive Director  
Kristin McLaughlin

## World Bank

Bob Watson, Chief Scientist & Director  
Rohit Khanna  
Enos Esikuri  
Steve Gorman  
Marea Hatziolos  
Kathy MacKinnon  
Sam Wedderburn

## UNDP

Delphin Ganapin  
Miguel Perez-Torralba

## STAP Secretariat

Christopher Whaley, STAP Secretary  
Anne-Marie Verbeken, Programme Officer  
Guadalupe Durón, Assistant Programme Officer  
Robin Burgess, Administrative Assistant



## **Annex B**

### **The Role of STAP**

1. Ahmed Djoghlafl, the Director of DGEF, introduced the draft document on the role of STAP prepared by UNEP in response to the May 2002 Council decision. He recalled that the Council's request was based on the OPS2 recommendations as well as on the document submitted by the Chair of STAP II at the May 2002 Council meeting. He indicated that the first draft was circulated to STAP III members in early 2003. A revised version incorporating the agreement reached at the meeting with the CEO held on 6 March 2003 was sent to the GEF Secretariat, at whose initiative it was agreed to postpone the discussion on the issue to the November 2003 Council meeting. At the meeting held in Durban on 9 September 2003 at the margins of the World Parks Congress between the Executive Director of UNEP and the Chair of STAP, it was agreed to provide more time for consultation and to postpone the discussion on this issue to the May 2004 Council meeting. ED and STAP Chair thought that the current Terms of References were sufficiently broad that there was not need for the moment to have new ones. The possibility remains open if there is a need for future. The GEF Secretariat endorsed the proposal. Mr. Ahmed Djoghlafl stressed the spirit, which guided the preparation of the draft document. He noted that, thanks to the leadership of the Chair and the unique contribution of STAP III members, tremendous progress had been achieved in integrating STAP in the mainstream of GEF activities. He also noted that the meeting held on 6 March 2003 with the CEO, the Assistant CEO, the Chair and the Vice-Chair of STAP as well as the Executive Coordinators of the Implementing Agencies was unprecedented. He noted that the decisions agreed upon at that meeting constituted a major step in the right direction. He also indicated that the triennial Work Plan of STAP, prepared for the first time in March this year, was a major development in aligning STAP activities with GEF priorities. In this regard, the establishment of a STAP High Level segment with the CEO and the Executive Director of UNEP is also a major welcomed development. The transfer in July 2002 of the STAP Secretariat from Nairobi to UNEP's regional office in Washington has greatly contributed in enhancing the coordination with the GEF partners. He also stressed the tremendous progress achieved in responding to Council's request arising from OPS 2 regarding the pruning of the STAP roster of experts. He concluded by reaffirming UNEP's commitment, at the highest level to continue enhancing its support to STAP and expressed the hope that this document, when adopted by the Council will clarify once and for all, the relation between STAP and the other GEF entities.
2. On behalf of all STAP Members, Julia Carabias, the STAP Chair, summarized the views members had expressed at the Panel's meeting earlier in the day. The general feeling was that improvements in communication mechanisms were necessary to enable STAP's work to be useful to the GEF family. STAP was made up of eminent scientists who had a lot of experience from their close involvement with many of the processes relevant to the GEF. She reaffirmed that

STAP members were strongly committed to using their expertise to serve the GEF, and thereby to contribute to fulfilling its objectives.

3. But to achieve this, an atmosphere of confidence needed to be built between STAP and its GEF partners. STAP members did not have any hidden or personal agendas. In her view, the draft document under discussion offered a unique opportunity to clarify and elaborate the role of STAP. She recalled that the Council had asked UNEP and the GEF Secretariat, in consultation with the World Bank and UNDP, to prepare such a document. She was therefore grateful to the Executive Director and the Director DGEF for having opened up this discussion to include STAP members.
4. The document should clearly indicate the role, activities and mandate of STAP, so that any new member of the Panel could read a single document and know what STAP was about. The current TOR were broad enough to include all STAP's current and planned activities, but the option of new TOR should remain open for future consideration. For the moment it would be preferable to concentrate efforts on completing STAP's programme of work.
5. The final document on the role of STAP should clarify inter alia the balance between work on focal areas and cross-cutting issues, as well as the need to promote a long term strategic vision, and to consider emerging issues.
6. On the latter, she announced that STAP had decided to devote its fourth (and final) meeting to cross-cutting issues; this would be held in March 2004 in Mexico. She proposed that the meeting to be followed by a one-day high-level brainstorming session with the GEF CEO, and Heads of the Agencies. The outcome of this, subject to agreement, could be submitted to the May 2004 Council meeting.
7. She went on to make a number of points about essential elements which the rules of procedure clarifying the role of STAP would need to address:
  - i. it was important that STAP's work programme was formally endorsed by GEF partners; this would bring improved transparency and accountability;
  - ii. while acknowledging the need to comply with UN rules and regulations about finance, STAP needed independence of operation for budgetary matters, as provided for in its TOR, so as to provide flexibility in implementing the work programme;
  - iii. it should clarify the process through which STAP was reconstituted by means of staggered terms of appointment, as had been agreed by the Council, this was important in ensuring continuity and balance between focal areas;
  - iv. it was important that STAP should include social scientists; and

- v. the mechanisms for linking STAP, the working groups and the IA/GEF Task Forces needed to be clarified, and made more efficient; and
  - vi. the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies needed to provide feedback on STAP's advice.
8. Ken King, the Deputy GEF CEO, recalled that the Council based on the recommendations of OPS 2, had requested UNEP and the GEF Secretariat to prepare a document on the role of STAP, in consultation with UNDP and The World Bank. STAP III had been working well on strategic issues. . He had no problem with STAP involving itself in the discussion of governance issues, but queried whether on issues such as capacity building it could respond in the time available. In his view, STAP should not get involved in operational matters. STAP needed to be responsive to GEF needs while maintaining its independence: its contribution should add value, and continue to focus on scientific issues. He agreed the STAP work programme should be formally adopted, and included as part of the GEF Business Plan. The GEF Secretariat would provide STAP with feedback on how it had taken STAP's advice into account.
  9. Bob Watson (World Bank), said that those taking STAP's advice should set the terms of reference, not STAP itself. UNEP's paper gave the historical perspective, but needed to be rewritten to say what STAP's role should be now. There was currently an air of frustration: STAP needed to feel empowered. What were the GEF's current requirements for advice? What enabling conditions, should be put in place to make STAP truly effective, or, for example, on interlinkages, and targeted research? What steps needed to be taken by the GEF Sec, and by the IAs? What should be the Council's role? He recommended that the paper being prepared for the May 2004 Council meeting address the following points: (a) current role and performance of STAP; (b) proposed changes to STAP's role, examining whether the current roles are still valid; and (c) steps that need to be taken (by Council, GEF Sec, IAs and STAP) to enable STAP to play its role. In his view, STAP needed a flexible work plan. A three-year work programme was too rigid: it needed to provide certainty for the first 18 months to two years, with flexibility in the third year. For proper accountability, the work programme needed to set out clear priorities, with well-defined deliverables. It was right to concentrate primarily on interlinkages between climate change and biodiversity, and for STAP to advise on the implications for the IAs. STAP should not just produce another academic paper on interlinkages.
  10. Miguel Perez-Torralba (UNDP) said STAP should provide operationally relevant advice, but not be engaged at the micro level.
  11. Habiba Gitay (STAP Vice-chair) agreed that the current mandate was wide, but there was a need to make it operational through terms of engagement, enabling conditions, Rules of Procedure, or by some other means. She said her comments, as the Chair had indicated, were aimed at helping future STAP members. She

agreed with Bob Watson that STAP should not set its own Terms of Reference. With that in mind, the Rules of Procedure should clarify the relationship between UNEP, as the provider of the Secretariat, and the Secretariat's role in providing support to the Chair and Vice-chair. Staggered terms for Panel members needed to fit with a work programme lasting 18 months to 2 years, and the Panel needed the right balance of expertise to deliver what the work programme promised. For quality control purposes, there needed to be some way for STAP to report on what it had delivered. STAP members needed to be included as full members of the Inter Agency Task Forces, and not only to engage with the GEF family through ad hoc working groups.

12. Brian Huntley (STAP Member) expressed concern that after three meetings of STAP III, STAP members are still requested to discuss terms of engagement. He stated that STAP has now finalized its work programme and should be allowed to concentrate on substance and do its job. He was of the view that 80% of STAP members' time has so far been devoted to the governance issue and 20% only on substance. He launched an appeal for focusing on the tasks at hand. He indicated that the gathering of such eminent scientists is a privilege and a unique opportunity that should be seized.
13. Leonard Nurse (STAP Member) expressed his agreement with Brian Huntley. He also stated that STAP members have little interaction with the representatives of the Implementing Agencies during the inter-sessional period and therefore full use should be made of the informal face-to-face meeting of STAP. He found the information contact through email with the representatives of the Implementing Agencies extremely helpful. He also agreed that the ToR of STAP cannot be prepared by STAP members. He indicated that STAP members have taken seriously their obligation and therefore they should respond on a timely manner to GEF corporate demands.
14. Peter Hennicke (STAP Member) stated that the idea of staggering of the membership of STAP is a nice idea in theory but has implications on the way STAP fulfils its responsibility. He indicated that the work programme has been prepared for three years but STAP members don't know who will stay beyond June 2004. He insisted to have feed back on the work of STAP by GEF partners and was of the view that there is a need to have a better delineation of responsibilities between STAP and the GEF Secretariat.
15. Peter Schei (STAP Member) expressed his full agreement with Brian Huntley and Leonard Nurse and insisted that STAP members should be allowed to focus on substantive issues. He also stressed the need to receive feed back on the work of STAP by GEF Partners and to this end requested more interaction with the partners. The feed back may also include what is perceived of not being adequate by the agencies based on the STAP deliveries.

16. Dennis Anderson (STAP Member) insisted also on the need to get on with the job and suggested that the Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat should also consider what they can do to make more use of STAP.
17. Alexei Maximov (STAP Member) called for the strengthening of the relation between STAP and UNEP as well the need to draw the lessons from operational activities.
18. After one and a half hours of discussion, Ahmed Djoghlaif, concluded by thanking the STAP members for their contributions and informed the participants that their views will be faithfully conveyed to the Executive Director of UNEP and will be incorporated in the revised version of the document. In response to the World Bank comments, he stated that the positive tone of the draft document was a reflection of the tremendous progress achieved by STAP III but UNEP was open to any new suggestions aiming at strengthening the document. He also indicated that the Executive Director of UNEP after consulting the Chair was of the view that there was no need for the time being for new Terms of Reference but the option should be left open if such a need will occur in the future. This is reflected in the final paragraph of the document. In response to the question raised by Ms. Habiba Gitay, on the relation between UNEP and the Secretary of STAP, he stated that the role of the STAP secretary who is a UNEP Staff member is included in his job description. Regarding the flexibility in the operations of STAP budget, he indicated the willingness of UNEP to discuss the ways and means of ensuring such flexibility with the prevailing UN financial rules and requirements. He recognized that there should be continuous dialogue with regular high-level meetings between the GEF Sec and IAs, as had been agreed on 6 March 2003 and that at least one Panel Member should be included in each Task Force. He also mentioned that it was unfair that STAP should be asked to respond to the GEF's corporate needs without STAP being involved in the process and that it was very important that the Panel be given proper feedback. He noted that the overwhelming majority of the STAP members expressed their strong desire to focus on substantive issues and do their job. He concluded by reaffirming the full commitment of UNEP to discuss the ways and means of alleviating the legitimate frustration of STAP members arising from the current STAP *modus operandi*.