



Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.34/Inf.12

October 14, 2008

GEF Council
November 11-13, 2008

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL, SEPTEMBER 15-17, 2008

(Prepared by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel)

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility



Report of the Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, September 15-17, 2008

A. Summary and Decisions of the Meeting

1. Background

The Science Panel met for three days, September 15-17, 2008, the first day and last half day as closed sessions, with the remainder open to GEF Agencies, GEF Secretariat and representatives of GEF-related multilateral environment agreements. The meeting objectives were to:

1. Review options for science vision contributions to GEF-5 strategy development and the Science Panel's role within the process
2. Recommendations on improved strategic working between the Science Panel, GEF Agencies and science panels of MEAs
3. Endorse the Science Panel's analysis of recent GEF Work Programs for reporting to GEF agencies and Council
4. Adopt changes and additions to the Science Panel's Work Program

1. Agenda item 1, 2 and 3. Opening of the meeting, adoption of the Agenda and confirmation of the Minutes of the April 2008 Science Panel meeting.

Thomas E. Lovejoy, new Chairperson of the Panel, opened the meeting. Maryam Niamir-Fuller, Director, DGEF, UNEP, added her welcome to the meeting and outlined the broader context of GEF within which the Science Panel was holding its deliberations and delivering its advice. The agenda as drafted was adopted by the meeting, while the Minutes of the April 9-12 2008 meeting of the Science Panel were confirmed.

Decision 3.1: The Minutes of the April, 2008 Science Panel meeting were confirmed

2. Agenda item 4. Progress update on the Science Panel reforms and related issues

The meeting considered the use of Panel Member available time, including in meetings, and agreed that the Science Panel can discontinue the Roster and concentrate instead on how to build more effective and transparent networks of available expertise to supplement Panel Members time.

The Science Panel's work on screening Project Identification Forms was supported but its selective extension to PIFs prior to CEO approval was re-emphasized. The Science Panel agreed to develop an analysis of its experience to date in the new project cycle including the impact of the Science Panel's comments. Regarding the constitution of the Council Work Program, the Science Panel was encouraged to provide its analysis taking into account the bottom up nature of its constitution.

Decision 4.1: Two meetings of the Science Panel per year will continue to be held

Decision 4.1: Replace the existing Roster with an alternative and active expert listing

Decision 4.2: The Science Panel will invite selected past Panel members to join the expert network and also to enable and facilitate access to their expert contacts

Decision 4.4: Experts from the Science Panel's networks will be listed by country, type of organization and will relate to and should address the following priorities:

- i. Assist with project reviews, and with developing projects.
- ii. Engage with knowledge management products.
- iii. Develop specific targeted research ideas.
- iv. Assist with developing priorities for the GEF.

Decision 4.5: The Science Panel will notify the GEF Council that the Roster will be replaced by the alternative expert database

Decision 4.6: The STAP Secretariat will prepare a report to the GEFSec and Council on the Science Panel's experience of influencing project preparation in the new project cycle, and also how the GEF Agencies address the Science Panel's comments in the final project document.

3. Agenda item 5. GEF Secretariat briefing for the Science Panel and GEF Agencies

The GEF Secretariat's briefing included information about a new Climate and Chemicals team leader, other staff changes and on the forthcoming Project Management Information System and GEF-5 strategy development arrangements. After discussion on the impact of the Science Panel's advice, the Science Panel was encouraged to draw attention to projects which have major challenges or bring its concerns to the GEFSec's attention.

Other discussion covered GEF's work to support LULUCF and preparations for potential REDD support.

Decision 5.1: The Science Panel will prepare a summary of how to strengthen the scientific basis of PIFs, following the Panel's screening of PIFs approved for inclusion in the November Council Work Program.

4. Agenda item 6. The Science Panel's GEF Science Vision; continuity vs. change

Four sessions covering biodiversity, international waters, land degradation and climate change were held in parallel followed by a plenary report back and discussion session to cover the four focal areas discussed. The discussions feed back into the Science Panel's preparations for its advisory work on GEF-5 strategy development, and each Panel Member has used the opportunity to test ideas that were first presented to the April 2008 meeting of the Science Panel.

Decision 6.1: Post on the Science Panel's website the original science vision summaries for each focal area, as well as feedback on this vision from the four sessions. The summaries and feedback will serve as inputs into the GEF-5 TAG process.

5. Agenda item 7. Review of joint work with GEF Secretariat and GEF Evaluation Office

Presentations were made on the Mid-Term Review of the Resource Allocation Framework and also the Overall Performance Study of the GEF (OPS4) by staff of the Evaluation Office, who welcomed the Science Panel's collaboration on further development of RAF indicator options and participation in the OPS4.

Decision 7.1: The Science Panel agreed to work with the EO on analysis of GBI construction and lessons learnt, to prepare for the Science Panel's work on possible indicators for non-RAF focal areas

Decision 7.2: The STAP Secretariat will engage with the EO on the assessment of science impact on GEF operations in OPS4

6. Agenda item 8. Moving from Science to Policy, the Science Panel's working relations with other bodies.

The objective for the session was to clarify which science bodies GEF should increase engagement with through the Science Panel and the modalities for doing so, illustrated by an overview of major initiatives and panels. As an example UNEP recommended engagement with the new Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). It was agreed that MEA Secretariats be requested to mediate more effective engagement between MEA science bodies and the GEF's Science Panel, including taking into account country level engagement while the Science Panel should consider the balance between strategic and operational priorities.

Decision 8.1: The Science Panel committed to better inform its science advisory work through liaising with the science bodies of the MEAs. As a first step follow up UNEP's invitation to meet with MEA Secretariats in Geneva to agree the most effective means.

Decision 8.2: A member of the Science Panel will attend the meeting of the IPBES in Kuala Lumpur in November 2008.

7. Agenda item 9. the Science Panel strategic advice and proposals for discussion with GEF Agencies

The Science Panel's proposals to review critically Council Work Program cover notes, and to encourage their use also to review past and future opportunities, were not supported by the meeting. Instead the Panel was urged to use the GEF Task Forces to test strategic issues and to report the Panel's advice to the Council using the report of the Chairperson.

Decision 9.1: The Science Panel will encourage Task Forces not only to discuss operational issues, but will propose that they also consider strategic directions for future work programs

Decision 9.2: The Science Panel's strategic advice on gaps and opportunities regarding the work programs will be presented to each Council meeting by the Chairperson of the Panel.

8. Agenda item 10. Approval of the updated Science Panel Work Program

Each Panel Member presented the current status of the work program per focal area and for cross-cutting actions, noting that with the exception of the Chemicals focal area that the relevant Task Force had discussed the work. It was agreed that the changes discussed would be reflected in the updated work program.

Decision 10.1: The Science Panel will amend the Work Program to reflect advice received at this meeting and publish the resulting document on the Panel's website.

B. Full Report and Decisions of the Meeting

Introduction

1. The Science Panel met in Washington DC in the World Bank “I” Building for three days, September 15-17, 2008, the first day and last half day as closed sessions, with the remainder open to GEF Agencies, GEF Secretariat and representatives of GEF-related multilateral environment agreements. The meeting was the first of two planned main meetings of the Panel held in GEF financial year 2009, and its objectives were to:
 1. Review options for science vision contributions to GEF-5 strategy development and the Science Panel's role within the process
 2. Recommendations on improved strategic working between the Science Panel, GEF Agencies and science panels of MEAs
 3. Endorse the Science Panel's analysis of recent GEF Work Programs for reporting to GEF agencies and Council
 4. Adopt changes and additions to the Science Panel's Work Program
2. This Report records the proceedings of the open session consisting of Tuesday 16th and the first half of Wednesday 17th September, 2008. Agenda numbered items refer to the agenda for the open session days posted on the the Science Panel website¹

Agenda items 1, 2 and 3.

Opening of the meeting, adoption of the Agenda and confirmation of the Minutes of the April 2008 Science Panel meeting.

3. Thomas Lovejoy, opened the meeting introducing himself as the new Chairperson of the Science Panel and welcomed the new Panel member for the chemicals focal area cluster, Bo Wahlström and also the new STAP Secretariat staff member, Lev Neretin.
4. Maryam Niamir-Fuller, Director of the Division of GEF Coordination (UNEP), welcomed Thomas Lovejoy to the Science Panel, and thanked him for guiding the members of the Panel in their work. She also welcomed the new staff member of the STAP Secretariat. Maryam Niamir-Fuller also reassured the Panel, and the meeting participants, that UNEP fully supports the Panel, its reforms, and is doing everything possible to make the Science Panel as effective as possible.
5. The agenda was adopted without change and the minutes of the last meeting of the Science Panel, held on April 9-12, 2008 at UNEP, Nairobi, Kenya, were confirmed.

Decision 3.1: The Minutes of the April, 2008 Science Panel meeting were confirmed

Agenda item 4. Progress update on the Science Panel reforms and related issues

6. The STAP Secretary introduced the agenda item and led the discussion, referring to the Agenda item paper and its annex.
7. UNEP asked how the estimates for Panel working days were calculated, and whether they were obtained from past records. It was clarified there were no long term records for use of time that the Secretariat could use to estimate distribution of tasks for Panel Members' working days; thus, the estimates were based on the STAP Secretariat's recent (2006-2008) experience of the use of their time.
8. The participants were asked to consider whether two Panel meetings a year were, indeed, needed. For example, only one formal meeting per year might be held; thereby, reducing the number of days the Panel allocates to its formal meetings, and, thus, freeing the Panel's time to focus on more strategic work. However the meeting agreed that two meetings a year remains necessary to provide continuity to the discussions held between the Science Panel and the GEF.

¹ See: http://stapgef.unep.org/docs/Activities/Meetings/Sep2008/Agenda_Final.pdf

9. The meeting was asked to consider, taking into account the changed role of Panel members, how the Science Panel could strengthen its ties to the scientific bodies of the four Conventions that receive support from the GEF. (Also see discussion under Agenda item 8)
10. The discussion also focused on how to build the Science Panel's networks, and whether the existing Roster remained a valuable tool for the GEF. The Panel provided two examples of possible network members, 1) the Center for Evidence Based Conservation (CEBC) at Bangor University, U.K. which has a narrow focus, and a broad network with a homogenous approach; and, 2) the Society for Conservation Biology (SCB), which relies on a full-time staff member to translate the scientific findings into policy.
11. The GEF Evaluation Office (EO) commented that the existing Roster could be more useful if it had a clear identity, and clear terms of reference. Recent experience of the EO regarding various requests made of the Roster was that a number of individuals did not respond because they identified with the Science Panel and not with the GEF. Therefore, it was suggested that to create and maintain a useful roster, or network, it should possess an identity shared with GEF as a whole.
12. The Panel and the STAP Secretariat responded by inviting the EO and other GEF partners to channel requests for scientific networks directly to the Science Panel. They pointed that since the Science Panel reforms in 2007 the Panel has been tapping directly into their scientific networks instead of using the Roster, or other indirect mechanisms, to access expertise for GEF advice.
13. UNDP questioned the development of networks by asking what could be the incentive for an individual, or institution, to join the group. It was noted that the main incentives would most likely be financial, and having ties to the GEF.
14. UNEP asked whether the Science Panel's experience and institutional capacity could be captured better. At the moment, Panel Members are appointed up to four years, and the institutional capacity may be suffering due to lack of continuity. The STAP Secretary suggested that maintaining formal ties with previous Panel Members could help address this concern.
15. UNEP raised four expectations about the networks, which the Science Panel could take into account as they consider further how to strengthen their ties and outreach to the scientific community –
 - v. Assist with project reviews, and with developing projects.
 - vi. Engage with knowledge management products.
 - vii. Develop specific targeted research ideas.
 - viii. Assist with developing priorities for the GEF.
16. As an initial step, the meeting considered a proposal to abolish the Roster. By doing so the Science Panel will instead be selecting directly advisory expertise through its scientific networks, whose quality of work is overseen by Panel Members. Science Panel-led scientific networks will allow, therefore, the performance of the Panel to be measured more effectively than by maintaining a roster database with no ties to the Science Panel.
17. The meeting agreed that the Science Panel should report the names of individuals, or institutions, it works with to develop advice. The STAP Secretariat would maintain a list of these names, which could be grouped by countries, type of organizations, and related to the four categories identified by UNEP.
18. The World Bank requested that the GEF Council to be notified of the abolishment of the Roster in favor of a list of the Science Panel-led scientific networks. It was also suggested that a network diagram should be created to map the expertise available.
19. Progress on other the Science Panel reforms was also discussed, including the Science Panel's input at the PIF stage. The STAP Secretary noted that the Science Panel gained valuable experience from screening PIFs. It was also noted that as the STAP Secretariat takes over more operational tasks, Panel Members will be asked to spend less time screening PIFs, and more time on strategic tasks.

20. It was noted that while the Science Panel's PIF screens have been useful to the GEF Secretariat, the Science Panel's comments would be more valuable if they were made before CEO approval. GEF Secretariat requested an analysis focusing on the following: 1) what has been the Science Panel's experience, or influence, so far in the project preparation phase; and, 2) how do the Agencies address the Science Panel's comments in the final project document? This request was also supported by the Panel.
21. The participants were assured that tracking how project concepts develop, based on the Science Panel's comments on PIFs at CEO approval, is a responsibility of the STAP Secretariat. It was acknowledged that the required systematic tracking is a current gap in the STAP Secretariat's system, which will be addressed soon. The GEF project management information system (PMIS) may also be helpful in this task.
22. On the work program constitution, The GEF Secretariat pointed out that, in reality, the Science Panel can have little influence because the constitution is driven mainly by the countries' demands, and in some instances by the Resource Allocation Framework; therefore, it is a "bottom-up" approach. The Science Panel was encouraged to consider its comments on the work program by combining a bottom-up versus a strategic approach.

Decision 4.1: Two meetings of the Science Panel per year will continue to be held

Decision 4.1: Replace the existing the Roster with an alternative expert listing

Decision 4.2: the Science Panel will invite selected past Panel members to join the expert network and also to enable and facilitate access to their expert contacts

Decision 4.4: Experts from the Science Panel's networks will be listed by country, type of organization and will relate to and should address the following priorities:

- ix. Assist with project reviews, and with developing projects.
- x. Engage with knowledge management products.
- xi. Develop specific targeted research ideas.
- xii. Assist with developing priorities for the GEF.

Decision 4.5: The Science Panel will notify the GEF Council that the Roster will be replaced by the alternative expert database

Decision 4.6: The STAP Secretariat will prepare a report to the GEFSec and Council on the Science Panel's experience of influencing project preparation in the new project cycle, and also how the GEF Agencies address the Science Panel's comments in the final project document.

Agenda item 5. GEF Secretariat briefing

23. The composition of the different teams in the GEF Secretariat was outlined, including the appointment of Robert Dixon as the new team leader for Climate Change & Chemicals, and noting the retirement of Walter Lusigi as the Land Degradation focal area lead. Briefing was provided on the project cycle, the Project Management Information System (PMIS), Resource Allocation Framework (RAF), and the process to formulate GEF-5 strategies.
24. On the project cycle, the GEF Secretariat noted that the reforms focused on decreasing the project approval time from sixty to twenty-two months, giving the Council a more strategic role in reviewing the proposals further upstream. It was noted that a paper reporting on the operations of the revised project cycle will be submitted to the Council at their meeting in November 2009. The objective of the paper is to examine the revised project cycle during its first year under implementation.
25. The GEF Secretariat reassured the Science Panel that its comments on the PIFs are taken duly into account, noting that if a project does not address the Science Panel's comments, the GEF Secretariat would raise this matter with the appropriate Agency. Nonetheless, the Science Panel is encouraged to

flag to the GEF Secretariat those projects which are likely to be challenging, or to raise concerns, during the project development phase. Furthermore, if the Science Panel is not happy with an Agency's reply to the Panel's comments, the Science Panel needs to let the GEF Secretariat know this.

26. The Panel noted that the Science Panel will prepare a brief summary of how to strengthen the scientific basis of PIFs – input that could be useful during the project preparation phase. This summary will be based on the Science Panel's experience with PIF screens.
27. On the PMIS, the GEF Secretariat reported that the system will be launched in October 2008.
28. The GEF Secretariat noted that the EO's mid-term review of the RAF will be completed soon. A GEF Secretariat management response will be written, and both reports will be submitted to the Council. Subsequently the RAF mid-term review will feed into the conceptualization, and development, of a GEF-wide RAF. For the Science Panel, there will be a substantial role in defining indicators for a RAF in each focal area, particularly, indicators that can be aggregated across focal areas.
29. On the GEF-5 strategy development, the composition of the technical advisory groups (TAGs) will consist of various independent experts recommended by the GEF Council, Conventions, as well as members of the Science Panel and the GEF Secretariat. The strategy advisory group (SAG) is also likely to change by being more technically oriented, and will include two members from each TAG, among other experts.
30. The GEF Secretariat team leader for Natural Resources, provided a brief update about the team's work. The team structure is formed on a regional basis – a structure which may also be adopted by the Climate and Chemicals group. It was noted that the RAF has allowed the NR team to address more closely the programming of resources, particularly for countries that fall behind their allotment. Programmatic approaches were considered to have led to further collaboration amongst the Agencies, and by default, this had led the team to work more closely with Agency partnerships.
31. The Panel requested information about how the GEF Secretariat has addressed Land Use, Land Use Change & Forestry (LULUCF) and Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) activities and also why there appeared to be a small number of projects on LULUCF and SFM.
32. The GEF Secretariat clarified that over \$100 million had been spent on SFM projects including LULUCF components – and that not all resources had been drawn from climate change allocations. On monitoring LULUCF and SFM, it was noted that the World Bank and UNEP are working to develop a methodology to measure carbon from different ecosystems. Once the methodology is complete and fully tested, the Agencies will be asked to apply it.
33. For now, the Agencies are being requested to calculate carbon stocks in LULUCF projects. The GEF Secretariat noted that the GEF is only channeling LULUCF funds to countries for capacity building, monitoring, etc. – and nothing beyond this. Four potential financial architectures for a global REDD program were outlined:
 - i. A global fund with no market – that is, a cap and trade system (this is the least supported model).
 - ii. Getting credits accrued.
 - iii. A market for project based credits.
 - iv. A project + market hybrid.
34. The Panel was briefed that the interlinkages between the portfolios on land degradation, biodiversity, and international waters are clear on the surface. The challenge, however, is how to capture the global environment benefits in a way that is suitable to the different political stakeholders.
35. The UNCCD Secretariat asked how the GEF can help to target the Convention when not enough Land Degradation investment is being made available. The GEF Secretariat responded that a replenishment is needed for Land Degradation and that the CoP needs to request donors to consider the allocation level.

Decision 5.1: The Science Panel will prepare a summary of how to strengthen the scientific basis of PIFs, following the Panel's screening of PIFs approved for inclusion in the November Council Work Program.

Agenda item 6. The Science Panel's GEF Science Vision

36. The Panel Members were joined by task managers from the GEF Secretariat to participate in parallel break out groups to consider the Science Panel's views on GEF-4 legacy issues compared to new directions for GEF-5. Four groups were formed – climate change, biodiversity, land degradation and international waters, and the Panel Member leads for each group provided a report back within the following the plenary session. Further detail of the discussion held in each group is provided in Annex 1

Climate change break-out group, Chair, N.H. Ravindranath

37. The participants included representatives of the GEF Secretariat, World Bank, EO, and the STAP Secretariat.

38. N.H. Ravindranath made a presentation on three concept notes on the Science Panel's work towards GEF-5. The three concepts are:

- "Strategic objectives and programs: A science-based analysis for the climate change focal area".
- "LULUCF/SFM/REDD towards GEF-5".
- "Regionalization of GEF Strategic Programmes".

39. The following suggestions were received from the participants:

- i. The Science Panel should analyze the achievements of GEF in the climate change portfolio.
- ii. The Science Panel needs to consider the changing greenhouse-gas emission profiles of countries.
- iii. The Science Panel needs to explore the opportunities for public-private partnerships in promoting climate change mitigation technologies.
- iv. The Science Panel should follow the emerging discussions in UNFCCC on sectoral opportunities for energy efficiency standards.
- v. The Science Panel needs to consider the RAF approach within the discussion on a GEF-5 science vision.
- vi. The Science Panel should consider the discussions and recommendations of UNFCCC in all activities for the GEF-5 vision.
- vii. Assess the carbon benefit from biodiversity and land degradation projects/portfolio.
- viii. Define the boundaries of REDD, LULUCF, and SFM for GEF, and consider it in the activities leading up to GEF-5.

40. The Panel discussed the suggestions including whether there is any evidence of Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) working successfully and cited a number of examples in India where PPPs are working successfully, and where private funds are critical to its success. The GEF Secretariat added that the private sector had already approached the GEF with an interest to evaluate certain technologies, evaluate GEF best practices in climate change, and with other interests to partner in climate change activities. It was also noted there is ample evidence of the GEF leveraging financing from the private sector for projects, and that a number of projects have demonstrated impact. A Panel Member emphasized the need to include safeguards in projects, since the private sector's goals may not always be favorable to the environment.

Land degradation break out group, Chair, Michael Stocking

Michael Stocking presented the main discussion points from the land degradation break-out group.

- i. UNCCD Secretariat remarked that the Science Panel's GEF 5 vision is aligned with the ten year strategic plan adopted in Madrid, Spain, 2007. For example, the Science Panel discussed generating global environment benefits through sustainable land management activities. This

activity correlates directly to the ten year plan. UNCCD Secretariat requested, therefore, that the Science Panel amends the GEF-5 vision to reflect more of the ten-year strategic plan.

- ii. The session Chair reported that the group agreed to cut sustainable agriculture from the Science vision because it is more a role for UNDP, and other multilateral aid organizations to address these activities, rather than the GEF.

Biodiversity break out group, Chair, Paul Ferraro

A more detailed summary of the break out group discussions is provided in the Annex, and with reference to *Draft Summary of Biodiversity Science Issues for GEF-5 (May 2008)*, written by Panel Member Paul Ferraro; the main points reported were:

1. GEF-4 components to continue were outlined, and while less scientific support was evident for access and benefit-sharing, biosafety and invasive species, this not necessarily mean dropping these issues from GEF-5 if policy priorities overrides scientific advice.
2. Why there were not more examples of combined Natural Resource Management and Climate Change projects was the subject of discussion, and it was recognized that a number of factors may be responsible. Looking at lessons from the current SLM program as a guide to CC-NRM opportunities was suggested
3. Freshwater ecosystems appear arguably to be under-represented in the GEF portfolio, perhaps protecting biodiversity in these systems is more complex than in terrestrial ecosystems, although transferring resources from the under-used marine SP to the freshwater SP might be appropriate. It was noted that interactions between the IW and BD programs would be ideal. Questions were raised about goal/targets for freshwater ecosystems, but also about the motivation of countries for such programs.
4. Protected and Productive Landscapes: the scientific rationale for doing joint protected-productive proposals was questioned, particularly in the context of the grant values disbursed by the GEF
5. Biosafety: The group agreed that the relative effectiveness of national versus regional approaches might be important and that the question is really "what can be achieved in a regional program that can't be achieved in a national program?"
6. Climate proofing biodiversity: An important topic which awaits further GEFSec work to enable further guidance.
7. Five other topics were covered either briefly or mentioned in passing.

International Waters Breakout Group, Chair: Meryl Williams

1. The IW breakout group was chaired by M. Williams (the Science Panel) and attended by P. Bjornsen and I. Zavatsky (GEFSEC), I. Vanderbeck (UNEP/DGEF), and L. Neretin (the Science PanelSEC). The major points of the proposed by the Science Panel work program were touched on briefly, but not discussed in depth as these had been dealt with in late April at the International Waters Task Force meeting. Instead, participants discussed a number of approaches and considerations to be taken into account when developing RAF for IW focal area.
2. P. Bjornsen for the GEFSec introduced RAF and M. Williams informed participants on the progress made with the 3 approach papers. With GEFSec assistance, the Science Panel has commissioned one of the 3 studies (an approach paper) with the aim to analyze and assess existing global databases for surface freshwater basins. The GEFSec, with assistance from the Science Panel has commissioned similar approach papers on LMEs and groundwater and appropriate indicators for respective water systems that can be utilized in constructing Global Benefits Index (GBI) in the RAF.

3. All participants agreed that the major challenge for developing a RAF for international waters lies in the need to develop country-specific allocations, while IW projects are all transboundary in nature. A RAF will need to ensure that country-specific work related to regional transboundary needs.
4. A number of approaches for developing country-specific allocations were discussed, but all approaches will present challenges. These approaches are (i) to use country's shares of particular basins, (ii) to develop RAF indicators for transboundary basins and not countries, (iii) to strategize by limiting RAF application to only those basins that are in greatest demand (how to define?) and etc.
5. The group reached a consensus on the following principles (considerations) that should be utilized when constructing a RAF in IW focal area:
 - RAF should address the issue of an individual country's allocations without compromising transboundary (regional and global) cooperation;
 - Lessons learned from MTR of the RAF application in BD and CC areas should be incorporated into RAF design for IW;
 - RAF indicators should take into account the existing enabling environment in the IW focal area as functioning governance institutions are in the center of IW interventions;
 - Depending on the level of funding in IW in GEF-5, individual country allocations for all focal areas may be pooled together passing responsibility for focal-area specific allocations to countries.

Decision 6.1: Post on the Science Panel's website the original science vision summaries for each focal area, as well as feedback on this vision from the four sessions. The summaries and feedback will serve as inputs into the GEF-5 TAG process.

Wednesday 17 September 2008

Deferred item from Agenda item 5. GEF Secretariat briefing – Robert Dixon, GEF Secretariat

41. Robert Dixon briefly introduced himself as the new team leader for the Climate & Chemicals team. He stated that he is a biochemist by training, and was formerly based at the International Energy Agency (IEA).
42. Noting that an holistic approach to climate change is being contemplated in collaboration with the NR team leader the two GEF Secretariat teams are focusing on adaptation – to identify what are the main priorities on adaptation for GEF-5. It was also emphasized help is needed from the Science Panel in this field.
43. On mitigation, advice is sought on the intersection between mitigation and biodiversity. In particular, there is strong support to work on habitat protection to mitigate climate change. However, this was recognized as a big challenge, and will need support from the Science Panel to address it.
44. Help from the Science Panel is also needed to deepen, broaden, and enrich the portfolio on technology. It was noted there is an occurring trend to develop fewer projects on renewable energy. There is a need to be looking at new technologies, and to identify what is the best approach for the GEF's clientele.
45. Another priority raised is how to position the GEF portfolio in relation to sectors. Nonetheless, the Science Panel was asked not to discard a technology specific portfolio – what would be an appropriate mix of technologies and sectors in the portfolio, and who would be the right players.
46. UNCCD Secretariat stated that to take care of mitigation, land issues need to be addressed. Thus, how can sustainable land management help address carbon sinks, and, more specifically, as the Kyoto Protocol is negotiated, how can sustainable land management be positioned? The GEF Secretariat supported UNCCD's intervention, arguing in favor of broadening and deepening the climate change portfolio and also arguing in favor of telling the GEF's successes better because they are, often, not heard.

47. UNFCCC Secretariat asked how technology transfer is envisioned by the GEF. The GEF Secretariat replied the GEF has been asked to write a report, and develop a program on technology transfer. As the largest public sector investor in technology transfer, the GEF needs to be able to quantify better what it wants, and to tell its story. It was also noted the GEF is committed to strengthening PPP on technology transfer.
48. The main challenge for the Science Panel, and other scientific working groups within the Conventions, is to be mindful of the new climate change funds, and to position the GEF in relation to these new funds.
49. Further ideas on how the GEF Secretariat envisions the future of the climate change portfolio are included in the climate change break-out discussion.

Agenda item 7. Review of joint work with GEF Secretariat and GEF Evaluation Office

50. The progress on the Evaluation Office's Mid-Term Review of the Resource Allocation Framework was reported by Siv Tokle (EO), including an explanation of how the GEF Benefits Index (GBI) was derived, and the relationship between the distribution of finance allocations and GBI and GEF Performance Index. For the climate change and biodiversity focal areas, 75% of \$1 billion for each area goes to individual allocations, 15% to group, 5% to global and regional and 5% to the Small Grants Program and cross-cutting capacity building.
51. The Evaluation Office considers that the GBI formula is robust regarding marine and terrestrial weightings (they tried different weightings which did not have a huge impact on allocations). Access and Benefit Sharing and sustainable development components of the CBD are not reflected in the GBI; these are harder to capture.
52. GBI is in continuous units (0 to infinity) while GPI is on scale 1-5. Thus RAF scores are driven by GBI and barely affected by GPI. However, RAF has improved predictability of funds which helps in planning coherent portfolios.
53. It was noted that the Science Panel will follow up with the Evaluation Office to learn more about the calculation methods used for the GBI following the release of the Review, which is expected in late September.
54. Claudio Volonte, Chief Evaluation Officer, presented the design of the forthcoming Fourth Overall Performance Study of the GEF (OPS4), which will also consider the Science Panel's role and performance, including the impact if any of its reforms. OPS4 and the forthcoming GEF-5 strategy will come to Council at the same time. The EO will try to report at level of environmental changes.
55. With specific reference to the Science Panel and the OPS4, the Panel's participation would be focused upon:
 1. Key stakeholder cluster 4 - assessing the Science Panel's role
 2. To help OPS4 access expert networks through Panel members
 3. Participation in the development of impact/theories of change (biodiversity is underway, others to be prepared)
 4. Report on work conducted by the Science Panel in the last 2-3 years
 5. Help OPS4 address Q 14: GEF as a learning institution including state of the art science and technology?

Decision 7.1: The Science Panel agreed to work with the EO on analysis of GBI construction and lessons learnt, to prepare for the Science Panel's work on possible RAF indicators for the remaining non-RAF focal areas

Decision 7.2: The STAP Secretariat to engage with EO on the assessment of science impact on GEF operations in OPS4

Agenda item 8. Moving from Science to Policy, the Science Panel's working relations with other bodies.

56. Maryam Niamir-Fuller, UNEP, made a presentation with the objective of surveying important and significant science processes and bodies with which the GEF could connect using the Science Panel as its mechanism to engage. The main topics covered were:
- Linking the Science Panel to ongoing or planned international commissions
 - Linking the Science Panel to MEAs
 - Science to Policy : UNEP's Chief Scientist and Division of Early Warning Systems
57. Key questions considered and discussed, included:
- Whether the Science Panel is capable of going beyond current GEF strategic priorities to have a 2-3 GEF cycle perspective
 - Consideration of cross-fertilization between UNEP's scientific program of work, and the Science Panel Targeted Research (lessons learnt, upscaling or downscaling)
 - Scientific networks – the Science Panel panel members to take advantage of networks already in place
 - Cooperation with International panels and commissions, for example the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)
 - The Science Panel's Chairperson and UNEP Chief Scientist to interact regularly – both have a cross-sectoral and holistic mandate; Chief Scientist to attend all the Science Panel meetings.
58. In the discussion that followed, it was agreed that MEA Secretariats should be asked to mediate opportunities for the Science Panel to interact with science bodies of MEAs for the benefit of the GEF, both the representatives for the UNFCCC and the UNCCD agreed to follow this up, and a meeting was proposed in Geneva by UNEP to bring together appropriate representatives.
59. Specific examples of experience with engagement were discussed; regarding UNCBD's SBSTTA, given the constraints on the Panel's time, engaging with the UNCBD subsidiary body directly would not be an efficient use of the Panel's resources. The Montréal Protocol Secretariat emphasized the need for GEF to show its value and the Science Panel would need to consider which advisory panel to relate to; the Protocol's Technology and Economic Assessment Panel has more influence on formulating current business, while the Protocol's Science Advisory panel is now less important.
60. The World Bank suggested building synergy with national focal points to counter the currently poor interest at country level of integrating GEF work. UNDP asked the Science Panel to think through and clarify the balance of its work between operational and strategic priorities.

Decision 8.1: The Science Panel committed to better inform its science advisory work through liaising with the science bodies of the MEAs. As a first step follow up UNEP's invitation to meet with MEA Secretariats in Geneva to agree the most effective means.

Decision 8.2: A member of the Science Panel will attend the meeting of the IPBES in Kuala Lumpur in November 2008.

Agenda item 9. The Science Panel's strategic advice and proposals for discussion with GEF Agencies

61. The STAP Secretary presented ideas for analyzing the GEF-4 work program priorities. Participants were asked whether the Science Panel should engage more strategically with the GEF to develop the work program cover notes.
62. The World Bank suggested using the task forces as the medium to communicate the Science Panel's advice more strategically – and not the work program cover notes. The meeting agreed that the GEF focal area task forces are the formal, collaborative medium to discuss technical issues.

63. The GEF Secretariat stated the work program is set, and it would be better for the Science Panel to advise on programmatic approaches, or engage in other processes, such as the Project Implementation Review (PIR). Although the PIR is an important process, the STAP Secretary emphasized this is not a forward-looking process at the project level; thereby, it would not be the right process to identify and analyze the GEF-4 work program priorities.
64. The Panel suggested that they could develop their own cover note that looks across projects, and reports the Science Panel's advice. However other participants believed it would be more strategic to include the Science Panel's work program assessment in the Chair's report to the Council. They also suggested the analysis could focus on identifying the strategic gaps in the work program.

Decision 9.1: The Science Panel will encourage Task Forces not only to discuss operational issues, but will propose that they also consider strategic directions for future work programs

Decision 9.2: The Science Panel's strategic advice on gaps and opportunities regarding the work programs will be presented to each Council meeting by the Chairperson of the Panel.

Agenda item 10. Approval of the updated Science Panel work program

65. The STAP Secretary presented the Science Panel's work program, and asked participants for comments with a view to approving it. The main points discussed were:
- a. Cross-cutting - Distribute the draft paper by Panel Members Michael Stocking and Meryl Williams on "Developing generic GEF-5 focal area expected impacts and indicators for natural resource management". The World Bank suggested distributing the paper to the task force for official peer-review by the GEF, this was agreed.
 - b. Biodiversity
 - Activities on marine protected areas will be coordinated jointly between Paul Ferraro and Meryl Williams. (Meryl Williams)
 - Revise indicators – the indicators appear to be output indicators rather than indicators associated with change. This applies also to the complete work program. (UNDP)
 - c. Climate change
 - Suggest refocusing climate change section by sector, or technology and include PPP activities. (UNCBD Secretariat)
 - The Science Panel's work program could be recommended to the Conference of the Parties, so they can provide feedback. (UNCBD Secretariat)
 - Re-title "REDD" as "LULUCF", and include the Agencies in this task, as they are already working in this area. (UNEP and World Bank)
 - Delete "equitable distribution" under regionalization activity. (UNEP)
 - Include land degradation experts in biomass activity. (UNEP)
 - Identify priority issues with the IEA. (World Bank).
 - On regionalization, recommend that the Science Panel reviews reports, and identifies where the increase in technology to decrease energy use is, and specifies what technology is increasing. (World Bank and UNDP)
 - Participants were unsure how the GEF could generalize and benefit from the regionalization exercise. Instead, identify the "big hits", opportunities for the GEF, and advise where to go with these big hits – technologies. (UNDP)
 - d. International Waters
 - Suggest adding acidification – perhaps intertwined with another activity. (UNEP)
 - Consider the marine waters beyond national jurisdiction (high seas). (UNEP)

- Others already working on dead zones. Focus on what to do – be more specific and include knowledge from scientific community in the examination of “...the effects of coastal dead zones on marine systems...”(UNDP)
- e. POPs – GEFSec may need assistance from the Science Panel to develop POPs indicators to be used in the RAF for chemicals. A short presentation on some proposed tasks was made by Bo Wahlström, Panel member. No further discussion was held because the draft POPs work program was to be further discussed with GEFSec and the Task Force before finalization.
- f. Land degradation
- Complete studies on land degradation. (UNEP)
 - Recommend moving “New and innovative approaches in SLM” from the shadow list to the work program. (UNEP)
 - Revise language in “RAF application to the LD FA” to better reflect the Council’s request to identify indicators under a potential RAF. (UNEP)

Decision 10.1: The Science Panel will amend the Work Program to reflect advice received at this meeting and publish the resulting document on the Panel’s website.

Annex 1. Additional notes on discussions in Science Vision break out groups (Tuesday 16th September, 2008)

Climate change break-out group

1. N.H. Ravindranath presented three ideas on the science vision for GEF-5. They were as follows:
 - i. "Strategic objectives and programs: A science-based analysis for the climate change focal area".
 - ii. "LULUCF/SFM/REDD towards GEF-5".
 - iii. "Regionalization of GEF Strategic Programs".
2. Zhihong Zhang, GEF Secretariat, Program Manager Climate Change, remarked that N.H. Ravindranath's ideas appear aligned with the GEF Secretariat's initial thinking on GEF-5 – a think piece is being developed by the climate change group to capture initial ideas about GEF-5. Broadly speaking, the paper covers the following aspects:
 - Programs according to technology.
 - Programs according to sector.
 - Eco-urban (eco-city) program/project that cuts across all sectors.
 - LULUCF (The rationale for LULUCF will be multi-benefits, including for countries that are not emitters; therefore, the program intends to target emitters and sinks.).
3. And, the principles described in the paper for GEF-5 include:
 - Cost effectiveness.
 - Based on the needs of the country.
 - National communication technology needs assessment.
 - Responsiveness to Convention
4. Yolando Velasco, Secretariat to the United Nations Framework on Climate Change (UNFCCC), remarked that the Science Panel may wish to consider the following areas:
 - Where will the climate convention be in 2010? For example, the Science Panel may wish to consider scaling up resources, technology transfer, and priorities for enabling activities.
 - On technology transfer, the Science Panel could consider the following aspects – development, mobilization, cost-effectiveness, and accessibility to developing countries.
 - On enabling activities, look into the lessons learned.
 - Consider Measurable, Reportable & Verifiable (MRV) emissions through REDD within the context of the climate change Convention.
 - Consider scaling-up communications if resources and technologies are scaled-up.
 - Look into the GEF's experience on market transformation- challenges, gaps, etc.
 - Work on linking science to policy.
 - Be flexible on your choice of ideas in case other needs arise from policy makers.
5. Richard Hosier, World Bank-GEF, Climate Change, expressed uncertainty whether regionalization of GEF strategic programs would be feasible to do. Nonetheless, he encouraged the Science Panel to look at regionalization, and to try to anticipate what needs need to be met, so there are incentives for most stakeholders. He encouraged, therefore, not to develop a rigid regionalization.
6. Richard Hosier also made a request to help the GEF define what are the boundaries between LULUCF, SFM, REDD, and what specific scientific criteria is needed. Osamu Mizuno, GEF Secretariat, Climate Change Program Manager, echoed this request.
7. Robert Dixon outlined potential areas that the Science Panel could address in its GEF-5 vision –
 - Pull together the GEF's accomplishments – help the GEF tell compelling stories about its successes.

- Advise and help during the GEF-5 replenishment. For example, the emissions profile has changed, as so have the technologies. There are also new climate change funds that could compete with the GEF. What could make the GEF unique, given these characteristics? What could be the potential opportunities for public-private partnerships in GEF-5?
- Focus on emissions in the energy sector, given their rapid growth. Therefore, do not only focus on forests.

Biodiversity break-out group

The following is a summary of discussion from 16 September 2008 breakout session on science vision for biodiversity focal area in anticipation of TAG process for GEF-5. The numbers and titles below follow the numbers and titles in the *Draft Summary of Biodiversity Science Issues for GEF-5 (May 2008)*, written by Paul Ferraro.

1. **GEF-4 Components to Continue.** No one had any problems with what was included in the summary (although there was a brief mention of whether protected area “sustainable financing” should continue to be an SP in GEF-5), but questions were raised by what the science vision process had not identified as elements of GEF-4 to continue: access and benefit-sharing, biosafety and invasive species. It was highlighted that the science vision process was not a systematic review of existing elements and thus absence from the list does not necessarily imply the component should be cut. Nevertheless, the absence of these elements could be interpreted as lack of scientific support for them (Ferraro noted that these topics also did not figure prominently in the Cambridge University-hosted workshop on the “top 100 conservation science questions for policy makers and practitioners”). A question was raised as to whether the GEF could ignore a major component of the CBD like ABS, even if it was deemed to not be a priority based on scientific grounds. With regard to the issue of the GEF contributing to the evidence base in marine protected area effectiveness, participants agreed that the GEF projects should play a role in verifying the implicit assumptions that underlie the application of this intervention globally (participants also noted, as is emphasized in point #12 in the summary, that such verification should be done throughout the GEF portfolio). The GEF-EO noted that such work would also improve the theory of change mapping actions to outcomes that are used in GEF proposals and evaluations.
2. **Integrating Natural Resource Management and Climate Change Portfolios.** The discussion centered on brainstorming about why there weren’t more NRM-CC projects (projects that draw funds from NRM focal areas and CC focal area). Potential barriers include (a) lack of appropriate metrics for measuring GHG emission impacts from NRM projects, (b) lack of awareness among nations that such multi-focal area projects were possible/desirable and no clear signals from GEF-Sec that such proposals are desired, (d) difficulty in writing and supporting such projects (requires capacity and complex coordination and design), (e) nations don’t have much incentive to propose NRM-CC projects because the benefits are less tangible and more diffuse (public) in comparison to initiatives like energy efficiency projects that generate clear, tangible private benefits as well as GHG emissions; and (f) NRM-CC projects are not the most cost-effective way to achieve GHG emission reductions (sequestration gains) and NRM benefits like biodiversity protection on a fixed budget (i.e., one can achieve greater biodiversity and climate benefits by investing in focal area-specific initiatives rather than cross-focal area initiatives). It was suggested to look for lessons in the SLM program, where there is space to do CC-NRM initiatives.
3. **Freshwater Ecosystems Gap.** Although no one disagreed that freshwater biodiversity was underrepresented in GEF portfolio in comparison to this ecosystem’s contribution to global biodiversity, the magnitude of this under representation was questioned. For example, it was suggested that the proportion of Ramsar-eligible sites funded by the GEF is large. Next the group considered if freshwater ecosystems should get more attention in GEF-5 despite their recognized importance. Protecting biodiversity in freshwater ecosystems is often more complex than protection in terrestrial ecosystems because of the scale and connectivity of these systems, which often cross regional and national boundaries. Thus a dollar of investment may do less in freshwater ecosystems than if used elsewhere. For example, the marine protected area SP has had few funded proposals and thus one could question whether it should be making room for freshwater in GEF-5 rather than staying the course in focusing on marine ecosystems. Finally, the group considered how one might increase the number of freshwater initiatives if they were deemed to be important. It was noted that interactions between the BD and IW program would be ideal because the IW can do transboundary work, which is often necessary for

freshwater ecosystem protection. The IW program incorporates some marine biodiversity issues, but few (if any) freshwater biodiversity issues. And few BD projects include freshwater components. Why is that? Would one need a strategic program with “freshwater” in the title? Would set-asides or goals/targets for freshwater ecosystems be needed? Freshwater ecosystems often get little attention within nations and when they do, the attention is often on the quantity and quality of water for human consumption or commercial fish stocks rather than biodiversity. Thus perhaps even with a special focus on these ecosystems in GEF-5, there would be little interest from eligible nations.

4. **Protected and Productive Landscapes.** First it was noted by the GEF-Sec that the separation between protected and productive landscape proposals looked greater than it is because the GEF-Sec encourages proponents to list the SP that covers the focus of the project rather than list every SP that a project may touch upon (so a project that is mainly protected areas with a smaller focus on mainstreaming in productive landscapes would be listed under a protected area SP). Second, the group noted that the GEF-Sec encourages proponents to focus on one or the other, which led to a discussion of whether proposals that try to do too much (large landscapes) were too ambitious and less likely to have impacts. In other words, the scientific rationale for doing joint protected-productive proposals was questioned, particularly in the context of the grant values disbursed by the GEF.
5. **Ecosystem Approach.** No time to discuss.
6. **Biosafety.** The group agreed that the relative effectiveness of national versus regional approaches might be important in areas with small nations within larger biomes, but believed that more thought was needed to determine if the “weakest-link” problem was an empirically relevant issue for GEF-5 given the nations in which the investment takes place and the nature of the investments. For example, would enabling activities be subject to the problem noted in the science vision? Fundamentally, the question comes down to “what can be achieved in a regional program that can’t be achieved in a national program?” Can one answer this question based on characteristics of the site and interventions that are observable to the GEF-Sec and Agencies? One has to determine how to identify “too much investment” is taking place relative to the nation’s neighbors (i.e., the incremental impact of additional investments is small because it is being constrained by the investments of the nations who have made the least progress).
7. **Climate Proofing Biodiversity Investments.** Agreed important and noted that GEF-Sec-CC is currently working on this topic. Agreed that guidance would be necessary if this concept will be operational in GEF-5. Group noted that this concept pushes initiatives back to a landscape approach. Although the concept may be difficult to precisely define and could imply complicated decisions and program design, there are elemental actions that can be considered based around the idea of avoiding isolated fragments of habitat. Ensuring dispersal corridors will be critical.
8. **Biofuels.** No time to discuss.
9. **Coherent Investments under Four-year Cycles and the RAF.** No time to discuss.
10. **Opportunities to Test and Improve the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT).** Only briefly mentioned as add-on to topic #12. No objections, but no time to discuss in depth.
11. **Spatial Targeting of Biodiversity Investments.** First it was not evident to group that such conservation planning exercises were not taking place in country and guiding investments in-country. Second, given political inputs are often more important than scientific inputs when determining where and how funds will be spent, it was not evident that conservation planning would affect outcomes in a substantial way (or, at least, in a cost-effective way).
12. **Conservation Evidence and Experimental Trials.** Little time to discuss. Discussed in context of GEF-4 at beginning of meeting and general agreement that these issues were important, but the open question was how to promote it. Not clear how GEF-5 could actively encourage such effort.

Annex 2.

Participants List for the Science Panel Meeting, 15-17 September 2008 Washington, DC

GEF Evaluation Office

Claudio Volonte, cvolonte@thegef.org
Siv Tokle, stokle@thegef.org
Anna Viggh, aviggh@thegef.org

GEF Secretariat

Monique Barbut, mbarbut@thegef.org
Peter Bjornsen, pbjornsen@thegef.org
Robert Dixon, rdixon1@thegef.org
Gustavo Fonseca, gfonseca1@thegef.org
Osamu Mizuno, omizuno@thegef.org
Nicole Glineur, nglineur@thegef.org
Danielius Piovoriunas, dpiovoriunas@thegef.org
Boni Biagini, bbiagini@thegef.org
Jaime Cavalier, jcavelier@thegef.org
Ivan Zavadsky, izavadsky@thegef.org
Yoko Watanabe, [ywatane@thegef.org](mailto:ywatanabe@thegef.org)
Zhihong Zhang, zzhang2@thegef.org
Dimitrios Zevgolts, dzevgolis@thegef.org
Andrea Kutter, akutter@thegef.org

IFC

Stacy Swann, sswann@ifc.org

UNCCD

Melchiade Bukuru, bukuru@un.org

UNDP/GEF

John Hough, john.hough@undp.org
Nancy Bennet, nancy.bennet@undp.org

UNEP/DGEF

Maryam Niamir-Fuller, maryam.niamir-fuller@unep.org
Kristin McLaughlin, km@rona.unep.org
Isabelle Vanderbeck, isabelle.vanderbeck@unep.org

UNEP/RONA

Paul Horwitz, ph@rona.unep.org

UNFCCC

Yolando Velasco, yvelasco@unfccc.int

Science Panel Members

Thomas Lovejoy, lovejoy@heinzctr.org
Michael Stocking, m.stocking@uea.ac.uk
Paul Ferraro, prcpjf@langate.gsu.edu
N. H. Ravindranath, ravi@ces.iisc.ernet.in
Meryl Williams, Scylla@myjaring.net,
meryljwilliams@gmail.com
Bo Wahlstrom, bo.wahlstrom@kemi.se

STAP Secretariat

Doug Taylor, dt@rona.unep.org
Lev Neretin, ln@rona.unep.org
Guadalupe Duron, gd@rona.unep.org
Robin Burgess, rb@rona.unep.org

World Bank

Steve Gorman, sgorman@worldbank.org
Dick Hosier, rhosier@worldbank.org
Kathy MacKinnon, kmackinnon@worldbank.org