



# Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.28/Inf.8  
May 11, 2006

---

GEF Council  
June 6-9, 2006

## REPORT OF THE 8<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF STAP III, APRIL 4-6, 2006

(Prepared by Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel)

## **REPORT OF THE 8<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF STAP III, APRIL 4-6 2006**

1. The eighth and last meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel III (STAP III) to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) was held on 4-6 April 2006, in Room I8-300, in the Latin America building of the World Bank at 1850 I Street, NW, Washington, DC. The meeting was preceded by a one-day meeting on Land Degradation and the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and by a closed meeting of the Panel. In addition, working group meetings were held during the meeting between Panel Members, the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies, on specific work program items. The principal outcomes from the plenary and working group meeting are recorded in these minutes. Details of those attending are in Annex A.

### **Items 1, 2 and 3: Opening session and reports from the GEF Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies and the Evaluation Office**

2. The meeting was opened by Yolanda Kakabadse, the Chair of STAP. She invited Len Good, GEF CEO and Chairman, to make a statement, following the adoption of the agenda. Len Good thanked the outgoing STAP members for their contribution to the GEF, and said that STAP is moving in the right direction and that communication between STAP and the GEF has much improved. He informed the Panel of the status of the two main current issues in the GEF, namely the RAF and the replenishment. The replenishment of GEF-4 is still under negotiation among the donors. On the RAF, he said that the positive implication is that it allows countries to plan over 4 years, and will lead to country level processes to more optimally use resources.
3. STAP members noted the implications for STAP of the RAF, and whether STAP should focus more on products and tools that could be used by countries. In response, Len Good was supportive of the idea, and referred to adaptation as an area where countries will need more support in formulating concrete measures. STAP also noted that the RAF will require more capacity building, could lengthen the project cycle, and that the weak coordination between departments may be an impediment. Len Good responded that the regional workshops to present the RAF and the focal point support project are addressing this concern.
4. STAP also raised the issue of the shift in discussion from the global environment to development, and the implication for the GEF. Len Good responded that the GEF is seeking to close the gap between global environmental and local benefits, and that with the new focal areas of land degradation and POPs, the GEF can now take an integrated approach to natural resource management and address the environment – development linkage.

5. The STAP Chair also invited the Implementing Agencies and Evaluation Office to make a statement.
- a. *UNEP, Olivier Deleuze* - Olivier Deleuze informed the members of the appointment of Achim Steiner as the new Executive Director of UNEP, from 15 June 2006. He briefed the Panel on the UNEP Governing Council and SAICEM meetings in February in Dubai. The latter produced an action plan and overarching policy.
  - b. *UNDP, John Hough* - John Hough, on behalf of Frank Pinto, expressed concern about the exhaustion of the biodiversity quota, and the impacts it will have on projects that have been technically cleared. He noted: the increasing interest in adaptation, and the significant amount of demand and work as a result of the new funds; that POPs is moving slowly but is picking up pace.
  - c. *Evaluation Office, Rob Van den Berg* - Rob Van den Berg gave a brief overview to the Panel of the workplan of the Evaluation Office, and informed the members of the Council's approval of the new M&E policy. On the collaboration with STAP, he noted the importance of working on indicators, and asked that STAP supports GEF in developing indicators. He said that STAP has a role in advising in M&E from an S&T perspective, and referred to the proposal to evaluate the role of science in the GEF. He made the observation that the relation between STAP and EO is still loose and ad-hoc, although it had led to collaboration on knowledge management, and the Chair had participated in the Hague meeting. He stressed the need for a more structured relation, information exchange, and said that a joint project would be a good idea.

#### **Item 4: STAP reports on intersessional activities**

6. The Chair commenced the item on reports on intersessional activities with an overview of STAP's accomplishment in FY05 and 06.
- a. *STAP's accomplishments in FY05-06* - In summary, STAP delivered advice on the following topics:
    - i. Biodiversity
      - Advice on mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and sectors. STAP's workshop report has been recently published by the GEF.
      - Advice, in the form of a sourcebook, on Environmental Risk Assessment of Genetically Modified Organisms – a Case of *Bt* Cotton in Brazil.

ii. Climate Change

- Advice on liquid biofuels for the transport sector. A report will be submitted to the June 2006 Council meeting.

iii. International Waters

- Advice on integrating groundwater, managed aquifer recharge, into the GEF focal areas. A report will be submitted to the June 2006 Council meeting.

iv. Land Degradation

- Advice on sustainable land management of drylands. Report submitted to the GEF Council in November 2005.

v. Interlinkages

- The principal objective of the report is to provide conceptual thinking on a “design tool” which could enable the GEF to make better use of the synergies between the focal areas. The report was submitted to the GEF Council in November 2005.

vi. Corporate

- **Improving the effectiveness of STAP.** STAP held a retreat in June 2005 to discuss, with the Implementing Agencies and GEF Secretariat, how to improve the effectiveness of STAP. The outcome of the retreat was a set of key measures, presented to the GEF Council in November 2005.
- **Roster.** Based on the GEF Council’s request for a more transparent and independent roster review process, STAP engaged in an extensive consultative process with the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies, resulting in agreed revised procedure for the selection of STAP roster reviewers, will be submitted to the Council in June 2006.
- In addition, STAP, in partnership with the World Fish Center, also convened a book-writing workshop in October 2005 to initiate work on the third biosafety sourcebook on transgenic fish. STAP also commissioned three inter-related studies on the global benefits in the land degradation focal area.

b. *Intersessional activities*

- i. STAP Technical Meeting on the global benefits in the land degradation focal area, and the application of the MA methodology, Washington, D.C. 3 April 2006 - Angela Cropper reported that this was a very useful meeting to assist the GEF in responding to the Council's request to better define and articulate the global benefits in land degradation. The meeting explored the conceptual and methodological issues surrounding global benefits, and examined the question of indicators. As a result, three sets of TORs for three inter-related studies were adopted, as an input into STAP's forthcoming advice on global benefits founded on factual evidence and scientific underpinning.
- ii. The GEF Evaluators meeting, The Hague, January 2006 - Yolanda Kakabadse briefed the meeting on her participation, highlighting the seven questions on the scientific underpinning of GEF's strategies, programs and interventions.
  1. Is the GEF aware of scientific developments relevant to its business, and are the most recent paradigms applied in its strategic thinking?
  2. Are the programs and strategies of the GEF based on the most up-to-date insights in what works and why in global environmental issues?
  3. Are the GEF's interventions and projects based on high quality analysis and knowledge on what works and why?
  4. What should be the appropriate role of STAP on all these levels?
  5. Were the appropriate levels of expertise and analysis engaged and applied?
  6. How is causality perceived in strategies, programs and interventions? Have chains of causality been adequately identified and addressed?
  7. Have the hypotheses, predictions and assumptions been adequately peer-reviewed?
- iii. Knowledge Management (KM) Meeting, January 2006 - Peter Hennicke briefed about his participation in the meeting, and emphasized the importance of securing institutional knowledge, and cited IW-learn as a model. He suggested a pilot initiative in KM in the climate change focal area.
- iv. Ad-hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment Meeting - Anne Kapuscinski reported on the key issues that emerged from this meeting of experts, including the lack of baseline information, and the scientific and technical capacity building that is required.

- v. SBSTA at COP-11 of the UNFCCC – On behalf of Anand Patwardhan, Anne-Marie Verbeken reported on STAP's participation in SBSTA, and on the discussions with the SBSTA coordinator on STAP cooperation in the implementation of the 5-year work program on adaptation and vulnerability, and coordination with SBSTA of STAP activities in adaptation.

#### **Item 5: Reports to the Council**

7. STAP will send reports to Council on three issues, Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR), Transgenic Fish, and Biofuels. Brief presentations were made on the main conclusions and recommendations.

#### **Item 6: STAP work program: FY06, and confirmed activities in FY07**

8. The STAP Secretariat presented the status of the STAP work program of FY06, and the confirmed activities in FY07. The FY06 work program which had been discussed at the October 2005 STAP meeting, and circulated for comments in November, had to be scaled down as a result of budgetary constraints. Three planned workshops, namely Energy Efficient (EE) buildings, Groundwater in SIDS, and Adaptation to Climate Change will now take place in FY07, as follows: SIDS, 6 – 9 November 2006 in Trinidad and Tobago; EE buildings, 27 November-1 December 2006, Beijing, China . The dates for the adaptation workshop are still to be decided. Cancelled activities are: the publication of the Sourcebook on Transgenic Fish, and the review of soil remediation techniques. The activities for the remainder of FY06 are: 1) the technical meeting on global benefits in land degradation and the application of the MA on 3 April 2006, and the three associated studies which will be finalized by end June 2006; 2) commissioning of the background paper for the Groundwater in SIDS workshop; and 3) commissioning of the technical background papers for the EE building workshop. An overview of the status of the FY06 work program is contained in table 1.

9. In addition, STAP will also focus on a number of corporate issues, in particular the roster and the Assembly.

Table 1: Overview of the FY06 Work Program

FY06 WORK PROGRAM		
Activity	Status	Comments
1. Biofuels workshop and advice (New Delhi, September 2005)	Completed - Report sent to GEF Council, June 2006	
2. Managed Aquifer Recharge workshop (New Delhi, September 2005)	Completed - Report sent to GEF Council, June 2006	
3. Transgenic Fish	Completed - Report sent to GEF Council, June 2006	
4. <i>Bt</i> Cotton in Brazil	Completed - Source Book published	
5. Applying the MA methodology to the Land Degradation focal area – 3 studies; technical meeting on 3 April 2006	Meeting held; Studies under preparation.	Completion date of studies: end June 2006. Advice to Council in November 2006.
6. SIDS/Groundwater workshop	Deferred to 6-9 November 2006, Trinidad and Tobago	Background paper commissioned – agreed workshop proposal
7. EE Building workshop	Deferred to 27 November-1 December 2006, Beijing, China	Technical background paper to be commissioned in FY07
8. Adaptation workshop	Deferred to FY07. Dates to be decided	Workshop proposal to be prepared.
9. Roster (reconstitution, review process, revision of the TORs)	On-going	
10. GEF Assembly (Quadrennial report, STAP participation)	On-going	

## Item 7: Working Groups

10. Since this was the last meeting of STAP III, no new activities were discussed in the working groups, which focused mainly on two deferred activities, namely the EE building and SIDS workshops, and the draft reports of the recently concluded workshops on MAR and biofuels.

### a. *Summary of the international waters working group*

- i. MAR workshop report: Angela Cropper requested for the GEF Secretariat to forward comments on the MAR workshop report to the STAP Secretariat by 18 April. She said it was important for the IW

GEF Secretariat team to review the draft, and ensure the paper covered well the rationale for linking groundwater management, especially MAR, to the other focal areas of the GEF.

- ii. Al Duda, GEF Secretariat, informed the group about a meeting on the science of IW projects, which has been discussed in the inter-agency task force. He said the meeting would be a UNEP initiative, resulting from an MSP. The meeting would occur in between the bi-annual IW portfolio meeting, and would focus on understanding better the science emerging from IW projects. When the meeting dates are agreed, the GEF Secretariat said it would like STAP's involvement with identifying scientists, contributing to the program, and hosting sessions.
- iii. Groundwater and SIDS workshop: The workshop would focus on groundwater and SIDS, build on the previous STAP workshops on integrating groundwater and MAR into the other focal areas, and continue to advance STAP's interlinkages work. The group agreed that SIDS provides good case study material to discuss the interlinkages between international waters, and the other focal areas. It was agreed, therefore, to structure the workshop based on the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) framework to enable discussions on ecosystem services, and interlinkages. It was further agreed to focus on 5 to 6 GEF projects (case studies) to reflect on issues relevant to groundwater and SIDS, interlinkages (with biodiversity, adaptation, POPs, land management), and best practices. The case studies will be selected from the IW, biodiversity, and climate change portfolios. Non-GEF case studies will also be identified and discussed at the workshop. Participants will include SIDS stakeholders (representing geographical regions and geological characteristics of SIDS), as well as the GEF Secretariat, Implementing Agencies and Executing Agencies.
- iv. The GEF Secretariat also requested that one STAP member per focal area and one member from each of the inter-agency focal area task forces be represented at the meeting. The group agreed the workshop proposal needs to be more specific, and address the current needs of the GEF. As a first step, Angela Cropper requested for the GEF Secretariat and the inter-agency IW task force to clarify the needs, identify projects (cases) to be discussed at workshop, provide feedback on the needs for the background paper, and suggestions for participants. The GEF Secretariat agreed to address this request by the end of April.
- v. STAP members with expertise on POPs are requested to provide input on how POPs can be factored into the SIDS workshop. The group also urged for the workshop to discuss the following issues:



mainstreaming biodiversity in seascapes, groundwater and freshwater systems in SIDS, the impacts of land degradation and climate variability on SIDS, and human well-being.

b. *Summary of the Climate Change working group*

- i. Biofuels report - Anjali Shanker presented (by teleconference) the main conclusions from the workshop as set out in the report. The need for a national biomass strategy, which addresses conflicting needs for food, energy and other uses, when developing a biofuel program, was emphasized. Ideally, a percentage of land can then be decided on and set aside for biofuels. The importance of environmental safeguards was also stressed, and biofuels should not counteract the objectives and interventions in other focal areas.
- ii. EE building workshop - Thomas Johansson will take the lead on the workshop from the Panel's side. Peter Hennicke and the Wuppertal institute will continue to be involved and provide substantive support to the workshop. The proposed dates for the workshop are 27 November-1 December 2006, and the proposed venue is Beijing. The current proposal (dated November 2005) will be re-circulated to the GEF agencies and the TORs of the technical papers revised. Since only 100,000 US\$ is available for the workshop from the STAP budget, co-financing will be sought. There are indications from the German Energy Agency and the China Energy Foundation that they want to co-organize the event and support it financially, or in kind. Zihong of the GEF Secretariat suggested STAP gets in touch with the Ministry of Construction, which has a big energy efficient building program.
- iii. The link with knowledge management was discussed, and the suggestion made to take building codes projects as a pilot. This would be very useful for GEF project development and programs. A link should be made with the UNDP strategy (of developing standard packages), and with the information/KM pillar of the programming framework.

## Item 8: The STAP roster

### a) *Procedures for an independent roster review*

11. Yolanda Kakabadse, STAP Chair, introduced the document “Minutes of the Meeting on the Adoption of an Independent and Transparent STAP Roster Review Process” (Document UNEP/GEF/STAP III/8/8/Add.1), and said the proposal was prepared in response to the GEF Council’s request to establish and implement an independent and transparent selection of roster reviewers. The STAP Chair asked the participants to focus on the proposal, but to consider other ideas that are outside the box. The summary of the discussion and decisions adopted are as follows:

- i. Number of reviewers that should be selected by STAP for each project: at least three reviewers to allow for some degree of flexibility. **Decision: (4d) - STAP will select three roster reviewers for each concept.**
- ii. Point (4g) is dropped because (4f) covers the same point: STAP will search for and identify experts outside the roster if no suitable expert can be found. Non-roster experts identified by STAP for the review of a project will not be automatically added to the roster. Instead their inclusion in the roster will be considered on a case-by-case basis. **Decision: (4g) is deleted.**
- iii. Rohit Khanna (World Bank) said the time needed for the selection of the reviewer is important in order to avoid the slipping of projects. Further clarification was requested on: 1) when would the GEF Secretariat send the list of approved concepts, and concept documentation to the STAP Secretariat; 2) when would the STAP Secretariat send the concept documentation and the results of the initial roster search to the STAP members; and 3) What happens when all three proposed reviewers are not available, and what time frame would be managed if a new search is required? **Response: the GEF Secretariat will send the concept documentation to the STAP Secretariat as soon as it publishes the pipeline. The STAP Secretariat will take one week or less depending on the number of projects in the pipeline to send the search results to the Panel members. Panel members will have up to two weeks to finalize their recommendations to the IAs. For projects which are fast-tracked, and in case none of the recommended reviewers are available, solutions would be created on a need basis.**
- iv. Rohit Khanna also requested further clarification on the following issues: Who is responsible for communicating with the roster expert? Are the Implementing Agencies still required to evaluate the reviewers? **Response: the Implementing Agencies are responsible for communicating with the roster reviewer, and continue to be responsible for evaluating the performance of the roster expert (STAP will also assess their performance).**
- v. Further clarification was also sought by the World Bank on the following text (4k): “The Implementing Agency would need to inform the STAP Secretariat

which reviewer(s) was selected prior to commissioning review.” **Decision:** - **Delete (4k) because the information on the reviewer can be found in the reviewer’s evaluation, which the Implementing Agencies are required to submit.**

- vi. (4h) “STAP may recommend the use of two, instead of one reviewer, if it deems that one reviewer cannot cover all the elements of the project with equal competence”. Concerns were raised by World Bank about the absence of criteria for the use of two reviewers. STAP as a whole supports the view that the nature and complexity of a project should determine whether 1 or 2 reviewers are necessary, and that it is STAP’s responsibility to ensure that projects that go into the work program are adequately reviewed. The Implementing Agency can then decide to act on the recommendation or not. STAP agreed on the need to be clear on the basis and criteria for adding a second reviewer, and on the need for clear Terms of Reference for the reviews. In the case STAP recommends two reviewers instead of one it will select 2 times 3 reviewers with complementary expertise. **Decision – retain (4h) and STAP will identify two times three reviewers in case it recommends the use of two reviewers. STAP will develop criteria for the use of two reviewers.**
- vii. Rohit Khanna also recommended removing, or discussing in a separate session on the role of the roster review, the following: (4j) “STAP may advise on an early roster review of complex and innovative projects”. He also asked what criteria would be used to recommend an early project review. Ramesh Ramankutty clarified that STAP can provide advice on projects during any point in the project cycle. STAP also decided to discuss early project reviews in a broader discussion on the role of the roster review. STAP recognized the need to clarify its advisory function when related to early project reviews. **Decision:** (4j) - STAP decided to delete this text from the proposal, and to define criteria for early project reviews.
- viii. In the event that an Implementing Agency disagrees with the selection of reviewers by STAP, the STAP Chair requested that clarification be provided on why the experts are not suitable. The World Bank also requested flexibility in the time frame allotted on forwarding the request for alternative reviewers. **Decision:** (4m) – In their requests to the STAP Chair for alternative reviewers, the Implementing Agencies will note why the selection of reviewers by STAP was not appropriate. The time frame for submitting requests for alternative reviewers is to be given further consideration, bearing in mind the World Bank’s request for flexibility whilst avoiding an open process.

*b) Role, focus and timing of the STAP roster review*

- 12. Anand Patwardhan introduced a second roster paper “Note on role, focus and timing of the STAP roster review” (Document UNEP/GEF/STAP III/8/8/Add.3). The distinction was noted between a review of a project prior to work program inclusion and early in the project development stage. There was broad agreement that the former is the role of the roster, and can be viewed as a technical quality stamp by STAP, while the latter has an advisory, and

quality enhancing function. The latter could be fulfilled by the Panel, through the selective review mechanism. Separate Terms of Reference would be required for an early review by the Panel.

13. The TORs for the roster review was briefly touched on, and it was agreed that the current TORs, which date from 1995 and overlap to an extent with the technical review by the GEF Secretariat, need revision and re-focusing. Refocused TORs for the STAP roster review will be prepared by the STAP Secretariat in consultation with the Panel, the GEF Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies, and the Evaluation Office, in advance of the next meeting of STAP. The Evaluation Office noted that the on-going joint project cycle evaluation will look at the role of the roster review.

*c) Reconstitution of the Roster*

14. Yolanda Kakabadse introduced a third roster document “Reconstituting the STAP Roster of Experts in GEF-4” (Document UNEP/GEF/STAP III/8/8/Add.2), and invited STAP members, and GEF representatives to comment.
15. Anand Patwardhan noted the process for reconstituting the roster is well laid out, and that the main trade-off will be between having a comprehensive roster, and the time it would require to establish, and a small roster, which would require a regular search for experts outside the roster for project review. An optimal size, striking a balance between comprehensiveness and compactness, commensurate with the needs of the Implementing Agencies should be aimed for. UNEP noted that a balanced roster, with an adequate number of experts in each of the focal areas is needed, and quoted the Land Degradation section which only has 5 experts. The importance of the inclusion of experts in the new and emerging issues, such as adaptation, was also stressed.
16. It was agreed that a “call for an expression of interest” is an important element of reconstituting the roster in order to avoid that it becomes a closed and self-sufficient process. The need for a time frame, number cap and criteria for the call for an expression of interest was recognized.

**Item 9: The GEF Assembly**

*a) Quadrennial Report of STAP to the GEF Assembly*

17. Its mandate requires STAP to provide triennial reports to the GEF Assembly on the broad scientific and technical issues that emerged during the preceding phase of the GEF and on emerging issues and gaps. The STAP meeting in Washington, DC in October 2005 established a committee of four members, led by Habiba Gitay, to lead this process. As an initial step, a document was produced drawing on material sent by Panel members deriving from their experiences in their respective areas of expertise, together with emerging priorities of science and technology relevant to other international organizations. This formed the basis of a document to be discussed at the STAP meeting, from whence a final document to be presented to the GEF Assembly in August 2006 is to be produced.

18. At the April meeting this document was discussed in plenary. Panel deliberated on the format and structure, and a time frame in which to complete this task, given that it will have to be submitted to the GEF Assembly in July 2006. Rather than adopt the format of previous reports which have resulted in rather lengthy and unwieldy tomes, it was decided to develop a report that is short and punchy, limiting its total length to about 12-15 pages. Also, it was decided to adopt a 'thematic' approach, rather than take the focal area approach. The rationale is that many of the current and emerging scientific and technical issues do not neatly fit into one of the five focal areas that define the work of the GEF. However, on issues that emerged during the preceding phase of the GEF the traditional approach would be retained, and a section would accordingly be devoted to them. This is because all such activities were undertaken within the ambit of a specific focal area. The work programme on inter-linkages would have a subsection to itself.
19. On the basis of the foregoing, the Panel defined the outline of this document, identified lead authors for each section, and identified the next steps. The outline of this document is in five main sections, namely:
  1. Broad context
  2. Science and technology trends and emerging issues
    - 2.1 State of science and emerging issues
    - 2.2 Emerging Technology issues and scaling up
    - 2.3 Taking knowledge to practice
  3. Substantive science and technology contributions from STAP III
  4. Implications and science and technology priorities for STAP IV,
  5. Strengthening science and technology in the GEF
20. While Lead authors were tasked with leading each section, individual panelists were identified for each specific subject within the section.
21. The broad context lays the ground for the rest of the document and addresses the major non-scientific and non-technical concerns of the STAP within GEF, and the financial and organizational components of the work of STAP/GEF. Panel discussed among themselves and agreed that Science and technology trends and emerging issues could be discussed under three broad headlines. Firstly, the state of science of which major concerns are: 1) abrupt climate change; 2) invasive alien species, including avian flu; 3) findings of the millennium ecosystem assessment (MA); and 4) access and benefit sharing as the third objective of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
22. Second is the issue of emerging technology issues and the scaling up of technology. Pertinent issues identified within this headline include primarily: 1) low carbon and clean energy; 2) bioinformatics; and 3) genomics.
23. The section taking knowledge to practice comprises those processes that have to be instituted and managed to realize the objectives of the work of STAP and GEF, and include: 1) capacity building; 2) technology and scaling up, together with lead markets; 3) knowledge management; and 4) interlinkages and multiple benefits.

24. As required by the mandate, there has to be an element of looking back, and highlighting the work of STAP III. This is covered under the section titled Substantive S&T contributions from STAP III, and covers all the activities undertaken in the period 2004-2006.
25. A fourth section titled the Implication and Science and Technology Priorities for STAP IV identified the following as of significance:
1. Mainstreaming: within this subsection are issues relevant to adaptation, biodiversity in production, landscapes, land degradation and integrated chemical management.
  2. Nutrient and waste management.
  3. Development while mitigating climate change.
  4. SIDS, and the inter-linkages between climate change and other focal areas.
26. Lastly, a section titled Strengthening science and technology in the GEF echoes previous work undertaken to make STAP more relevant, and is directed towards maximizing the use of objective scientific advice by the GEF.
27. It was agreed the above issues in the format outlined would form the basis of STAP III's Quadrennial report to the GEF Assembly in August 2006. Due to other pressing commitments elsewhere, Habiba Gitay could not continue leading this process and Cristian Samper kindly agreed to take over the lead role. It was further agreed that a strict timeline was necessary to ensure a timely completion and submission of this report. The following timeline was agreed upon.
- April 7      Zero Order Draft
  - April 17     First draft of Individual Sections
  - April 28     Compilation of first draft
  - May 8        Comments on First Draft Due
  - May 15       Second draft of individual Sections
  - May 22       Second draft of complete document
  - May 31       Comments on Second Draft
  - June 12      Final Paper completed

*b) STAP participation in the Assembly*

28. The STAP Chair briefed the Panel members on the on-going dialogue with the GEF Secretariat on STAP's input into the Assembly. The proposal is that the Chair of STAP will make a statement at the Assembly, submit a report, and individual members will be invited to kick-off the high level roundtables, based on discussion notes, in which STAP's input is expected. Three themes are proposed for the high-level panels: 1) Opportunities and Challenges for the GEF as a financial mechanism for MEAs: Regional Perspectives; 2) Sustainable development, economic growth and the global environment; and 3) Enhancing the performance at the country level.

29. It was agreed that theme two would be a suitable plank on which to base STAP's contribution. STAP's input would be in the form of bullet points for the Panel discussion, and input into the discussion notes for the Panels, which would be 5-6 pages long.
30. A broad title 'Energy for Sustainable Development, Economic Growth and Global Environment' was proposed. Other focal area issues to be considered were mainstreaming biodiversity and biosafety issues.
31. It was decided finally that a bullet list of what these themes could encompass should be developed, and a discussion to be written out (in language provoking thought and debate) on how these themes can be approached. It was proposed that the round table discussions will be kicked off by two experts (one a STAP Member and the other from partner organizations, e.g. other scientific bodies or SBSTTA member).

*c) First meeting of STAP IV on 1-2 September 2006, Cape Town, South Africa*

32. The STAP Chair informed the Panel that after consultation with the GEF Secretariat on holding the first meeting of the new Panel immediately after the Assembly, that the meeting will take place on 1-2 September in Cape Town, South Africa.

**Item 10: An evaluation of the role of science**

33. Yolanda Kakabadse invited Rob Van den Berg to present the key issues and questions in an evaluation of the role of science in the GEF, for discussion with STAP.
34. *Presentation by Rob Van den Berg* - Key questions for the GEF are: Does the GEF understand the world? Does the GEF make use of the best and most recent technologies and interventions? Can the GEF track its achievements and impact on the global environment? In terms of the role of science, related questions are: 1) Is the GEF aware of scientific developments relevant to its business, and are not the most recent paradigms applied in its strategic thinking? 2) Are the programs and strategies of the GEF based on the most up-to-date insights in what works and why in global environmental issues? and 3) Are the GEF's interventions and projects based on high quality analysis and knowledge on what worked and why?
35. The scope of a possible evaluation would have to be carefully considered: an evaluation at all levels (policy, intervention, STAP), or one level, or one focal area only? Or focus on a substantive issue, for example the integration of focal areas? In addition, the methodology would need to be determined, and collaboration with STAP discussed.

*Key points from the discussion:*

- i. What would be the objective of the evaluation? The parameters and boundaries of the evaluation should stem from what you want to achieve.

- ii. A key question is “how can science maximize impacts of projects? A translation of science into operations and better solutions is required.
- iii. The STAP focal point said that there is a broad consensus of the role of science, but that it is the integration that is more problematic. What are the barriers to achieving integration?
- iv. STAP commented that scientific issues are perhaps identified in the GEF, but not absorbed.
- v. The use of science should be focused on rather than the science itself.
- vi. Which mechanism and processes are needed to achieve integration of science?
- vii. Is the GEF a learning organization? What emerged from the Hague meeting is an unease that the mechanisms in the GEF are not conducive to getting science in, that GEF is not aware of new developments, and that some projects are based on outmoded models and practices.
- viii. Should the evaluation be a layered study? It is important to look at the layer above projects.
- ix. What kind of level of science in projects is required? Cutting edge, or good practice?
- x. Do we need an evaluation of STAP? Should there be a continuous evaluation of STAP, and the basis on which it operates? STAP needs to have its mandate re-affirmed by the Council – it has drifted.
- xi. How to hardwire STAP and science into the GEF? Science should be brought to bear on the strategic priorities in the GEF.
- xii. Should we look at the series of examples where S&T successfully interacted with the GEF, and are these good examples outliers?

36. Rob Van den Berg will come back to STAP with a proposal for an evaluation of the role of science based on the initial feedback and views of STAP. He suggested that members write an autobiographical note on their experience with STAP. It should be noted that the Council would have to approve the evaluation and allocate funds for it.



---

**UNEP/GEF/STAP III/8**

---

## **Annex A**

### **Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel**

#### **Eighth Meeting of STAP III**

**Washington D.C., 4-6 April 2006**

## **8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of STAP III 4-6 April 2006**

### **Participants List (all or in part)**

#### **STAP Members**

1. Yolanda Kakabadse  
Fundacion Futuro Latinoamericano  
Mariano Echeverria 843  
Quito, Ecuador  
Tel: +593 2 292 0635  
Email: [yolandak@uio.satnet.net](mailto:yolandak@uio.satnet.net)
2. Habiba Gitay  
Vice Chairperson, STAP  
Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Capacity Building Coordinator  
(visiting Fellow at the Australian National University)  
9918 Chase Hill Court  
Vienna, VA 22182  
USA  
Tel. +703 438 3064  
Email: [habiba.gitay@anu.edu.au](mailto:habiba.gitay@anu.edu.au)
3. Peter Hennicke  
President, Wuppertal Institute  
for Climate, Environment and Energy  
Doppersberg 19, 42103 Wuppertal  
Germany  
Tel: +49 202 2492 100  
Fax: +49 202 2492 108  
Email: [Peter.hennicke@wupperinst.org](mailto:Peter.hennicke@wupperinst.org);  
[sylvia.borbonus@wupperinst.org](mailto:sylvia.borbonus@wupperinst.org)

4. Saburo Matsui  
Professor  
Graduate School of Global Environmental Studies,  
Department of Technology & Ecology  
Kyoto University  
Yoshida Honmachi,  
Sakyo-ku, Kyoto City  
Kyoto 606-8501  
Japan.  
Tel : + 81 75 753 5151  
Fax: + 81 75 753 3335  
Email : [matsui@eden.env.kyoto-u.ac.jp](mailto:matsui@eden.env.kyoto-u.ac.jp)
5. Anand Patwardhan  
IIT  
Shailesh J. Mehta School of Management  
Indian Institute of Technology  
Powai, Mumbai 400076  
India  
Tel: + 91 22 25767788  
Fax: + 91 22 2572 3480  
Email : [anand@iitb.ac.in](mailto:anand@iitb.ac.in); [apat@yahoo.com](mailto:apat@yahoo.com); [edtifac@tifac.org.in](mailto:edtifac@tifac.org.in)
6. Thomas Johansson  
Professor and Director  
International Institute for Industrial  
Environmental Economics  
Lund University  
P.O. Box 196  
221 00 Lund  
Sweden  
Tel: + 46 46 222 0222  
Fax: + 46 46 222 0220  
Email: [thomas.b.johansson@iiiee.lu.se](mailto:thomas.b.johansson@iiiee.lu.se)
7. Timothy Williams  
Chief Programme Officer (Agriculture)  
Special Advisory Services Division  
Commonwealth Secretariat  
Marlborough House  
Pall Mall  
London, SW1Y 5HX  
UK  
Tel: +44 0 20 7747 6374  
Email: [t.williams@commonwealth.int](mailto:t.williams@commonwealth.int)

8. Brian Huntley  
Chief Executive  
National Botanical Institute  
Kirstenbosch  
Private Bag X7  
Claremont 7735, Cape Town  
South Africa  
Tel.: +27 21 799 8800 or +27 72 799 8766  
Email: [Huntley@sanbi.org](mailto:Huntley@sanbi.org); [laidler@sanbi.org](mailto:laidler@sanbi.org)
9. Sani Ibrahim  
Associate Professor  
School of Chemical Sciences  
Universiti Sains Malaysia  
11800 USM, Pulau Pinang  
Malaysia  
Tel: + 604 6577888 ext 3555  
Email: [sani@usm.my](mailto:sani@usm.my), [sanihim@yahoo.com](mailto:sanihim@yahoo.com)
10. Cristian Samper  
Director  
Smithsonian Institute  
National Museum for Natural History  
10<sup>th</sup> & Constitution Avenue, NW  
Suite 421  
Washington, DC 20560-0106  
Tel: +202 633-2664  
Email: [samperc@si.edu](mailto:samperc@si.edu)
11. Angela Cropper  
2 Mt. Anne Drive, Second Avenue  
Cascade  
Port of Spain  
Trinidad and Tobago, W.I.  
Tel: + 1-868-626-2628  
Email: [acropper@thecropperfoundation.org](mailto:acropper@thecropperfoundation.org)
12. Peter Schei  
DG PJS  
Fridtjof Nansen Institute  
PO Box 326  
NO-1326 Lysaker, Norway  
Phone: +47 67 11 19 00  
E-mail: [pjs@fni.no](mailto:pjs@fni.no)

13. Anne Kapuscinski  
Director  
Institute for Social, Economic and  
Ecological Sustainability (ISEES)  
University of Minnesota  
186 McNeal Hall  
1985 Buford Avenue  
St. Paul, MN 55108, U.S.A.  
Tel: +612 624 7719 or +612 624 7723  
Email: [isees@umn.edu](mailto:isees@umn.edu); [kapus001@umn.edu](mailto:kapus001@umn.edu)
14. Anjali Shanker (via teleconference)  
IED Innovation Energie  
D'veloppement  
2, Chemin de la Chauderaie, 69340  
Francheville  
France  
Tel: +33 4 72 59 13 20  
Mobile: +33 68 38 790 64  
Fax: +33 4 72 59 13 39  
Email: [a.shanker@ied-sa.fr](mailto:a.shanker@ied-sa.fr)

## **FAO**

15. Freddy Nachtergaele  
Email: [Freddy.Nachtergaele@fao.org](mailto:Freddy.Nachtergaele@fao.org)

## **GEF Secretariat**

16. Len Good  
CEO & Chairman  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-473-3202  
Email: [lgood@thegef.org](mailto:lgood@thegef.org)
17. Patricia Bliss-Guest  
Deputy CEO  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-473-4678  
Email: [pbliss-guest@thegef.org](mailto:pbliss-guest@thegef.org)

18. Ramesh Ramankutty  
Head, Operations and Business Strategy  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-458-2725  
Email: [ramankutty@thegef.org](mailto:ramankutty@thegef.org)
19. Peter Bjornsen  
Senior Policy Officer  
Operations and Business Strategy  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-473-4884  
Email: [pbjornsen@thegef.org](mailto:pbjornsen@thegef.org)
20. Andrea Merla  
Consultant, International Waters  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-458-8198  
Email: [amerla@thegef.org](mailto:amerla@thegef.org)
21. Christian Severin  
Program Officer, Land & Water  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-458-2001  
Email: [cseverin@thegef.org](mailto:cseverin@thegef.org)
22. Christine Woerlen  
Program Manager, Climate Change  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-473-5196  
Email: [cwoerlen@thegef.org](mailto:cwoerlen@thegef.org)
23. Paz Valiente  
Program Manager, Senior Environmental Specialist  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-458-8863  
Email: [pvaliente@thegef.org](mailto:pvaliente@thegef.org)

24. Zhihong Zhang  
Program Manager, Sr. Climate Change Specialist  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-473-9852  
Email: [zzhang@thegef.org](mailto:zzhang@thegef.org)
25. Al Duda  
Sr. Adviser, International Waters  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-473-1077  
Email: [aduda@thegef.org](mailto:aduda@thegef.org)
26. Andrea Kutter  
Program Manager, Natural Resources Specialist  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-473-4231  
Email: [akutter@thegef.org](mailto:akutter@thegef.org)
27. Jozef Lubbers  
Sr. Environmental Specialist, Land & Water  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-458-8216  
Email: [jlubbers@thegef.org](mailto:jlubbers@thegef.org)
28. Moctar Toure  
Team Leader, Land & Water  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-473-9008  
Email: [mtoure@thegef.org](mailto:mtoure@thegef.org)
29. Funke Oyewole  
Team Leader, Corporate Affairs  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-473-4486  
Email: [foyewole@thegef.org](mailto:foyewole@thegef.org)

**Evaluation Office**

30. Rob van den Berg  
Director of Evaluation  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-473-6078  
Email: [rvandenberg@thegef.org](mailto:rvandenberg@thegef.org)

31. Aaron Zazueta  
Sr. Evaluation Officer  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-473-6406  
Email: [azazueta@thegef.org](mailto:azazueta@thegef.org)

32. Lee Risby  
Evaluation Officer  
Global Environment Facility  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN G6-602  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-473-7983  
Email: [Irisby@thegef.org](mailto:Irisby@thegef.org)

**UNDP**

33. John Hough  
Principal Technical Adviser for Biodiversity  
UNDP/GEF  
New York, NY  
Tel: 212-906-5560  
Email: [john.hough@undp.org](mailto:john.hough@undp.org)

**UNEP**

34. Olivier DeLeuze  
Officer-in-Charge  
UNEP/DGEF  
PO Box 30552  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: 254-20-7624166  
Email: [olivier.deleuze@unep.org](mailto:olivier.deleuze@unep.org)

35. Anna Tengberg  
Division of GEF  
PO Box 30552  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: 254-20 7624147  
Email: [anna.tengberg@unep.org](mailto:anna.tengberg@unep.org)

**World Bank**

36. Rohit Khanna  
Sr. Operations Officer  
The World Bank  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-458-2685  
E-mail: [rkhanna2@worldbank.org](mailto:rkhanna2@worldbank.org)
37. Claudia Sobrevila  
Thematic Specialist for AFR, LCR  
The World Bank  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-473-5004  
E-mail: [csobrevila@worldbank.org](mailto:csobrevila@worldbank.org)
38. Marea Hatziolos  
Thematic Specialist  
The World Bank  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-473-1061  
E-mail: [mhatziolos@worldbank.org](mailto:mhatziolos@worldbank.org)
39. Tracy Hart  
Thematic Specialist  
The World Bank  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20433  
Tel: 202-458-7465  
E-mail: [thart@worldbank.org](mailto:thart@worldbank.org)

**STAP Secretariat**

40. Anne-Marie Verbeken  
Acting STAP Secretary  
UNEP  
STAP Secretariat  
PO Box 30552  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: +254-20 7623250  
Email: [anne-marie.verbeken@unep.org](mailto:anne-marie.verbeken@unep.org)  
[amv@rona.unep.org](mailto:amv@rona.unep.org)



41. Robert Ondhowe  
Programme Officer  
UNEP  
STAP Secretariat  
PO Box 30552  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: +254-20 7624085  
Email: [robert.ondhowe@unep.org](mailto:robert.ondhowe@unep.org)
42. Guadalupe Duron  
Associate Programme Officer  
UNEP  
STAP Secretariat  
1707 H Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20006  
Tel: 202-974-1313  
Email: [gd@rona.unep.org](mailto:gd@rona.unep.org)
43. Robin Burgess  
Administrative Assistant  
UNEP  
STAP Secretariat  
1707 H Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20006  
Tel: 202-974-1311  
Email: [rb@rona.unep.org](mailto:rb@rona.unep.org)