



# Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.16/Inf.17  
October 18, 2000

---

GEF Council  
November 1-3, 2000

## REPORT OF THE SEVENTH MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL II (STAP II)

WASHINGTON, D.C.  
SEPTEMBER 18-22, 2000

(Prepared by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel)

**Report of the Seventh Meeting of the Scientific and  
Technical Advisory Panel II (STAP II)**

---

**September 18-22, 2000, Washington, D.C.**

**STAP Secretariat  
United Nations Environment Programme**

## **Introduction**

1. In accordance with its Programme of Work, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel II (STAP II) held its seventh meeting from September 18-22, 2000 at the World Bank, MC Building MC-CI-108, Washington, D.C.

### ***Agenda Item 1: Opening of the Meeting***

2. The opening plenary of the Seventh Meeting of STAP II commenced at 9.00 a.m. on September 19, 2000. The meeting was opened by Prof. Madhav Gadgil, Chairman of STAP who welcomed the participants to Washington, D.C.
3. In his introductory remarks, the Chairman made reference to the Executive Session of the Panel which preceded the STAP meeting and indicated that the conclusions reached will be discussed during the STAP meeting.
4. Introductory remarks were also made by Dr. Kenneth King, the Assistant Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the GEF. In addition to welcoming the participants to Washington, he outlined from the GEF perspective, the importance of the meeting to the GEF. In this regard, reference was made to the strategic inputs of STAP into a number of corporate activities, namely, the Second GEF Overall Performance Studies (OPS2), the Impact Studies; the Corporate Business Plan and the Programme Status Review (PSR).
5. At the general level, the Assistant CEO highlighted a number of activities to which the GEF has made a contribution. These included the negotiations on the international legally binding instrument for POPs; the Kyoto and Biosafety Protocols. The GEF contribution to the implementation of Agenda 21 was also highlighted.
6. A number of operational challenges facing the GEF were also highlighted. These included further developing GEF programmatic support to individual countries, integrated environmental management across focal areas to secure multiple benefits; strengthening sustainability of projects; facilitating replication of GEF projects; private sector partnerships and adaptation. Non-project activities which were highlighted as been very important were strengthening of country ownership and support; the country dialogue workshops; strengthening relations with partnership agencies (i.e. Regional Development Banks, UNIDO, etc.); streamlining the project cycle and further consideration of the use of the fee-based system.

### ***Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the Draft Provisional Agenda and Organization of Work***

#### **A. Agenda and Organization of Work**

7. The meeting adopted the draft provisional agenda and organization of work with minor modifications contained in UNEP/GEF/STAP II/7/2/Add.1 and UNEP/GEF/STAP II/7/2/Add.3.

#### **B. Participation**

8. The STAP members attending the meeting were Prof. Madhav Gadgil, Dr. Christine Padoch, Dr. Setijati Sastrapradja, Prof. Jose Sarukhan, Prof. Paola Rossi Pisa, Dr. Zhou Dadi, Prof. Shuzo Nishioka, Prof. Dennis Anderson, Dr. Stephen Karekezi, Prof. Angela Wagener and Prof. Eric Odada.
9. The representatives from the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies who attended the meeting were Dr. Kenneth King, Assistant CEO; Dr. Colin Rees; Dr. Allan Miller, Dr. Herbert Acquay and Jarle Harstad (GEF Secretariat); Dr. Eduardo Fuentes (UNDP); Dr. Lars Vidæus

(World Bank); Ahmed Djoghlaif and Kristine Elliot (UNEP); Dr. Mark Griffith and Ms. Anne-Marie Verbeken (STAP Secretariat).

10. In addition, a number of task managers from the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies participated in selected segments of the meeting, particularly those dealing with the impact studies.

***Agenda Item 3: Report by the GEF Secretariat, Implementing Agencies and Subsidiary Bodies of the Conventions on Issues Relevant to STAP***

11. The representatives of the Implementing Agencies endorsed the view expressed by the Assistant CEO in his introductory remarks. In addition, the representative from UNDP gave an update of the Capacity Development Initiative (CDI).
12. The representative from UNEP took the opportunity to introduce the recently appointed UNEP Regional Director of North America, Ms. L. Brennan Van Dyke. Emphasis was also placed on a number of UNEP/GEF initiatives in which STAP has a role to play. These included the Land Degradation Global Assessment, the Regional Based Assessment for POPs and the formulation of National Biosafety Frameworks. With respect to the latter, the meeting was informed of efforts being undertaken by UNEP/GEF to facilitate greater private sector involvement on biosafety issues and their contribution to the implementation of the protocol.

***Agenda Item 4: Report of the STAP Chairman, other Panel Members and the STAP Secretariat on Intersessional Activities***

13. The STAP Chairman reported that most of the activities during the intersessional period in which he participated, were geared towards supporting the GEF corporate agenda, namely, the impact studies, the CDI and the Targeted Research Committee.
14. Prof. Shuzo Nishioka reported on his participation in the Thirteenth Meeting of the Subsidiary Body of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, Lyon, France, 11-15 September, 2000. Issues which were highlighted which have implications for STAP work include:
  - (i) **Adaptation:** In light of the discussion for the financial mechanism to fund the implementation of State II activities, STAP strategic guidance to the GEF on this issue is important. The strategy proposed by Subsidiary Body 13 (SB13) on this issue includes the need for information and methodologies; the establishment of demonstration projects; integrated management of ecosystems and coastal zone infrastructure development.
  - (ii) **Clean Development Mechanism (CDM):** CDM implies the emergence of a new co-operative technology transfer channel to sustainable development of developing countries. Part of the benefit from Certified Emission Reductions (CER) gained by CDM is supposed to be used for adaptation in developing countries, which should be under some reasonable guidelines, such as GEF strategy for adaptation. As a consequence, the challenge is for the GEF to find an appropriate way to deal with it and identify GEF role in promoting the CDM.
  - (iii) **Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF):** The strong movement towards the utilization of terrestrial ecosystem, mainly forest and its soil, for carbon sequestration will probably have huge impacts on ecosystem, biodiversity and inland water and soil. In the light of the GEF Operational Programme (OP#12) on integrated ecosystem management, careful consideration needs to be given to how the 'forest' is defined in the negotiations, what kind of human activities are recommended as the best practices and how the sustainable management is practiced.

- (iv) **Capacity Building:** Strengthening capacity to cope with climate change in developing countries and economies in transition as well as the importance of scientific and technological capacity was stressed. This, it was suggested, has implications for STAP role in facilitating greater input from the wider scientific and technical community in GEF work on climate change issues.

***Agenda Item 5: Overview of the Monitoring and Evaluation Work Programme with Specific Emphasis on Impact Studies and STAP's Role***

15. The Monitoring and Evaluation Co-ordinator presented an overview of the Monitoring and Evaluation Work Programme with a focus on STAP's Role. The meeting was informed that the Second Study of GEF's Overall Performance (OPS2) will be undertaken between January 2001 and January 2002 by an independent team of international consultants. The study will focus on a number of key elements including the effects of GEF policies on results; operational and programme results; effects of GEF's Institutional Structure and Procedures on results and country ownership and sustainability of results.
16. In preparation for the OPS2, a series of programme/impact studies will be undertaken between October 2000 and March 2001. In general, the programme studies would address three key questions, namely:
- (i) What are the impacts/likely impacts of GEF projects;
  - (ii) What are the most significant implementation issues and lessons?
  - (iii) What are the primary factors influencing sustainability and replication prospects of projects promoted by the GEF - within projects, within a country, regionally or internationally?
17. In addition, a linkage study on land degradation is proposed to complement the three focal area programme studies. A further elaboration of the various programme studies was provided as a basis for more substantive discussion in the focal area contact groups.
18. In terms of modalities for facilitating further collaboration between Monitoring and Evaluation and STAP, a number of ideas were highlighted namely,
- The review of the technical and scientific soundness of GEF portfolio on the basis of the scientific and technical quality of STAP Roster project reviews, including assessments of whether the STAP recommendations have been accepted and followed up by the GEF;
  - Complementary inputs into the programme studies, particularly for review of selected features of projects which are oriented towards scientific and technical objectives. This would be particularly relevant for:
    - Biodiversity projects with relatively large research and monitoring components, including research co-operation;
    - Climate change projects of alternative technology approaches, e.g., solar thermal technology, Brazil biomass gasification;
    - International waters projects with relatively large research and monitoring components.
  - Comments of STAP members on various steps of the programme studies and OPS2.

## ***Agenda Item 6: Programme Status Review: Introduction and Overview***

19. An overview of the Programme Status Reviews (PSR) were presented by the GEF Secretariat Team Leaders for Land and Water Resources, Climate Change and Biodiversity. Following is a summary of the key issues which emerged from the PSR which were identified as possible areas for STAP's future inputs.

### **(a) Land and Water Resources Portfolio**

The land and water resources portfolio is made up of projects relating to Operational Programmes on Waterbody-based (OP#8); Integrated Land and Water Management Focal Area (OP#9); Contaminant-based (OP#10); Integrated Ecosystem Management (OP#12) and the cross-cutting issue of land degradation as it relates to the GEF focal area. To-date the GEF has financed 46 International Waters projects for a total of \$379.3 million. Approximately, \$117.9 million of GEF resources were committed during the Pilot Phase.

The main gaps which were highlighted analysis of OPs 8, 9 and 10 as follows:

- There are no projects addressing the management of transboundary ground water systems. Currently, 67% of the portfolio of OP#8 is made up of projects in freshwater systems and the remaining 33% are in large marine ecosystems (LMEs);
- Only a limited number (approximately 27%) of OP#9 projects are in Africa, a region identified as the initial area of emphasis;
- Only one project in Small Islands Developing States (SIDS), one of the three components of OP#9; and
- Limited private sector involvement in co-financing projects despite being identified as an important source of co-financing for the implementation of priority investments identified through the transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA)/Strategic Action Plan (SAP) process.

In addition, particular emphasis was placed on the cross-cutting area of Integrated Ecosystem Management (OP#12) which is aimed at catalysing widespread adoption of comprehensive ecosystem management interventions that integrates ecological, economic and social goals to achieve multiple local and global benefits. In this regard, specific reference was made to the preparation of a "Handbook on Integrated Ecosystem Management", the implementation of the Land and Water Initiative for Africa and the Action Plan on Land Degradation. The strategic directions and proposed actions for the Land and Water Resources Portfolio are outlined in Table 1.

<b>Strategic Direction</b>	<b>Proposed Action</b>	<b>Lead Organizations</b>
Increase emphasis on timely results on the ground in International Waters projects	Develop basin-wide strategic partnership framework to mobilize financial and technical resources to implement the most urgent priority actions needed to address transboundary environmental issues	Riparian Governments, Basin Commissions or equivalent bodies, STAP, Scientific and Technical Networks, IAs, and GEFSEC
Promote integrated ecosystem management	Prepare an operational handbook on integrated ecosystem management	GEFSEC, STAP and Scientific and Technical Networks
Implement the Africa Land and Water Initiative	Facilitate the development of demonstration projects on integrated land and water management  Prepare and disseminate case studies on good practice on community-based approaches to integrated ecosystem management	GEFSEC and IAs  GEFSEC, STAP and Scientific and Technical Networks
Enhance GEF support for land degradation prevention and control	Prepare operational guidelines for the identification and development of GEF-supported projects on land degradation prevention and control	GEFSEC, IAs and STAP

Table 1: Strategic Directions for the Land and Water Resources in the GEF

## **(b) Climate Change**

The GEF climate change portfolio including the pilot phase (1991-94) has a total of 267 projects and a total cumulative commitment of \$1082.22 million. The largest portfolio in terms of projects and total commitments is OP#6, removal of barriers to cost-effective renewable energy technology, followed by OP#7, commercializing new technologies and OP#5, removal of barriers to energy efficiency.

The major scientific and technical issues which emerged from the PSR under the specific OPs are summarised as follows:

### **(i) Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency (OP#5)**

- **Review of Demand Side Management/Energy Service Companies (DSM/ESCO experience):** Currently, generic demand-side management (DSM) programmes account for two-thirds of the portfolio and an additional 14 projects incorporate some approach based on the use of energy service companies (ESCOs) as a delivery mechanism. A review to assess the experience with this model is necessary.
- **Omission of categories and types of projects:** Generally, the OP#5 project portfolio is imbalanced in the type of projects financed. Projects dealing with passive heating and

cooling/energy efficient buildings; manufacture of energy efficient equipment other than lighting such as boilers, refrigerators; micro-turbines/combined heat and power are not adequately represented in the OP#5 activities.

## (ii) Promoting Renewable Energy (OP#6)

This OP has promoted a wide variety of renewable energy technologies (i.e. low temperature solar thermal heating; biomass; geothermal; wind, hydro and photovoltaic power for rural electricity supply; and grid-connected wind farms and photovoltaic). Rural photovoltaic (PV) projects continue to dominate the portfolio with about fifty per cent of all PV projects focusing on off-grid application.

The scientific and technical issues arising out of the analysis of the portfolio are:

- **The omission of categories and types of projects**, namely village-scale systems, agricultural applications, storage systems, grid-connected wind power etc.

Consideration of other categories of energy systems becomes necessary when one considers that key barriers for future growth of PV use seem not to be so much the barriers addressed by OP#6, but the fact that the vast majority of all rural households which are currently not connected to the GRID are simply too poor to afford costs associated with such technologies. The relative high costs and risks of rural PV barriers removal intervention, demand a more thorough comparison with alternative programming options.

- **Power Sector Reform**: The need for the establishment of a mechanism(s) to ensure the operationalization of power sector reform issues within the current GEF climate change portfolio was emphasised.

## (iii) Reducing the Long-Run Costs of Low GHG-Emitting Technologies (OP#7)

Projects in OP#7 continue to lag behind Corporate Business Plan (CBP) projects. The major issues identified were:

- **The omission of categories and types of projects**: Several technologies identified as promising in the OP remain unaddressed, including advanced biomass to liquid fuels, large-scale grid connected wind power, fuel cells for distributed combined heat and power (CHP) applications, and advanced fossil-fuel gasification and power technologies.
- **Reconsideration of Wind Technologies**: The increasing win-win potential for distributed power wind application and excellent potential to promote their widespread use in the context of energy sector restructuring and re-regulation warrants a review of wind-power as an OP#7 technology.
- **Programmatic Approach to Technology Commercialization**: Consideration should be given to employing a programmatic approach to technologies such as fuel cells, solar thermal plants etc.
- **Integrated Gasification of Clean Coal (IGCC)**: The major issue raised related to this issue is whether GEF resources should be directed to advance clean coal technologies.

## (iv) Sustainable Transportation (OP#11)

Despite the fact that projects in OP#11 are not a significant part of the climate change portfolio to-date, nevertheless, the following areas were highlighted.

- **The Need for a Balance Portfolio**: Additional technologies, beside fuel cells should evolve within this OP;

- **Linkage of Transport Planning to Air Quality:** This is an area that warrants more consideration in the evolving portfolio on transportation.

(v) **Additional Areas**

- **Vulnerability and Adaptation:** This was identified as a priority area for urgent consideration by STAP.
- **Community Participation in Climate Projects:** The social dimensions of climate change has been a major weakness in many GEF climate change projects.

(c) **Biodiversity**

From FY 92 to FY 00, the GEF provided over \$1.18 billion to cover the incremental costs of biodiversity conservation in 395 projects in 123 countries. The activities in these projects are aimed at promoting conservation, sustainable use, and benefit sharing to achieve local, national, and global benefits. In addition, an additional \$2.01 billion in co-financing from counterpart contributions from national and local governments, international donors, project beneficiaries, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the private sector was mobilized.

The trends in portfolio development indicate that the range of projects and coverage are extensive in terms of geographic distribution and global biodiversity issues. However, expansion is required in land degradation as related to biodiversity conservation and sustainable development and selected mountain ecosystem. There is a continuing need to improve participation of the private sector and local communities in GEF interventions. The following issues were identified as requiring follow-up in future development and analysis:

- **Ecosystem management:** COP guidance has been provided, however there is a need for further elaboration in terms of defining its scope and application in projects.
- **Expanding coverage:** Protected areas, while corresponding to national priorities, still comprise a relatively small proportion of biodiversity-rich sites within countries and regions, and there is a need to expand coverage to include the wider productive landscape;
- **Conservation priorities:** There are globally significant sites identified by key conventions and scientific programmes which may not be covered by the current portfolio of GEF-financed biodiversity projects. In addition, there are regions (e.g., Eastern Europe, Middle East, Africa) and specific biodiversity issues (e.g., biosafety, alien and invasive species, benefit sharing, incentive measures) that may need further development and support.
- **Root cause of biodiversity loss:** More support may be needed to help countries and key stakeholders in-country, address the fundamental or root causes of biodiversity loss, including, for example, sector reforms in forestry, coastal management and fisheries, mountains, and in issues related to land degradation and desertification.
- **Sustainable use and poverty alleviation:** Linking sustainable use with biodiversity conservation may include sustainable livelihoods and activities that support poverty alleviation. Special attention would be given to vulnerable groups such as indigenous and local communities and women's groups.

In addition to the main trends in portfolio development, a number of performance issues were highlighted as a result of STAP selective reviews and review of the reviewer. These are summarised as follows:

- **National co-ordination:** The project performance reviews showed how projects could benefit from better country co-ordination of biodiversity conservation efforts across geographic areas and across government agencies, including programs of non-governmental groups. This may require a programmatic, versus project-by-project approach to the portfolio development.
- **Global biodiversity issues:** There is a need for better defined interactions among components of biodiversity from a scientific standpoint, leading towards a better scientific consensus on key issues.
- **Biodiversity monitoring and indicators:** A consistent finding in project performance reviews is the need for the adoption of better monitoring and evaluation indicators, including establishment of benchmarks.
- **Participatory approaches:** Stakeholder participation is vital for projects success, from the viewpoint of project performance and science. Local stakeholders need to be accountable for the project's outcomes, as well as build ownership over its management and decision-making. Scientists have increasingly recognized the value of indigenous technical knowledge and the benefits to be gained from effective community-based natural resources management.
- **Mainstreaming biodiversity in sustainable development:** Consistent with the finding regarding root causes and national co-ordination, where it was shown that reducing biodiversity loss may require actions outside of the sector (e.g. economic and trade policies, agriculture and rural development, infrastructure, etc), the project implementation reviews also found that there was an equally critical requirement within IAs' (and within other funding agencies) to co-ordinate programmes. This will ensure that biodiversity conservation is integrated into the IAs' own sustainable development programmes.

#### *Agenda Item 7: Working Group Sessions*

20. The Working Group Sessions focused primarily on defining STAP's participation in the Impact Studies. Three Working Groups were convened, namely, land and water resources, climate change, biodiversity. The background documentation for the working group sessions was provided by the M&E Unit of the GEF Secretariat.
21. Following are the major conclusions which resulted from the Working Group Sessions and adopted by the Panel.

##### **(i) Land and Water Resources**

STAP will support the International Waters Impact Studies through a number of selective reviews. The GEF projects selected for STAP examination are:

- Water and Environmental Management in the Aral Sea Basin;
- South-Eastern South America (SAP for the Argentina-Bolivia Binational Bermejo River Basin, Integrated Watershed Management Program for the Pantanal and Upper Paraguay River Basin);
- Integrated Management of the Lake Chad Basin.

The Selective Reviews will give some indication on how science and technology have been integrated into GEF projects. In addition, analysis of the overall portfolio will draw on the STAP review of the reviewers undertaken during GEF II as well as the Annual Reviews of the STAP Roster of Experts.

The Terms of Reference for the selective reviews are outlined below as follows:

- The use of the best and adequate science and technology including monitoring activities and sustainability aspects;
- Impacts of GEF activities on science and technology development (i.e. scientific institutional capacity; innovation);
- Communication and interaction between several actors including the social and natural scientists, policy-makers, managers and other stakeholders;
- Transfer and diffusion of scientific and technical knowledge between the participating countries and/or between regions;
- Replicability and/or extrapolation of the science, results and/or methodologies;
- Extent to which science and technology encouraged integrated ecosystem management in GEF activities.

These TORs are also relevant to the Selective Reviews in other focal areas of Biodiversity and Climate Change.

## **(ii) Climate Change**

The main impact studies are expected to be the following:

- Portfolio Coverage Analysis (PCA) which will review the genesis of GEF climate portfolio (to be undertaken by special consultant Dilip Ahuja) and assess the rationale and effectiveness of current coverage. The draft report is expected in October 2000. STAP to review the draft report and forward its comments to the GEF Secretariat.
- Thematic reviews on solar PV (completed and report published as a GEF Working Paper), grid connected renewables, solar thermal; ESCOs and, efficient products and markets. STAP to be involved in the solar thermal review.
- Country reviews to be undertaken in Mexico, India and China. STAP will be expected to dovetail its selective reviews with the country reviews.
- Possible STAP selective review will be undertaken of (a) China Efficient Industrial Boilers Project and (b) Brazil Biogas Integrated Gasification/Gas Turbine Project.

## **(iii) Biodiversity**

STAP's involvement in the biodiversity impact study will focus on two major themes, namely, on sustainable uses of biodiversity and participation. Special studies will be conducted in both of these issues.

Following are the major issues which will be addressed in those studies.

Sustainable Uses of Biodiversity:

- How well are existing management practices and uses of biodiversity understood? How well do new uses build upon them? If little is known about them, what measures will be taken to provide appropriate information?

- Are assumptions concerning sustainability or destructiveness of present patterns based on adequate information, if not, how will this information be provided and what measures are to be used to monitor changing impacts on the specific resources in question as well as more broadly on ecosystem function, soils, water, etc.?
- How well are labor availability and organization for various tasks and task-specific and seasonal variations understood and how is this understanding incorporated into the project?
- Is there an adequate understanding of patterns of tenure and access as they relate to the resources in question as well as related resources including land, water, trees, etc. and are current trends of change in tenure and access taken into account?
- How well are the specifics of various proposed new uses understood and described, i.e., beyond generic terms like “agroforestry”, “sustainable harvesting”? How adequately have they been tested?
- How well is the heterogeneity of local human groups (e.g. ethnic identity, economic status, gender, age, labour availability, specialization, etc.) understood and are the implications of this heterogeneity for different patterns of resource use incorporated into the project? How well are present and probable future conflicts over resources understood and what measures have been taken to cope with them?
- How well are probable fluctuations in natural, political, and economic environments taken into account in planning for use? Are local ways of coping with such fluctuations understood and appropriately incorporated into the project?
- How well are potential markets for the products and the structure of marketing – including transport – understood, as well as their present and future prospects?
- Are any potential partnerships between the use components of the projects and other similar efforts being effectively pursued? Are any potential conflicts among such efforts identified, understood, and adequately provided for?
- Are local extension agents and others who are employed in promoting development and/or sustainable uses in the region appropriately involved in the project?

#### Participation :

- To what extent have stakeholders been identified and involved in project design/implementation (including communities, NGOs, private sector)?
- Has public awareness been raised on conservation and sustainable uses?
- What innovative activities has the GEF supported to enhance stakeholders participation, public awareness and partnership arrangements?
- To what extent have social issues been identified in the project preparation and implementation such as gender and indigenous communities?

In particular, the study will explore the following issues:

How are the stakeholder groups defined as social groups linked to the ecosystems sought to be conserved/sustainably used/restored/identified and/or characterized), in terms of their role in:

- ecological resources,

- economy,
  - political systems,
  - influencing development decisions,
  - practical ecological knowledge,
  - conservation and sustainable use practices?
- Is it appreciated that different segments of the local communities and genders may relate differently to the ecological resources?
  - What are the modes used to impart an understanding of Conventions, GEF and its objectives, potential GEF project and the process of designing and implementing it to the various stakeholders?
  - What are the modes of bringing the knowledge and experience of various stakeholders to bear on project design?
  - What are the modes of involving the various stakeholders in the process of actual design of project? What institutions are involved? How are community assemblies, elected representatives, co-operative societies, NGOs, government departments involved in designing the project?
  - What are the modes of involving various stakeholders in project implementation? Through what institutions?
  - Is there flexibility in the process of project implementation to respond adaptively to the lessons thrown up by the monitoring process? How is this flexibility built in?
  - How are various stakeholders involved in identifying lessons learnt? Through what institutions?

#### *Agenda Item 8: GEF Corporate Business Plans*

22. An overview of the GEF Corporate Business Plan was presented by the Assistant CEO of the GEF. The presentation focused primarily on the vision of GEF's corporate direction. The overview was placed within the context of GEF operational effectiveness and how to achieve maximum impact of GEF activities. In this context, a number of broad operational themes were highlighted, namely:

- **Programmatic Framework and Responses:** The need to keep the various programme frameworks (i.e. multi-year programming approach etc.) employed by the GEF and client responses under constant review was emphasised. In addition, issues such as, how to develop partnerships with, for example the private sector for new technologies; adaptation and vulnerability and power sector reform were identified as possible areas which might require particular types of programmatic frameworks if they are to be addressed effectively and efficiently by the GEF;
- **Integration of Benefits Across Focal Areas:** This was identified as one of the major strategic directions of the GEF. In this context, specific reference was made to the GEF Team on Land and Water and the importance of the ecosystem approach underlined;
- **Building sustainability of global benefits into individual of GEF interventions:** This was identified as a priority area of concern. The need for facilitating the inputs of the wider scientific and technical community in this process was also stressed;

- **Promotion of International Co-operation and Replication of GEF ideas:** The need to build replication into GEF interventions and to develop a strategic approach to replication was highlighted. This raised a number of issues including what types of mechanism(s) to build into GEF initiatives, particularly in biodiversity interventions and the need for a framework to evaluate scientific and technical issues in the context of GEF projects.

***Agenda Item 9: STAP Work Programme Planning for FY01***

23. Under this agenda item the Panel reviewed its programme of work for FY01 with the view of ensuring its complementarity and timing with GEF corporate activities.

24. The Panel agreed to the following Work Programme for FY01, namely:

- **Impact Studies:** Most of STAP's efforts will be directed to the GEF Impact Studies, a corporate activity, between October 2000 and March 2001.
- **Expert Group Planning Session: One on the Scientific and Technical Dimensions of Case Studies on Community-Based Approaches to Integrated Land and Water and the other on Establishing a Framework for a Handbook on Integrated Ecosystem Management, University of Bologna, January 2001.** Both of these activities are being convened to support GEF corporate thrust in Land and Water Resources which has the following objectives, namely; Operationalizing the principles of integrated ecosystem management approaches to natural resources through OP#12; Implementation of the Land Degradation Action Plan; Implementation of the Integrated Land and Water Management issues in Africa in response to the decision of the Heads of the GEF and IAs in March 1999 and March 2000.

A few experts comprising specialists representing the ecological, economic and social sciences will participate in the planning sessions.

- **Expert Group Workshop on Community-Based Approaches to Integrated Land and Water Management, April 2001:** This workshop will build upon the results of the case studies on the implementation of community-based approaches to integrated land and water management commissioned by the GEF Secretariat as well as ongoing work in specific demonstration sites by scientific networks, with the view of identifying a number of good practices which could be replicate.
- **Expert Group Workshop on Managing Agro-ecosystem Change in a Globalising World - Examples from S.E. Asia, May 2001:** The workshop, using S.E. Asia as an example, will draw lessons which have implications for the implementation of OP#12 - integrated ecosystem management and OP#13 – Agrobiodiversity.
- **Expert Group Workshop on Adaptation and Vulnerability – June 2001:** This is a priority area which has been identified by the PSR as requiring urgent consideration by STAP.

The Workshop will focus on the following two main issues; namely the **State of the science:** Based on the most recent IPCC reports on vulnerability and adaptation, the Workshop will review the IPCC finding on impacts (and associated methodologies); and adaptation and the **Potential role of the GEF:** Subject to the guidance from the COP, the workshop will examine the rationale and potential role(s) of GEF.

25. In addition to the activities to be undertaken by STAP during the current financial year (FY01), a timetable for STAP's input into the Handbook on Integrated Ecosystem Management was outlined, namely:

- An Expert Group Workshop to facilitate input from the wider scientific, technical and conservation communities on framework for the handbook and commissioned papers. The workshop will also provide opportunity to discuss examples of best practices in integrated ecosystem management. Tentative date – September 2001;
- Review of the Handbook by a small team of experts based on the input from the workshop. Using the framework as a guide, the GEF portfolio will be reviewed to identify best practices, October – November 2000.
- Review and Finalization of the Handbook: March/April, 2002.

26. The draft OPs on Persistent Organic Pollutants and Agrobiodiversity were also made available to STAP for their input. Generally, satisfaction was expressed by the Panel that the results of STAP brainstorming sessions on these issues were reflected in the draft OPs.

27. In addition, the Panel examined a number of issues, highlighted in the Programme Status Review, particularly in the climate change focal area.

**(i) Energy Conservation and Energy Efficiency (OP#5)**

Concerns were raised over the limited range of technology options deployed by projects under this OP, notably the heavy emphasis on energy efficient lighting. In addition, the win-win benefits of energy efficient lighting type projects are very substantial. It is increasingly difficult to justify the incremental costs element of well proven interventions such as energy efficient lighting – type projects.

*STAP is therefore recommending that consideration be given to reducing the emphasis placed on energy efficient lighting – type projects in OP#5. These type of projects can eventually be delegated to third parties with the active involvement of networks such as the UNEP/GEF technology alternatives network.*

*The case for continued support for projects with a heavy emphasis on policy initiatives that ensure the inclusion of efficiency and energy conservation options in client country energy investment plans is very strong. For example, the ongoing power sector reform and electricity re-regulation initiatives provide an ideal platform for ensuring that energy conservation and efficiency remain on the priority agenda of client countries. Other opportunities for influencing national investment plans can also be explored.*

*In countries where the energy conservation and energy efficiency industry is still embryonic, the case for continued promotion of energy efficient lighting – type projects is, however, still strong.*

*STAP is also urging increase efforts to diversity the range of technology options promoted under OP#5. Of particular interest is increased support for project aimed at improving the energy efficiency of basic materials industries that are growing rapidly in many developing countries. Other options that deserve additional support include passive heating and cooling/energy efficient buildings; manufacture of energy efficient equipment such as boilers, refrigerators; combined heat and power and micro-turbines systems.*

**(ii) Promoting Renewable Energy (OP#6)**

*STAP underlined the need for greater diversification in the range of technologies covered by OP#6.*

*The current heavy emphasis on solar PV in OP#6 needs to be addressed urgently. In addition STAP recommends that the GEF redouble its efforts to diversity the OP#6 portfolio to encompass other*

*renewable energy projects such as wind power; wind mechanical, small scale modern biomass energy technologies and small hydro. Small-scale geothermal programmes could also assist in diversifying the OP#6 portfolio.* The aforementioned renewable energy options would, in most cases, offer more attractive opportunities for the reduction of carbon emissions – the most common baseline option is small diesel generators. In addition, the income generation and employment creation potential of renewables such as wind power, wind mechanical, small hydro and small-scale modern biomass energy technologies are significantly higher than that of solar home PV systems.

*STAP underlined its support for the programmatic approach to OP6 that has been initiated by GEF, notably through its renewable energy partnerships.* In addition to other important benefits, the partnerships that have been initiated to-date are likely to result in the deployment of a wider range of renewable energy technologies and would greatly assist the diversification of the OP#6 portfolio.

### **(iii) Power Sector Reform**

The meeting reviewed the report of the STAP Power Sector Reform Workshop and broadly endorsed the following main recommendations that emanated from the Workshop:

- Increased involvement of GEF in the reform process to ensure that the ongoing reforms encourage the deployment of renewables and energy efficiency programs;
- Increased GEF support to cover the incremental transaction costs associated with the introduction of renewable energy and efficiency perspectives in ongoing power sector reform initiatives.

Given the implications of power sector reform for the energy sector, *STAP recommends that the GEF develop appropriate instruments for incorporation of relevant power sector reform issues in climate OPs. STAP also recommends that GEF supports (possibly through targeted research) a series of empirical studies on the impact of power sector reform on the deployment of renewables and efficient energy technologies in selected GEF client countries.*

### **(iv) Reducing the Long-term Costs of Low Greenhouse Gas-Emitting Energy Technologies (OP#7)**

Although OP#7 is proving to be a difficult portfolio to develop, STAP emphasised that it will and should be an important element in future GEF operations. With the exception of IGCC, the portfolio is to support ‘transforming technologies’ that will be fundamental for addressing the climate change problem in the long-term, all of which are proven, and are capable of considerable development with the support of GEF in concert with other parties. Developing countries are likely to have a comparative cost advantage in the use of two of the technologies – grid connected PVs and thermal solar – on account of high solar insolation in these regions. The difficulty is that OP#7 technologies are ‘near-commercial’ rather than commercial, and entail incremental costs *in addition* to the market barriers encountered in OP#5 and OP#6 type projects.

For these reasons STAP supports the efforts of the Implementing Agencies and the Secretariat to establish partnerships with the private sector to enhance the development and use of grid-connected renewable energy technologies. They also emphasised that partnerships with the *public sector* are needed in two respects:

- Between the private sector, the IAs and the public sector in developing countries, since the technologies, as in the OECD countries, need local support as well as GEF and private sector support. The justification of the ‘triple alliance’ with public support arises not only from the environmental benefits, which need to be internalised in developing country policies, but from the positive external benefits of declining costs arising from ‘learning-by-doing’, which will confer important benefits on future generations of investments and users. The justification of public

support for such technologies needs to be recognised, *inter alia*, in the power sector reform process.

- Second, partnerships and agreements are also needed with industrial-country governments in certain cases because neither the GEF, nor the developing countries, can be expected to carry out the task of development of the technologies alone. In the case of fuel cells, wind, and grid connected PVs, the industrial country governments are supporting the development of the technologies and have substantive programmes in place. STAP expressed the hope that, now the GEF is supporting thermal solar, industrial country interest and government support will also be rekindled for this technology.

On wind energy, the question was discussed why developing country interest seems to be languishing, at a time when there are major technological developments that are able to reduce costs and improve reliability, and when industrial countries are strongly supporting the further development and use of the technology. *STAP believes that, in light of these developments and that substantive experience has been gained over the past decade, now would be a good time for an International Workshop, perhaps run jointly with the US and the EU, on the status of wind technologies, operational experience to-date, and lessons of experience from policies of support.*

*STAP also recommended that a concentrated efforts should now be made to develop a portfolio of grid connected PVs. Fuel cells for decentralised or 'embedded' forms of electricity generation also show much promise, and a planned international workshop on this subject should help pave the way forward.*

#### (v) **Integrated Gasification of Clean Coal (IGCC)**

This has become an increasingly anachronistic item in the OP7 list of technologies, and it is difficult to support its use in terms of mitigating climate change *unless*, as a STAP report<sup>1</sup> of September 1997 concludes, *it is part of a strategic plan to use coal in a climate friendly way*. The case that it will raise energy efficiency has always been modest; there is a wide range of options, under OP#5, that are cheaper and which can be more rapidly deployed; these options include a range of efficient 'clean coal' technologies, albeit with marginally lower efficiencies – but appreciably lower costs – than IGCC that are commercially proven. Second, a far more powerful and 'win-win' option for improving thermal efficiency of power plant and reducing energy losses the power sector reform process, on which the STAP has already had a brainstorming in Bangalore, June 2000. Third, it is difficult to see a *programme* of such technologies emerging – any operation is likely to be 'one-off-, and how lasting the GEF's impact would be, if it were to support IGCC, is unclear.

Fourth, and most importantly, a more promising option for supporting coal was identified by the previous STAP in their last meeting in July<sup>2</sup> 1998, which was the development of coal bed methane. In this practice, CO<sub>2</sub> injection into coal beds releases the methane; the methane can be steam reformed in to hydrogen and CO<sub>2</sub>, such that that hydrogen can be used in combined cycle plants or fuel cells, and the CO<sub>2</sub> re-injected into coal beds to release further methane on a non-net carbon emitting cycle. There is considerable interest and engineering research in this (proven) technology. The STAP September 1997 report found "that the option offering the greatest potential for using coal in a climate friendly way is to separate the energy value of coal from its carbon content, be decarbonising the coal to produce hydrogen at the production plant . . ." STAP continues to support this finding. In addition "an evolutionary approach to coal (one which goes beyond efficiency improvements) that would facilitate the realization of deep reductions in GHG emissions over the longer-term . . ."

---

1 Prospects for Reducing GHG Emissions in Coal Systems. Report of the STAP Workshop on Options for Improving Coal Supply Systems and Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 16-17 June, 1997

2 See Report of the Twelfth Meeting of STAP, 16-19 June, 1998

28. Finally, STAP also noted that the direct use of coal-bed methane for electricity generation has long-been recognised as – and continues to be – an appropriate technology for GEF support.

*STAP therefore recommends that support for IGCC under OP#7 be reconsidered. In making this recommendation, STAP recognises that since IGCC has been classified as an eligible technology for some time, there are problems of due process in managing the transition, should the recommendation be accepted. (This is for example at least one IGCC project in the pipeline). STAP will continue its dialogue on this issue with the Implementing Agencies in question on the difficult issues that arise with the proposed IGCC project.*

(vi) **Fuel Cells:** The Panel reviewed the UNDP-GEF draft strategy note entitled “*Towards a GEF Partnership to Develop Fuel Cell Buses for the Developing World*”. It was noted that, in general, the draft strategy note addressed the concerns and issues raised by STAP during the Bangalore Meeting of June, 2000. However, the strategy note needs to further elaborate the following outstanding issues:

- *Local manufacture of the fuel cell:* The extent to which GEF support for Fuel Cell Buses (FCB) would assist the active involvement of its client countries in the manufacture of the fuel cells. The strategy note needs to clarify how GEF would approach the complex patent and licensing procedures that local manufacture would require.
- *Hydrogen:* The success of FCB technology is in the long-term reliant on the transition to a hydrogen-based fuel system. At the moment, the draft strategy note does not adequately explain how this transition would unfold and the potential role of GEF in facilitating a rapid transition.
- *Portfolio balance:* At the moment, the OP#11 portfolio is dominated by the FCB project with limited coverage of other important transport options such as non-motorized transport (bicycles); two and three-wheelers electric/hybrid vehicles; and, transport/land-use planning. The draft strategy note needs to explain the mechanisms that will be used to ensure that OP#11 is not effectively transformed into an OP on Fuel Cell Buses.

(vii) **Transport and Air Quality:** The meeting endorsed GEF plans to ensure closer integration of OP#11 programmes with relevant initiatives of the World Bank notably its “*Clean Air Initiative*”.

#### ***Agenda Item 10: Report by the Implementing Agencies on the Status of Planned Targeted Research Projects***

29. Much of the discussion focused on what modality could be put in place to facilitate the development of a targeted research portfolio. The IAs emphasised the need for STAP to play the leadership role in this regard by identifying potential targeted research areas through their workshops brainstorming sessions and selective reviews. Once these areas are identified, a mechanism should be put in place to facilitate dialogue between the GEF Task Forces and STAP Ad-hoc Working Group to further examine the potential targeted research areas and prioritize them.

30. The STAP Secretariat was requested to further explore the implementation of such a modality and report back to the Panel at its next meeting.

#### ***Agenda Item 11: Annual Review of the STAP Roster of Experts***

31. The STAP Secretariat reported on the use and management of the roster and presented the results of the performance evaluation of the reviewers.

32. Main issues arising from this year's STAP review of the reviews are: firstly, the need for an adequate level of detail in the project document on how the proposed models will work and how complex activities will be accomplished to give the roster reviewers the opportunity to assess the potential strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. This is closely related to the observation made on the need to provide information on the science underlying and fundamental to the project and secondly, the need to select experts, whenever possible, who are intimately and recently familiar with actual situation on the ground, and with the cultural and socio-economic realities of the country. However, overall, the quality of the reviews was considered good and their value significant in terms of ensuring an objective external expert review.
33. In FY00, the IAs increased the use of developing country roster experts to 28%, a trend that is strongly encouraged by STAP. 57% of the roster experts selected were used before by the IAs.
34. Although the IAs have made a consistent effort to increase the use of the roster, in particular of developing country experts, the full potential of the roster is not being fully utilized as the IAs are reluctant to select experts who they perceive to lack an understanding of GEF procedures and operations. This results in repeated use of the same experts and, in some cases, the uneven quality of the reviews, as the reviewer may not have the necessary expertise to review a particular project. Closely associated to this is the ability of one roster expert to analyse all components of a project, particularly for large and complex projects. *To increase the use of more Roster experts as well as to ensure the scientific and technical soundness of GEF projects, STAP is recommending that, in the case of complex projects and in projects being developed in OP#12, a minimum of two experts be used, one of which should come from the region or country where the project is going to be implemented and preferably, a roster expert that has not been used.* This would also address one of the concerns raised by the Panel that the lack of knowledge of the situation in a country results in reviews that are very general and lack country-specific recommendations.
35. In light of evolving nature of the GEF, the Panel agreed to the process of acting on the recommendation made by the STAP Secretariat for filling gaps in the roster. The gaps were identified by the Implementing Agencies and are listed in the Annual Review. The Panel also agreed to a timetable for filling the gaps in the Roster (see Annex 1).
36. In addition, the Panel agreed to the removal from the roster of those who had deceased or indicated they no longer wished to be on the roster. The Panel also mandated the STAP Secretariat to review the Roster with the view of identifying experts who have retired and no longer practicing scientists. Once these have been identified and reviewed by the Panel, a decision will be taken whether to remove them from the Roster of Experts.
37. With regard to the demand from the IAs for more information on the experts, the STAP Secretariat outlined its plans to expand its web services to including information the use of the experts and the reviews itself.

***Agenda Item 12: Finalization of STAP's Submission to the GEF Council***

38. The Panel agreed that the following documents be finalised and transmitted to the November meeting of the GEF Council:
  - Strategic Advice on Commercialization of Fuel Cell Buses: Potential Roles for the GEF;
  - Report of the STAP Selective Review of "Pilot Biosafety Enabling Activity Project";
  - Report of the STAP Brainstorming on Agricultural Biodiversity, 21-22 February, 2000, Bridgetown, Barbados;

- Report of the STAP Brainstorming on Power Sector Reform, June 26-28, 2000, Bangalore, India;
- Report of the Sixth Meeting of STAP II, 21-23 June, 2000, Bangalore, India;
- Report of the Seventh Meeting of STAP II, 18-22 September, 2000, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.;
- Report of the STAP Brainstorming on Small Island Developing States: The Sustainable Development of SIDS – Opportunities for GEF Intervention, 17-18 February, 2000, Bridgetown, Barbados;
- Annual Review of the STAP Roster of Experts (FY 2000).

***Agenda Item 13: The Land and Water Initiative for Africa: Scientific and Technical Dimension***

39. Moctar Toure, Executive Secretary, Special Programme for African Agricultural Research (SPAAR) of the World Bank gave an overview and the progress achieved to-date in the implementation of the Land and Water Initiative for Africa.
40. The initiative has two dimensions: (a) Activities undertaken by the Implementing Agencies funded with their own resources, and (b) GEF funded activities to be implemented by the IAs.
41. The first priority for the GEF-related activities involves collaboration between the GEFSEC and the IAs to develop and implement demonstration projects on integrated land and water management, using the programmatic approach. The meeting was informed that by the end of October three to five basins or sub-basins would have been selected as demonstration sites for the first generation of projects under the Initiative. STAP's role is assisting the GEFSEC and the IAs in implementing the initiative, particularly ensuring that the Initiative is scientifically and technically sound. This collaborative approach would enable the GEFSEC and IAs to show tangible results within a relatively short time.
42. A second priority covers community-based approaches to integrated land and water management. It would specifically focus on developing case studies on the implementation of community-based approaches to integrated land and water management. This activity would support on-going efforts by the GEF and other organizations to facilitate wider adoption of such approaches. The case studies to be undertaken would highlight good practices in community-based application of integrated land and water management, including traditional systems. In addition, the case studies would focus on understanding different community-based management systems, including their origin and rationale for the adoption of these systems, major practitioners, management practices, and their institutional framework (e.g. decision-making processes), and the types of enabling environment needed to sustain these system.

***Agenda Item 14: Any Other Business***

43. The following issues were discussed under this agenda item:
  - (i) **Eighth Meeting of STAP:** It was agreed that the eighth meeting of STAP be convened in Washington D.C. during the week of 05 March, 2001. The STAP meeting will be preceded by the following activities:

- **Brainstorming Session on Adaptation and Vulnerability**, March 05, 2001 to determine the key issues and scope of the STAP Expert Group Workshop on Adaptation and Vulnerability to be convened in June, 2001 and
  - **Review Sessions of the Impact Studies**, March 06, 2001. Three concurrent sessions will be convened, namely, land and water resources, climate change and biodiversity.
- (ii) **Representation at Meetings:** During Intersessional Period, STAP members nominated to represent STAP at the upcoming international meeting are as follows:
- Prof. Angela Wagener and Eric Odada - GEF International Waters Conference, 14-15 October, 2000, Budapest, Hungary;
  - Prof. Angela Wagener - Fifth Session of the INC/POPs;
  - Prof. Paola Rossi Pisa - Fourth Session of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention to Combat Desertification, 11-12 December, 2000, Bonn, Germany;
  - Prof. Shuzo Nishioka - Sixth Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change, 13-24 November, 2000, The Hague, The Netherlands.
- (iii) **Mobilization of the Wider Scientific and Technical Community in GEF Work:** The Panel agreed that in order to facilitate greater participation of the scientific and technical community in GEF work, the following actions should be considered for implementation by the GEF:
- **Scientific and Technical Outreach Initiative:** The allocation of resources by the GEF to facilitate the engagement of the S&T community in a number of concrete activities which can be feed into GEF policy development.
  - **GEF Annual Scientific Conference:** Commencing in FY2001 GEF, through STAP, should convene a GEF Science Conference to address the Implications of Science and Technology for the GEF.
  - **Publication Series:** To strengthen its relationship with the S&T community as well as to provide an incentive for their participation in GEF activities, the inputs into STAP brainstormings and workshops will be produced in the form of Working Papers, Proceedings, etc., either as GEF and/or UNEP publications.
  - **Interactive Discussions:** Using electronic means STAP will increase its interaction with the S&T community on specific issues of relevance to the GEF.
  - **Establishment of S&T Advisory Bodies for GEF Projects:** For complex GEF project and/or project exceeding a particular amount of GEF resources, the establishment of a S&T Committee should be mandatory. These projects would also be the same ones targeted by STAP for Selective Reviews. This would enable STAP to develop a linkage with the local S&T community as well as keep a overview of the S&T dimension of the project.
  - **Inclusion of S&T engagement in Stakeholder Participation Annex:** Concern was expressed about the absence of the involvement of scientists and technologists in GEF projects. To improve the situation STAP is recommending that it becomes mandatory for the Implementing Agencies to include in the Stakeholder Participation Annex specific reference as to how the S&T community in the country/region where the project is being implemented have been engaged in the project preparation process.

- (iv) Pipeline Analysis: Concern was expressed by the Panel of the disconnection between the strategic advice provided by them and what is contained in the final project brief. To address this issue a “pipeline analysis” will be undertaken periodically by STAP of a select number of projects to ensure a match between the strategic advice provided by STAP and the type of project being developed.

## STAP Work Programme for FY2001

ACTIVITY	DATE	OUTPUT	TASK LEADER RESPONSIBLE
<p><b><u>STAP MEETINGS/BRAINSTORMING SESSION</u></b></p> <p>Eighth Meeting of STAP – Washington, D.C. Ninth Meeting of STAP – (Decision to be taken at the Eight Meeting of STAP)</p>	<p>March 7-9 , 2001 June 2001</p>	<p>Report Report</p>	<p>Secretariat</p>
<p><b>MANAGEMENT INCLUDING UPDATING OF THE STAP ROSTER OF EXPERTS AND OUTREACH TO THE ROSTER EXPERTS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of gaps in the roster in consultation with the Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat</li> <li>• Screening, initial selection and approval by Panel</li> <li>• Technical inputs (updating of database to accommodate new requirements)</li> <li>• Maintain and further develop STAP website, including the Roster related services</li> <li>• Management of the Roster of Experts including quality control</li> <li>• Annual Review of the Use of STAP Roster Expert</li> <li>• Publication and distribution of the STAP Roster newsletter and information package to STAP Roster of Experts</li> </ul>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>January – March 2001</p> <p>April – May, 2001</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updating Roster of Experts</li> <li>• Management of STAP Website and Database</li> <li>• Annual Review for submission to GEF Council</li> <li>• Minimum of 2 Newsletters circulated to STAP Roster Experts</li> </ul>	<p>STAP Panel/STAP Secretariat</p> <p>STAP Secretariat</p> <p>STAP Panel/STAP Secretariat</p> <p>STAP Panel/STAP Secretariat</p>
<p><b>SELECTIVE REVIEWS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact Studies. At least seven Selective Reviews on a project and/or thematic basis as an integral part of GEF Impact Studies</li> <li>• Climate Change – 2 projects</li> <li>• Biodiversity – 2 projects</li> <li>• International Waters – 3 projects</li> </ul>	<p>September, 2000 – March, 2001</p>	<p>Contribution to GEF Impact Studies</p>	<p>All STAP Members</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel of STAP chair and STAP members to meetings <i>inter alia</i> Council meeting; meetings of the scientific and technical bodies of Conventions for which the GEF serves as the financial mechanism, PIR etc.</li> <li>• Background Papers to support STAP substantive work</li> </ul>	May 2001		
<p align="center"><b>MONITORING AND EVALUATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Input into the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation exercise</li> <li>• Participation in GEF Country Dialogue Workshops</li> </ul>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>As determined by the Steering Committee</p>	<p>Reviews and technical papers</p> <p>Presentation</p>	<p>C. Padoch/D. Anderson</p> <p>STAP Members/STAP Secretariat</p>
<p><b>MEETING TO BE ATTENDED BY STAP CHAIR/ MEMBERS -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 GEF Council Meeting (Chairman and Vice-Chair)</li> <li>• 2 NGO Consultations</li> </ul> <p><b>Climate Change</b></p> <p>SBSTTA - Climate Change</p> <p><b>Biodiversity</b></p> <p>SBSTTA - Biodiversity</p> <p><b>Land Degradation</b></p> <p>CCD</p> <p>COP4/CCD</p> <p>Interlinkage Expert Group</p> <p>Fifth Session of the INC/POPs</p> <p>GEF International Waters Conference</p>	<p>November, 2000 and May, 2001, Washington, D.C.,</p> <p>November, 2000</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>October, 2000</p>	<p>Report</p> <p>Expert Panels</p>	<p>M. Gadgil</p> <p>S. Nishioka</p> <p>J. Sarukhan S. Sastrapradja M.Gadgil</p> <p>P. Rossi</p> <p>P. Rossi</p> <p>A. Wagener</p> <p>E. Odada</p>