



Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.18/Inf.9
November 28, 2001

GEF Council
December 5 – 7, 2001

**REPORT OF THE NINTH MEETING
OF THE
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL II (STAP II)**

(Prepared by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel)

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

October 23-25, 2001, Washington, D.C.

Introduction

1. In accordance with its Programme of Work, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel II (STAP II) held its ninth meeting from October 23-25, 2001 at the GEF Secretariat, G Building, 1776 G Street, Washington, D.C., 20433, U.S.A.

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 October 23, 2001. The meeting was opened by Prof. Madhav Gadgil, Chairman of STAP who welcomed the participants to Washington, D.C. and expressed his gratitude for the efforts made by everyone to attend the meeting in light of events taking place in the world with respect to security. The Chairman, on behalf of his colleagues on the Panel, welcomed Ms. Julia Carabias to her first STAP Meeting. Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaif, Executive Co-ordinator of UNEP/GEF also welcomed Ms. Julia Carabias on behalf of the Executive Director of UNEP, the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies.
3. The meeting was also addressed by Dr. Kenneth King, Assistant CEO who welcomed the participants to Washington, D.C.

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

A. Agenda and Organization of Work

4. The meeting adopted the draft provisional agenda and organization of work contained in UNEP/GEF/STAP II/9/2/Add.1 and UNEP/GEF/STAP II/9/2/Add.3.

B. Participation

5. The STAP members attending the meeting were Prof. Madhav Gadgil, Dr. Christine Padoch, Dr. Setijati Sastrapradja, Prof. Paola Rossi Pisa, Dr. Zhou Dadi, Ms. Julia Carabias, Prof. Dennis Anderson, Dr. Stephen Karekezi. Prof. Angela Wagener and Dr. Michel Colombier participated in sections of the meeting via teleconference.
6. The representatives from the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies who attended the meeting were; Dr. Allan Miller, Dr. Herbert Acquay, Saima Qadir (GEF Secretariat); Dr. Eduardo Fuentes (UNDP); Rohit Khanna and Sam Wedderburn (World Bank); Ahmed Djoghlaif and Kristine Elliot (UNEP); Dr. Mark Griffith and Ms. Anne-Marie Verbeken (STAP Secretariat).
7. In addition, a number of task managers from the GEF Secretariat and the World Bank participated in selected segments of the meeting, particularly the working group sessions.

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

8. The Assistant CEO, in his address, welcomed Ms. Julia Carabias to STAP. He informed the meeting that Dr. Collin Rees, Team Leader for Biodiversity, had retired and his portfolio is being handled by Herbert Acquay. Specific reference was made to two important events, namely, the World Summit on Sustainable Development, and the ongoing GEF Third Replenishment which will have implications for the GEF. With respect to the latter, an overview was given of the process, including a brief report of the recently concluded meeting

held in Scotland from October 10-12, 2001. The Assistant CEO indicated that, for the replenishment, a range of between 2.5 – 3.5m in available resources is being contemplated. As a consequence, the Secretariat was in the process of revising the set of principles for business planning, with the broad principle of more strategic programming consistent with convention guidance and country drivenness.

9. Specific reference was also made to the ongoing preparations to make land degradation a GEF focal area, expanding opportunities and developments relating to the various Conventions with implications for the GEF. In this regard, reference was made to the request to the GEF by the Montreal Protocol for the consideration of additional chemicals beyond those originally targeted by the GEF
10. The representative from the World Bank highlighted a number of issues. Firstly, the meeting was informed of the efforts of the Bank to operationalise OP#11 on Sustainable Transport. In this regard, a number of challenges were highlighted, namely, the mitigation opportunities of a technology based approach to transport and the difficulties associated with achieving those benefits; the restricted scope for financing advanced technologies in developing countries; and the emphasis of World Bank's intervention will be on the integration of non-technological options with urban and regional planning. Secondly, on the issue of adaptation, the challenge being posed is the determination of the baseline and what is incremental and the relation between adaptation and other sectors as well as methodological issues. Thirdly, a review of the broader biodiversity portfolio to assess participatory approaches and lessons learnt as well as an examination of the relationship between biodiversity and poverty alleviation. The major challenge in this regard being the relationship between national and global benefits and how biodiversity can contribute to improving the quality of life of local communities. Fourthly, specific reference was made to the resource constraints being experienced by the GEF and the impact on the Bank's operations. In this regard, the meeting was informed that the World Bank had to defer approximately US\$150m in projects for FY01 and a similar amount in FY02. This shift towards managing excess demand has had significant operational implications for the Bank's mainstreaming efforts.
11. The representative from UNDP informed the meeting that Mr. Frank Pinto has been appointed as the new Executive Co-ordinator of UNDP/GEF Co-ordination Office. The meeting was also brought up-to-date on the UNDP's restructuring process, with an emphasis on the decentralization of operations in the field.
12. The UNDP representative emphasised UNDP's interest in productive landscapes and its link to poverty alleviation. This was identified as an area where STAP could assist the IAs.
13. The Executive Co-ordinator of UNEP/GEF informed the meeting of a number of initiatives in which UNEP was playing a leading role, namely, the International Year for Eco-Tourism and Mountains and the organisation of the preparatory Regional Meeting for the World Summit on Sustainable Development. In addition, the process leading to the preparation of the Third Edition of the Global Environmental Outlook as well as the convening of the recently concluded GIWA Assembly were highlighted.
14. The meeting was informed that the UNEP/GEF project on Biosafety Framework had commenced and eight projects have been submitted for consideration by the GEF Council at its December meeting. Reference was also made to UNEP/GEF efforts in assisting countries in the preparation of their enabling activities for POPs and country submissions under the Capacity Development Initiative (CDI).

15. The meeting was also brought up-to-date on the progress of the Search Committee for the Reconstitution of STAP III. It was highlighted that the work of the committee should be concluded by the first quarter of 2002 with the view of presenting the final recommendations for the consideration of the GEF Council at its May 2002 meeting.

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

16. The STAP Chairman reported on his participation in the GEF Council Meeting of May 9-11, 2001. He reported that his statement to the GEF Council on STAP activities since the last Council Meeting and its Work Programme for FY02 were well received by the GEF Council. Accordingly, the STAP budget for FY02 was approved as part of the overall corporate budget. He informed the meeting that the content of his statement was made available to Council Members two weeks in advance. As a result, there were relatively few questions from Council Members since they had a chance to study the report. It is clear that adaptation and POPs are two issues of current concern and there were several references from Council Members on the value of STAP contributions in these areas. One Council member sought clarification on how the consideration of social issues in climate change relates to adaptation.
17. It was also highlighted that a major achievement for STAP at the GEF Council Meeting related to the decision of establishing Land Degradation as a focal area of the GEF. This can be cited as one of STAP's major contribution. Since September 1996, STAP has been at the forefront in providing scientific and technical guidance to the GEF on its approach to addressing land degradation issues.
18. Dr. Paola Rossi reported on her participation in the UNFCCC Workshop on Methodologies on Climate Change Impact and Adaptation convened on June 11-14, 2001 and COP5/CCD.
19. With respect to the former, the workshop, hosted by Environment Canada, reviewed a draft *UNDP-GEF Adaptation Policy Framework* and considered next steps in its development. The Workshop was held in association with a United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Workshop on *Methodologies on Climate Change Impact and Adaptation I*. In terms of the next steps, the meeting was informed of the plan to further develop and test the framework within the context of a regional GEF Stage II adaptation project involving Central America, Mexico, and Cuba; drawing from this experience, the framework will be modified for wider application in other countries and regions. The workshop especially drew attention to the need to involve stakeholders in the meaningful way in project development and implementation, and to ensure that sufficient interaction with policy-makers took place such that the project could contribute effectively to adaptive capacity building. A work plan for developing the revised framework, particularly the supporting materials and methods, will be circulated to potential donors and collaborators, such as the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the World Health Organisation (WHO).
20. Prof. Shuzo Nishioka reported, in *absentia*, on his participation in the Resumed COP6/UNFCCC held in July 2001. A number of issues of relevance to the GEF were highlighted, namely, the establishment of new funding mechanisms (i.e. Adaptation Fund, Special Climate Fund and LDC Fund) and their governance structures and additional guidance on the implementation of Stage II adaptation activities and establishing pilot or demonstration projects to show how adaptation planning and assessment can be translated into projects. In addition, the importance of the STAP/GEF Expert Group Workshop as a basis for advising GEF on solid adaptation strategy was emphasised.

21. Prof. Angela Wagener, in absentia, reported on her participation in the First GIWA Assembly. It was agreed that STAP's observation be forwarded to UNEP for consideration.

Agenda Item 5: Review of the STAP Work Programme for FY02 and the Identification of Priority Activities

22. The Panel reviewed the STAP Work Programme for FY02 as agreed by the Panel at its Eighth Meeting in March 2001 with the view of determining which priority activities should be undertaken for the remaining of FY02. From the Implementing Agencies perspective, the STAP Roster of Experts; Adaptation and Vulnerability, transport, POPs, the Handbook of Ecosystem Management and the Sourcebook on Community-Based Integrated Land and Water Management were identified as high priority areas. With respect to the Handbook on Ecosystem Management and the Sourcebook on Community-Based Integrated Land and Water Management, it was agreed that these activities should be co-ordinated with the implementation of GEF Africa Land and Water Initiative
23. On the issue of the selective review of the SAPs/TAD. It was agreed that before such an activity be undertaken, specific objectives and terms of reference should be clearly outlined so as to enable an assessment of the scientific and technical merit of the review. In addition, it was highlighted that such a selective review needs to be considered within the overall context of the GEF M & E Work Programme so as to ensure that the results are operationally useful to IA's project task teams in terms of promoting learning.
24. Based upon the discussion, a revised STAP Work Programme is presented in Annex 1.

Agenda Item 6: Planning for the GEF Assembly 2002

25. Three main activities were considered by the Panel under this agenda item, namely:
- (i) Preparation of a document on Priority Issues Which STAP Should Address in GEF Phase III;
 - (ii) Preparation of a Report on STAP Activities and the broad scientific and technical issues which emerged in GEF II as well as emerging issues and gaps; and
 - (iii) Scientific event at the merging of the Second GEF Assembly.
26. In order to provide a contextual framework for the preparation of the above activities, the GEF Secretariat was asked to provide an overview of the priority and emerging issues as identified in the Programme Status Review (PSR). The PSR is structured to provide an overview of the status, trends and gaps in the GEF portfolio as well as to identify the challenges and strategic directions and priorities to further the global environmental impact of GEF operations and therefore provide a useful starting point for the identification of priority issues trends and emerging opportunity. The priority issues and strategic operational challenges identified are summarised below as follows:
- (a) Climate Change Focal Area**
- **Adaptation to Climate Change:** GEF response will be guided by the evolving Convention guidance, particularly with respect to the establishment of New Funds. The potential links between adaptation capacity building and land degradation to be explored.

- **Sustainable Transport – OP#1:** Emphasis to be placed on modal shift of transportation under this OP as well as the need for a more balanced portfolio – additional technologies, beside fuel cells should evolve within this OP.
- **Linkage of Transport Planning to Air Quality:** This is considered as an emerging issue which the GEF should pay closer attention to in its future programming.
- **New Technology Commercialization – OP#7:** The question was raised concerning the need for a re-examination of the assumption on which this OP was designed, namely, technological adoption according to the learning curve. Several technologies identified as promising in this 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 technology. Taking this in mind, the future role of this OP given the resource constraints was raised as well as the need to build great co-operation with industry in the commercialisation of technologies under this OP. The view was also expressed that a combination of OECE donors, Departments of Energy, laboratories in addition to industry would be important for many OP7 projects.
- **Market Aggregation and Transformation Strategies:** Opportunities exist for the potential for PV market aggregation through the use of PVs in conjunction with medium scale hydro in grid-connected applications. The view was expressed that preliminary results indicate, that this approach remains a significant stretch approach that could only be undertaken with very significant (additional) OECD financial and political support to create a sea change in PV scale and manufacturing economies.
- **Social Issues in Climate Change Project:** The social dimensions of climate change has been a major omission in many GEF climate change projects.
- **Power Sector Reform**

(b) Land and Water Resources

The operational challenges in the Land and Water Resources Portfolio were identified in international waters as the need for greater emphasis on “on the ground results”; in land degradation as the difficulties in defining operationally the linkages between land degradation and the GEF focal area, the difficulties in applying the incremental cost principle, and the limited in-country policy environment to support land degradation prevention and control; and expanding GEF assistance to POPs.

The following priority issues are highlighted with the view of addressing these operational challenges.

- (i) **Review of the benefit and applicability of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis/Strategic Action Plans:** In this context the need for a conceptual framework which seeks to achieve integration and timely results on the ground. The need to balance the planning process with results on the ground was highlighted as a central concern in designing land and water interventions. In this context, the need to mobilize additional resources for the implementation of completed SAPs; demonstration activities and utilization of adaptive resource management framework as well as greater private sector involvement were highlighted.

- (ii) **Handbook on Integrated Ecosystem Management:** 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 was highlighted. In this regard, specific reference was made to the preparation of a “*Handbook on Integrated Ecosystem Management*”, and the implementation of the *Land and Water Initiative for Africa and the Action Plan on Land Degradation*.
- (iii) **Case Studies on Community-Based Integrated Land and Water Management:** The results of the STAP Technical Workshops on Integrated Land and Water Management and the Publication of a “*Sourcebook on Community-Based Integrated Land and Water Management*” were acknowledged as critical inputs to the Work Programme of the Land and Water Resources Team.
- (iv) **Technical Guidelines for Enabling Activities on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs):** The meeting was informed that existing GEF resources will be used for the preparation of enabling activities in POPs. Notwithstanding this, guidelines for undertaking enabling activities were necessary. In addition, it was highlighted that guidance was also required on innovative technologies to address issues such as disposal, alternatives and remediation as well as issues relating to bi-products. In addition, technical and scientific support and advice will be required to support the implementation of a limited number of pilot projects to demonstrate innovative and cost-effective technologies and management practices.

(c) **Biodiversity**

The strategic directions of the biodiversity focal area were highlighted as follows:

- Consistent with the global consensus on promoting sustainable development adopt a broader view of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within the production landscape/seascapes while maintaining support for protected areas.
- In response to the results of the BPS and PIR, and country priorities shift towards inter-sectoral and integrated ecosystem management and capacity building, while focussing on site-specific resources of global biodiversity value.
- In response to the need to address root causes of biodiversity increased linkage of GEF projects to national IA/EA programmes with rural agricultural development to meet local and country needs.

The priority areas for concentration are highlighted by OP as follows:

- **Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems - OP#2:** The key gaps and opportunities were identified in the areas of freshwater ecosystems; small island developing states (SIDS) and least developed countries (LDC); coral management including coral bleaching and synergies across focal areas and conventions.
- **Sustainable Forest Ecosystems- OP#3:** The “launch” of pilots to test enabling environment model in an effort to improve operational delivery and sustained benefits of conservation as an integral part of the Forest Initiative was identified critical as well as the synergies across conventions (CBD, UNFCCC, CCD, UNFF) which could be derived to improve delivery of the forest programme.

Given the emerging issues in forest, the GEF is considering the possibility of organising, in collaboration with other partners, a high level roundtable to discuss the different forces acting on forests; and in particular to reaffirm the central role of sustainable forest management within the context of sustainable development. The meeting will take place in San Jose, Costa Rica on March 11, 2002 in conjunction with the Second United Nations Forum on Forest.

- **Mountains Ecosystems – OP#4:** The need for the development of a portfolio of projects which support and enhance mountain functions on synergy with other OPs was highlighted, given the increasing attention on mountains in the context of the International Year of the Mountain.

STAP was specifically requested to provide strategic advice on the enabling environment for production landscapes of which a number of elements¹ have already been identified; biodiversity indicators in three categories, namely, coverage enabling and impact; financial arrangements for sustainability of biodiversity resources and synergies across conventions, for example, linkages between forest, carbon and biodiversity and coral reefs, carbon, biodiversity and waters.

- (i) **Priority Issues which STAP Should Address in GEF Phase II:** It was agreed that the various STAP Ad-Hoc Working Groups will compile the priority issues in their respective areas. Dr. Stephen Karekezi was identified as the focal point for this activity.
- (ii) **Triennial Report to the GEF Assembly:** It was agreed that all members would contribute to the preparation of this report under the guidance of the STAP Chairman. This report will be published and circulated at the GEF Assembly and will form the basis of the STAP Chairperson's address to the Assembly.
- (iii) **Science Congress on the Global Environment:** After much discussion, it was agreed that a Science Congress as originally envisioned should not be convened. Instead a two phase approach should be adopted, namely:
 - (a) In the context of the Joint STAP Meeting in June 2002 of the current and incoming STAP, presentations will be made on emerging S&T issues relevant to the GEF. In this regard, it was decided that each STAP member will prepare a paper on emerging issues and gaps. By December 1, 2001, the abstract of the papers would be communicated to all STAP members and full papers completed by March 2002.

Issues identified for consideration include the following:

- **Adaptation:** A discussion of linkages between sectors and, on the international policy side, between conventions on Biodiversity, Climate Change and Desertification could be explored as well as an analysis of how we adapt cost benefit methodologies to address several problems in this area: the multipurpose nature of many projects on adaptation; uncertainties; technical and managerial progress in adaptation; and the 'long-lived' nature of the projects and policies.

¹ A workshop was convened at CIFOR Headquarters in April 2001 to address the question: "What actions should the GEF support in order to help create an enabling environment for achieving biodiversity conservation across landscape, especially in forest countries". For further information see the Workshop Report entitled "Creating an Enabling Environment for Biodiversity Conservation Across the Landscape: Actions to be Supported by GEF to Create an Enabling Environment for Achieving Sustained Biodiversity Conservation Across the Landscape, Using Forests as an example "CIFOR Headquarters, Bogor, 16-20 April, 2001.

- ***Transforming or disruptive technologies for addressing climate change.*** The focus could be on how to advance projects in OP#7 and to relate them for the incentives for innovative responses to the climate change problem.
- ***Power Sector Reform, Climate Change and Technology Policy.*** Power sector reform is proceeding in many countries without acknowledgement of the need to address the climate change problem, or to support innovation directly through technology policy. The paper will address this issue as well as those raised by STAP.
- ***Innovation and Energy Efficiency.*** Much attention has been given to ‘barriers’ to the use of energy efficient technologies; but this is an area where there are considerable possibilities for innovation, which merit review.
- ***Social and community dimensions of GEF projects*** – or the linkages between GEF and sustainable development more generally.
- ***The economic case for an expanded international effort to protect the global environment***
- ***Biodiversity: Land use (Changes and Related aspects)***
 - ❖ Rapid change in Agroecosystems
 - ❖ The development of biological corridors
 - ❖ Relations between changes in land use and climate change
 - ❖ Impacts of climate change on biodiversity and degradation
 - ❖ Country level conservation in-situ and global needs
 - ❖ Biodiversity-friendly technologies and livelihoods (poverty alleviation)
 - ❖ Evaluation of market mechanisms for biodiversity conservation
 - ❖ Land use change, land degradation and land tenure: issues of scale in time and space
 - ❖ How many biodiversity (and areas) should be conserved
 - ❖ Indicators
 - ❖ Land and water management effects on agriculture (and vice versa)
- ***Water (Fresh and Marine)***
 - ❖ Developing tools for coastal management
 - ❖ Health and alternative livelihood for communities
 - ❖ Development of databases for developing countries
 - ❖ Indicators

(b) The participation of STAP members on Panels to be convened in support of the Second GEF Assembly. STAP members will be advised appropriately.

Agenda Item 7: Monitoring and Evaluation

27. Two main themes were considered under this agenda item, namely (a) the Monitoring and Evaluation Work Programme for FY02 and (b) the Second Overall Performance Study.

(a) Monitoring and Evaluation Work Programme for FY02

The areas highlighted for STAP input are as follows:

Development of Indicator: This will involve the redrafting and further development of programme indication for biodiversity as well as coverage and impact indicators.

Emphasis will also be placed on the development of programme indicators for International Waters. In the international waters focal area two levels of project indicators will be developed, namely: (a) Project indicators: process indicators as mandated by GEF Operational Strategy (OPS#8&9), stress reduction indicators and environmental status indicators and (b) Programme indicators with a focus on OPS#8&9.

The amount of STAP time anticipated for these activities have been estimated as five person weeks.

Human Impacts of GEF Projects: This activity will seek to address a number of critical issues such as: the types of human benefits, positive or negative resulting from GEF interventions; the recipients of those benefits; the key factors that are important in the design and delivery of benefits that are effective in ensuring achievement of global environmental objectives and lessons learnt and good practices.

Financial Arrangements for Sustainability in Biodiversity: The purpose of this initiative is to generate a menu of options of financial arrangement taking into account the range of mechanisms (including those used in GEF projects) available for supporting and facilitating biodiversity sustainability.

The timetable for undertaking this study was outlined as follow: January 2002 – Background paper on issues/methodology/database/literature review; February 2002 – Portfolio Review; May 2002 – case studies and August 2002 – guidelines, lessons and best practices. It is anticipated that approximately three persons weeks of STAP time will be required for this activity.

(b) Overall Performance Study

No substantive discussion took place on this item. The meeting was reminded of the timetable for the completion of the OPS2 and the importance for STAP to submit its comments on the various drafts.

The timetable for the finalization of the OPS2 was outlined as follows:

- First Draft Report - September 21
- Interim Report (for GEF Replenishment Meeting in Edinburgh) – October 2
- Comments to the Interim Report – October 26
- Revised Chapter 7, sent to GEF entities – November 13, 2001
- Final Draft Report to GEF entities – early November
- Final Draft Report to GEF Replenishment/Council Meetings – November 9
- Discussion at GEF Replenishment/Council Meetings – December 3-7
- Final Comments to the draft Report – December 13
- Final Report – January 25, 2002

Agenda Item 8: The STAP Roster of Experts

28. The consideration of this agenda item was done in two parts, namely (a) annual review of the roster for FY02 including comparisons with previous years and (b) analysis of the review process of the use of STAP Roster of Experts.

(a) **Annual Review of the STAP Roster of Experts**

The STAP Secretariat provided an overview of the analysis of the use of the STAP Roster of Experts based on the evaluation of the reviews undertaken by Roster experts by the Implementing Agencies and the Review of the Reviewers by STAP as well as comparison with previous years experiences with the use of the Roster.

The main conclusions from the analysis as highlighted in the presentation and the discussion which followed were:

- In FY01, thirty per cent (30%) of the reviewers came from developing countries, which is a slightly higher figure than in FY00 (28%). Notwithstanding, the positive trend in the use of roster experts from developing countries, up to 30 percent from 9 percent four years ago, STAP continues to urge, in the case of complex projects, the use of two or more experts, with at least one of them coming from developing countries.
- The geographical distribution of the experts used in FY01 remains as in previous years, skewed toward the Western Europe and Others Group (WEOG), which comprises Europe, USA and Canada. Seventy-five per cent (75%) of the experts selected to undertake reviews during FY01 were previously used. This higher than usual figure (50-55%) may be an indication that the use of the roster in the present mode is reaching a saturation point, where new experts are only used for atypical projects demanding a different type of expertise, or when the frequently used experts are not available.
- Twenty-three percent of the roster has been used for reviews over 5 consecutive years. There are strong indications that the roster could have been used more optimally in the sense that a project should be reviewed by the best available expert in terms of substantive and geographical experience. An analysis of the quality of the reviews, as evaluated by STAP, reveals that the performance of the same expert can range from poor to excellent. This strengthens the case for a more CV and expertise-based use of the roster as opposed to previous good reviews by an expert.

Although the Implementing Agencies have made cautious but consistent efforts to make a more optimal use of the roster, the figures and task manager feedback indicate that “safe” and well-known experts are often preferred over unknown ones, even if the result is a mismatch of project and reviewer. There is a greater likelihood that this occurs when the selection and recruitment of a reviewer is left until very late in the project development cycle (close to the time of submission). This occurrence raises the key issues of the need to re-evaluate the role of the STAP Roster review in the GEF project cycle as well as to examine the possibility of more comprehensive orientation programme, beyond making information available, on GEF procedures for Roster Experts that have never been used to review a GEF project.

- An analysis of the use of the STAP Roster of Experts for project reviews over the last five financial years (July 1996 – June 2001) indicates that a total of 97 experts of the 423 experts contained in the database reviewed 267 projects submitted to bilateral meetings. This means that approximately 77 per cent of experts contained in the database have never reviewed a GEF project. Of the 97 roster experts used by the Implementing Agencies, 31% came from developing countries
- The Panel considered the issue of the pruning of the roster since it is apparent that a large number of experts have not been and most likely will never be used over the past five years for project reviews. The large number of the unused experts on the roster possess valuable but very

specialized skills and expertise that may still be used in cases where a more technically specialized opinion is required. Examples are experts in taxonomy and climatology, two areas of expertise the GEF rarely draws upon.

In this regard, the Panel considered two issues that are pertinent in this context, (a) the possibility of an alternative approach in which criteria could be developed for a “core” roster containing experts with adequate operational and GEF experience, and who are able to assess projects within a global context, and to complement the core roster with a secondary more specialized roster and (b) the extent to which the roster experts could be utilised on a wider level in GEF operations (i.e. monitoring and evaluation exercises; project design and development at the regional and national level, etc).

- Overall, the quality of the reviews for FY00 was rated adequate to excellent by Task Managers in the Implementing Agencies, with a majority (65%) being “good”, 20% “excellent”, and 15% adequate. However, the repeat use of the same reviewers, and 20-25% of less than good reviews, as rated by STAP are an indication that system improvements must be made. STAP is therefore suggesting that a standard is introduced for a minimum time given to reviewers for project review, that the priority given to the review is raised, and that the role of the review in the project cycle and current TOR are critically reviewed.

(b) Analysis of the Review Process

To facilitate the consideration of this issue, a background paper entitled “*The GEF Project Cycle: How to Enhance the Project Review Process – Some Lessons Learnt from the French GEF Experience*” prepared by Dr. Michel Colombier was used as a basis for discussion. The main issues highlighted were:

Generally, STAP has observed a marked improvement in the review process, in particular in the response from the IAs to the reviews. The role of the reviewer seems to be better understood than four years ago, and the entire process seems to be maturing even though there are some areas which will be addressed in the next section where the review process can be improved. For example, good examples already exists of exchanges between the STAP roster reviewer and project proponents throughout the project preparation phase. This has resulted in the reviewer making a valuable contribution in strengthening the scientific and technical soundness of the project. This is a practice STAP would like to encourage.

In examining the question of how to enhance the project review process, STAP had the opportunity to draw on lessons learnt from the French GEF experience. After experiencing poor results with asking the scientific committee to evaluate the scientific and technical soundness of finalized projects, the French GEF made two changes. The first was to let the evaluation take place at an earlier stage in order to allow the Implementing Agencies to adapt the project design according to the observations made by the Scientific and Technical Committee. However, at the early stage of a draft proposal of about 20 pages long, it appeared even more difficult to critically assess the proposed approaches and methods, because of the lack of detailed information at that stage. Consequently, the Committee abandoned the “assessment” objective, and adopted an approach whereby a list of scientific and technical questions is presented that it identifies as key issues to ensure the success of the project. After the finalization of the project document, it is once more reviewed by the Scientific and Technical Committee, and a report is made available to the Council on how the issues identified earlier were addressed. This new system has proved very efficient, and the dialogue with the Implementing Agencies, and the Council has much improved.

The difference with the French GEF is that the project review is done by their scientific panel given the small number of projects submitted every year. The panel member is however, faces the same difficulties: limited information at the earlier stage of project development and complex projects that require a range of expertise. Once the key issues have been identified, the expert organizes a consultative process, looking for more specialized skills to cover all aspects of the project. After the review is completed, the committee expert may be drawn upon for clarification of additional specific advise.

A similar process may be adapted to the institutional context and procedures of the GEF giving an opportunity to a greater involvement of the wider scientific community, while keeping the responsibility for the review, and thus the predictability of its quality, in the hands of one reviewer only.

Agenda Item 9: Working Group Sessions

29. Two Working Group Sessions were convened, namely, Climate Change and Land and Water Resources and Biodiversity. The Working Groups provided the opportunity for STAP Members to discuss in more detail the priority issues identified under Agenda Item 5; assign priorities and to finalise the activities to be addressed by STAP in FY02.
30. The major decisions which were adopted by the Panel based on the presentation of the Adhoc Working Group are summarised as follows:

(a) Climate Change

- (i) **Adaptation**: The meeting noted that the bulk of past workshops and meetings on adaptation have used a top-down approach that attempted to address all the complexities associated with adaptation issues. Consequently, the meetings have not been able to provide user-friendly and practical guidance on how a framework for adaptation interventions could be designed. It was therefore agreed that STAP Workshop adopt a different approach (bottom-up) that might yield better results and that the emphasis be placed on past and ongoing case studies of adaptation initiatives.

The case studies are expected to be more sector-specific and grounded in a more emphatic regional/national perspective.

The case study approach (bottom-up) is expected to yield more useful guidance for developing a framework for adaptation interventions. It was also agreed that the meeting be convened at UNEP Headquarters during January and/or February 2002. The Secretariat was mandated to work with the STAP focal point, Dr. Shuzo Nishioka with respect to the finalization of dates for the meeting.

- (ii) **Sustainable Transport** – OP#11: The meeting discussed the proposed STAP Brainstorming Session on the Transport OP11. The consensus was that the session should focus on non-technology options for engineering a modal shift in city transport systems (e.g. away from personal motorised transport to mass transit, buses, bicycles and walking).

As with the Adaptation Workshop, it was suggested that the brainstorming session focuses on selected case studies (preferably from outside the implementing agencies to provide a new perspective) that can yield useful insights for encouraging more effective modal shift projects in the Transport OP11.

It was agreed that Drs. Stephen Karekezi (STAP), Todd Johnson (World Bank), Yasemin Biro (GEF Secretariat) and Dick Hosier (UNDP) and Mr. Michael Waite (UNEP) to jointly prepare an initial outline for the Brainstorming Session on Transport tentatively scheduled to be held in conjunction with the next STAP meeting to be held in Nairobi, Kenya in March 2001. For the background paper, Dr. Stephen Karekezi was mandated to contact the Shell Foundation Program Co-ordinator on transport for nominations for a potential author of the background paper.

- (iii) **Reducing the Long-term Costs of Low GHGs Emitting Energy Technologies – OP#7:** Concern was expressed over the limited progress that OP#7 projects have made. The pilot phase Biomass Gasification Project in Brazil has been particularly slow and may be discontinued. Better results have been registered with the solar thermal projects but he meeting expressed some concern that the expected solar thermal initiatives in the industrialized countries have not materialized. As a result, significant international efforts will be needed if the critical mass of solar thermal installations is to be realized.

Much more encouraging results have been realized with modular OP#7 technologies such as fuel cells. There may be a case for encouraging a shift towards modular technologies in the OP#7 portfolio. Stationary fuel cell applications are of particular interest, as are grid-connected PVs in areas where there are capacity constraints on the distributed networks and central generation.

- (iv) **Market aggregation and transformation strategies** The GEF Secretariat briefed the meeting on ongoing assessments of the potential for PV market aggregation through use of PVs in conjunction with medium-scale hydro in grid-connected applications. The rationale would be to convince utilities to take up large-scale PV installations for the provisions of electricity at times when hydro energy is unavailable (e.g. during dry season). The resultant large aggregate PV market can then be used to convince PV manufacturers to pursue a stretch goal of low-cost PV (US\$2.00 per peak watt). Consensus was that while the above concept is attractive, the opportunities for such applications may be constrained by the rapid changes that are taking place in the electricity sector. It is thought that the potential of distributed generation opportunities may provide a better option for PV market aggregation.
- (v) **Social community dimensions of climate change projects** The meeting expressed strong support for greater emphasis on income generation potential of renewables in the OP#6 program. This emphasis is already present in OP#5 but it could be given even greater prominence in future OP#5 projects. Income generation provide a reliable mechanism for ensuring sustainable dissemination of renewable and energy efficiency technologies beyond the lifetime of a GEF intervention. It is important to place the income generation emphasis in a sustainable development context.

It was agreed that STAP should participate in FAO Workshop to be convened in March 2002 that would be examining the income generation potential of renewables.

(b) Land and Water Resources

- (i) **Selective Review of a Selection of TDA/SAP:** The GEF Secretariat suggested that the selective review should serve to provide advice on a set of scientific and technical issues rather than merely an evaluation of the process of TDA/SAP, including advice on the management of transboundary issues in international waters.

Prof. Angela Wagener, Eric Odada and Paola Rossi were identified as the lead persons for STAP on this issue. It was agreed that the selective review be undertaken in January 2002 subject to prior agreement on terms of reference of such review in collaboration with relevant implementing agencies.

- (ii) **Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)**: In response to the GEF Secretariat request for guidelines for undertaking enabling activities for POPs as well as innovative technologies and issues relating to by-products, the Panel concluded that there was a need to augment the expertise of STAP members by inviting two experts, one on POPs technologies and the other on agriculture and POPs to work with STAP members on this issue.

It was further agreed that these two invited experts should be invited to work with Profs. A. Wagener and E. Odada in the preparation of a STAP Technical Workshop with a focus on stockpiles and innovative technologies. The workshop will be convened in March 2002.

- (iii) **Sourcebook on Community-Based Integrated Land and Water Management**: The first draft of the case studies were presented to the meeting for information. It was agreed that a meeting of the Editorial Committee for the publication be convened as soon as possible, but before the end of 2001 to review the case studies and to facilitate peer review. In addition, it was agreed that the Secretariat will distribute the revised draft of the papers to STAP members for their input in January 2001. The target date for the publication of the case studies is April/May 2002.
- (iv) **Handbook on Integrated Ecosystem Management**: Taking into consideration the remaining time available to STAP II, it was agreed that a detailed outline of the Handbook be prepared by STAP II. Profs. Paola Rossi and Eric Odada were mandated to co-ordinate the preparation of the detailed outline for the Handbook.

(c) Biodiversity

- (i) **Meso-American Biological Corridor Selective Review**: It was emphasised that this initiative is a programme that includes a series of linked multi-foci projects and this type of project is appropriate for a STAP selective review. It was agreed, however, that this particular review should be undertaken by STAP III.
- (ii) **Agroecosystem**: Given the importance of this issue, the Panel agreed that rather than undertaking any specific activities during FY02, it should be highlighted as an emerging issue which the GEF should pay attention, particularly with respect to the operationalization of OP#13 on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture.
- (iii) **Biosafety**: It was agreed that the Panel be guided by the GEF Secretariat on the specific activity to be undertaken during FY02.

Publication: The Panel agreed that a series of publications drawing on STAP activities during GEF II be compiled. The Secretariat was mandated to initiate work on these publications.

Agenda Item 10: Preparations for STAP Inputs into the Ad-Hoc Expert Group on Biodiversity and Climate Change

- 31. The meeting was informed that SBSTTA, at its Sixth Meeting held in Montreal from 12-16 March, 2001, in its recommendation VI/7, noted the interlinkages between biological diversity

and climate change, and decided to promote, on the basis of the ecosystem approach, a wider assessment of these interlinkages.

32. As a first step in this wider assessment, SBSTTA decided to carry out a pilot assessment to prepare scientific advice to integrate biodiversity considerations into the implementation of the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol, and, for this purpose, established, an ad-hoc technical expert group in accordance with its modus operandi. STAP is invited to participate in the work of the ad-hoc technical expert group as an observer. It was agreed that Dr. Shuzo Nishioka will serve as the STAP representative on the Ad-Hoc Expert Group.
33. The Panel agreed to consider this issue after the convening of the first meeting of the Ad-Hoc Expert Group, by which time, additional guidance will become available on STAP's overall contribution to the process.

Agenda Item 11: Assessing the Health Benefits of Urban Air Pollution Reduction Associated with Climate Change Mitigation

34. To-date much of the discussion on climate change has focused on long-term considerations such as increased temperatures and sea level rise, alterations with the ecology of infectious diseases, radical change in land use. Evidence is suggesting that the same actions that can reduce the long-term build-up of GHG can also yield powerful, immediate benefits to public health by reducing the adverse effect of local air pollution.
35. The issue – the linkage between GHG mitigation and its linkage with public health has been identified by the GEF Secretariat as an emerging issue for GEF consideration. As a response and in collaboration with the GEF Secretariat, a seminar presentation was organised as an integral part of the Ninth Meeting of STAP II to begin STAP consideration of this issue. In this regard, the leading scientists exploring these linkages, participated in this session.
36. STAP is considering the material presented at the seminar with the view of advising the GEF on how to respond to this issue. In this regard, STAP is reviewing a proposal made by the experts who made the presentations for a workshop on “Air Pollution as a Climate Forcing”. Such a workshop would have as its main objectives improve understanding of climate forcing caused by changing amounts of aerosols, tropospheric ozone (O₃), and methane (CH₄) as well as discuss and evaluate actions that could improve air quality and slow growth of climate forcing.

Agenda Item 12: Any Other Business

37. The following issue was discussed under this agenda item:

The Tenth Meeting of STAP II. It was agreed that the Tenth Meeting of STAP II will be convened either the week of March 18-22 and/or March 25-29, 2002. The Secretariat was mandated to contact all members, especially those who were not present, with the view of finalising the dates for the meeting.

Agenda Item 13: Adoption of the Report

38. The meeting considered the draft conclusions of the last meeting and entrusted the STAP Secretariat to incorporate the comments made.

Agenda Item 14: Closing of the Meeting

39. The meeting was closed at 5.00 p.m. on Thursday, October 25, 2001.

Revised STAP Work Programme for FY2002

TYPE OF ACTIVITY/RECOMMENDED BY	THEMATIC AREA/ISSUE/PURPOSE	MODALITY	DATE	OUTPUT	TASK LEADER RESPONSIBLE
CORE ACTIVITY	<p>STAP MEETINGS</p> <p>Purpose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Facilitate exchange of ideas between STAP members, the GEF Secretariat, IAs and Expanded Opportunities Institution of GEF Corporate Priorities and the identification and agreement of STAP demand. Develop and consolidate the STAP Work Programme Convened to coincide with the GEF Corporate Planning Cycle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Ninth Meeting of STAP – Washington, D.C. ❖ Tenth Meeting of STAP – Nairobi ❖ Joint Meeting of Outgoing and Incoming STAP – Washington, D.C. 	<p>September, 2001</p> <p>February 2002</p> <p>June 2002</p>	<p>Report</p> <p>Report</p> <p>Report</p>	<p>Chairman/STAP Secretariat</p>
CORE ACTIVITY	<p>MANAGEMENT OF THE STAP ROSTER OF EXPERTS AND OUTREACH TO THE ROSTER EXPERTS</p> <p>Purpose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ To contribute to ensuring the scientific and technical soundness and technical quality of GEF projects through independent reviews and objective scientific and technical advice; ❖ Maintaining linkages with STAP Roster of Experts including updating on GEF activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Identification of gaps in the roster in consultation with the Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat; ❖ Technical inputs (updating of database to accommodate new requirements); ❖ Editing and Printing; ❖ Distribution; ❖ Maintain and further develop STAP website, including the Roster related services. ❖ including quality control; ❖ Annual Review of the Use of STAP Roster Expert for FY02; ❖ Review of the Review Process; ❖ Publication and distribution of the STAP Roster newsletter and 	<p>Ongoing (July 2001 – June 2002)</p> <p>Sept. – Oct. 2001</p> <p>Sept. – Oct. 2001</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Consolidate Roster of Experts (Version I and II) ❖ Establishment of Website Annual Review for submission to GEF Council. Minimum of 1 Newsletter circulated to STAP Roster Experts <p>Annual Review Report to GEF Council</p> <p>Background Discussion Paper</p>	<p>STAP Panel/STAP Secretariat</p> <p>STAP Panel/STAP Secretariat</p> <p>M. Colombier</p>

		<p>STAP Roster newsletter and information package to STAP Roster of Experts;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Maintenance of STAP Web Site as a basis for information 	Ongoing (July 2001 – June 2001)		STAP Secretariat
<p>DEMAND – RECOMMENDED BY TEAM LEADER LAND AND WATER RESOURCES</p> <p>DEMAND</p> <p>[UNDP/GEF Secretariat – Discussed in Ad-Hoc Working Group and Recommended to the Panel]</p>	<p>SELECTIVE REVIEWS</p> <p>Purpose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Review of the scientific and technical aspects of project implementation 	<p>Two selective reviews:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Selective Review of SAPs/TDA (International Waters) <p>Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Definition of and Agreement on Terms of Reference in collaboration with GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies (i.e. meeting between STAP members and GEF Secretariat to be convened to determine scientific and technical issues to be addressed); ▪ Selection of Review team (STAP members and local/regional consultants); ▪ Field work and Preparation of Final Report; ▪ Finalization of Report with input from the responsible IA; ▪ Submission to GEF Council. 	January 2002	<p>Advice to the Land and Water Team (LWT)</p> <p>Agreed TOR</p> <p>Review Team Agreed</p> <p>Site Visit(s) undertaken</p> <p>Preparation and Finalization of Report</p>	A. Wagener, E. Odada, P. Rossi
CORE	<p>STRATEGIC ADVICE (A)</p> <p>Propose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Advise on state of scientific, technical and technological knowledge; ❖ Advise on the scientific and technical aspects of strategic matters (i.e. cross-cutting issues, scientific coherence of GEF operational strategies and programmes and their consistency and integration of national and global benefits in GEF interventions; ❖ Advise on research by identifying targeted research which would improve the design and implementation of GEF project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Contribution to operationalizing GEF Operational Programmes/Policy Frameworks through the preparation of strategic papers and the convening of brainstorming and expert group workshop sessions. Emphasis will be placed on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Transport (b) Integrated Ecosystem Management (c) Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) ❖ Review of GEF Operational Programmes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity • Climate Change • International Waters • Integrated Land and Water Management and Integrated 	Ongoing (July 2001 to June 2002)	<p>Advice</p> <p>Strategic Assessments</p>	STAP Panel

CORPORATE		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecosystem Management • Review of GEF projects • Operational Strategic Issues identified by GEF Council, the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies 			
CORPORATE		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Input into the Global International Waters Assessment (i.e. Participation on the Steering Committee); ❖ Biosafety ❖ Capacity Development Initiative (i.e. Participation in the Steering Committee, review of documents, etc.) 		Advice	
	STRATEGIC ADVICE (B)				
	<p>Purpose</p> <p>On the basis of the demand identified by the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies to facilitate the input of the wider scientific and technical community as a means of better understanding of scientific and technical issues of the global environment, providing a forum for integrating expertise on scientific and technical and function as a conduit between GEF and the natural and social science communities and technologists.</p>				
	<p>Land and Water Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Operationalisation of Integrated Ecosystem Management Operational Programme (cross-sectoral); ❖ Provision of strategic advice on implementation of the POPs convention with specific emphasis on stock piles and innovate technologies; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Development of Outline of Handbook on Integrated Ecosystem Management. Will build on work commenced in FY01. ❖ STAP contribution on Implementation of GEF POPs Agenda with specific reference to stock piles, innovative technologies, etc. – Technical Workshop 	<p>January/February 2002</p> <p>March 2002</p>	<p>Detailed Outline of Handbook</p> <p>Report/Strategic Advice</p>	<p>E. Odada, P. Rossi, C. Padoch, S. Sastrapradja</p> <p>A. Wagener, Eric Odada in collaboration with two nominated experts: one on technologies and the other on agriculture and POPs</p>
DEMAND – [Team Leader – LWR – Discussed in Ad-Hoc Working Group and Recommended to the Panel: Adopted by Panel]					
DEMAND					
DEMAND/FOLLOW-UP	<p>Climate Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Provision of strategic advice on adaptation and vulnerability; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Expert Group Workshop on Vulnerability and Adaptation ❖ Brainstorming on Sustainable Transport 	<p>February 2002</p> <p>March 2002</p>	<p>Report/Advice to the GEF</p>	<p>S. Nishioka</p> <p>S. Karekezi, D. Anderson</p>
DEMAND	Further advice on				

DEMAND- [Team Leader – Climate Change: Discussed In Ad-Hoc Working Group and Recommended to the Panel: Adopted by Panel] DEMAND	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Operationalization of OP#11 Sustainable Transport. <p>Biodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Operationalisation of the Protocol in Biosafety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Brainstorming on Biosafety 	March 2002	Report Report	S. Sastrapradja
DEMAND	<p style="text-align: center;">PUBLICATIONS</p> <p>Land and Water Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Corporate output requested by LWR Team; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Case Studies on Community-Based Integrated Land and Water Management 	July 2001 – Feb. 2002	Source Book on Community-Based Integrated Land and Water Management	STAP Panel/STAP Secretariat
DEMAND	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Corporate output requested by LWR Team; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Handbook on Integrated Ecosystem Management 	July 2001 – Feb. 2002	Detailed Outline of Handbook on IEM	
STAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Compilation of Background Paper prepared for STAP Expert Group Workshop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Land Degradation Interlinkages 	July 2001 to June 2002	Proceedings of the STAP Workshop on LDI	
STAP	<p>Climate Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Compilation of Background Papers on STAP Brainstorming on Power Sector Reform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Power Sector Reform 		Proceedings of the STAP Workshop on Power Sector Reform	
STAP	<p>Biodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Compilation of Background Papers on STAP Brainstorming on Sustainable Forestry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Sustainable Forestry 		Proceedings of the STAP Workshop on Sustainable Forestry	
DEMAND	<p style="text-align: center;">MONITORING AND EVALUATION</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Purpose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Provision of strategic guidance on annual evaluation agenda, methodologies for evaluating global benefits and scientific and technical evaluation of the portfolio. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Input into the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation exercise; ❖ Participation in Project Implementation Review 	Ongoing (July 2001 – June 2002) November/December 2001	Reviews and technical papers	C. Padoch/D. Anderson
DEMAND/IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATION OF THE FIRST GEF ASSEMBLY	<p>MOBILIZATION OF WIDER SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY</p> <p>Purpose</p>				

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ To facilitate greater involvement of the wider scientific and technical community in GEF; ❖ To support the objectives outlined by the First GEF Assembly which mandated the GEF to build strong relationships and networks with the global scientific community, especially with national scientists and scientific institutions in recipient countries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Participation in GEF Country Dialogue Workshops; ❖ Interaction with S&T Community (i.e. Third World Academy of Science, etc.); ❖ Joint Meeting of Incoming and Outgoing STAP (Emphasis on Emerging Themes) 	<p>As determined by the Steering Committee</p> <p>June, 2002</p>	Presentation	STAP Members/STAP Secretariat
	<p>PREPARATIONS FOR THE SECOND GEF ASSEMBLY</p> <p>Purpose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ As part of its strategic role, prepare a Triennial report to the GEF Assembly on the broad scientific and technical issues that emerged during GEF Phase II and on emerging issues and gaps. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Preparation of Triennial Report on STAP Activities and Broad Scientific and Technical Issues ❖ Publication of Brochures on STAP 	March – June, 2002	Triennial Report	STAP Members/STAP Secretariat
	PRIORITIES FOR STAP III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Priority Areas which STAP Should Address in GEF Phase III 	September 2001 – March 2002	Brochure Report on Priorities	
CORPORATE	RECONSTITUTION OF STAP		July 2001 – March 2002	Final Report and recommendations	STAP Secretariat
CORE/Reciprocal Relationship to Conventions	<p><u>CO-OPERATION WITH SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL BODIES OF THE CONVENTIONS AND OTHER SCIENTIFIC BODIES</u></p> <p>Purpose</p> <p>Implementation of practical working arrangement to facilitate and enhance co-operation with scientific and technical bodies of the conventions.</p>	<p>(a) Participation in Relevant Meetings</p> <p>Climate Change</p> <p>SBSTA - Climate Change Resumed UNFCCC/COP-6 UNFCCC/COP-7</p> <p>Biodiversity</p> <p>SBSTTA 7 - Biodiversity</p> <p>Land Degradation</p> <p>CCD/COP5</p>	<p>29 October – 9 November, 2001 July 16-27, 2001</p> <p>12-16 November, 2001, Montreal, Canada</p> <p>17-28 September, 2001, Bonn, Germany</p>	<p>Mission Report with Recommendations</p> <p>Report with Recommendations</p> <p>Report with recommendations</p>	<p>S. Nishioka</p> <p>S. Sastrapradja</p>

SBSTTA DECISION		<p>(b) Participation in Expert Group Meeting Convened by the Secretariat of the Conventions</p> <p>Contribute substantively at the invitation of SBSTTA/CBD to the Open Ended Ad-Hoc Expert Group on Biodiversity and Climate Change</p>	TBD		<p>P. Rossi</p> <p>Biodiversity/climate change experts</p>
CORE	<p>REPORT TO THE GEF COUNCIL</p> <p>Purpose</p> <p>To report to the GEF Council on STAP activities and in particular strategic advice on GEF operations and programmes</p>	<p>2 GEF Council Meetings</p> <p>2 NGO Consultation</p>	December 2001/April 2002	<p>Presentation of STAP documents to GEF Council</p> <p>Chairman Statement to GEF Council</p>	STAP Chairman/STAP Secretary

() original dates based upon Panel decision at the Eighth Meeting of STAP II.
 ?? Questions raised and/or directives given

STAP Workshop on Adaptation to Impacts of Climate Change

Central question: Adaptation, especially efforts to build adaptive capacity (including scientific and institutional capacity), should be addressed within the context of sustainable development. This raises an immediate operational question: how can adaptation concerns be successfully incorporated into development projects in sectors that are vulnerable to climate change impacts?

Goals of the workshop:

1. Provide GEF with scientific and technical advice on how to operationalize COP guidance on adaptation, taking into consideration:
 - Current level of scientific knowledge on adaptation;
 - Multidisciplinary nature of adaptation;
 - Difficulty of distinguishing climate change impacts from impacts associated with climate variability;
 - Regional differences in terms of vulnerability and adaptive capacity;
 - The need to prioritize among adaptation activities to be funded;
 - Environmental and social impacts of adaptation;
 - The need to integrate adaptation into sustainable development efforts;
 - Limited availability of funds.
2. Provide advice on how to integrate adaptation concerns into mainstream development projects in specific sectors in a scientifically sound manner;
3. Develop a framework or approach for guidelines to fund adaptation interventions;
4. Identify gaps in current scientific knowledge in terms of integrating adaptation concerns into mainstream development projects in specific sectors;
5. Outline a research agenda on adaptation based on these gaps.

Proposed pre-workshop activities:

1. Preparation of a background paper: This paper would :
 - (a) briefly review current scientific knowledge on adaptation as background for an analysis of concrete adaptation measures currently used to cope with climate variability and climate change in vulnerable sectors in both developed and developing countries;
 - (b) describe, based on examples of practical experience, existing institutional frameworks within which adaptation measures are successfully undertaken in a sustainable manner;
 - (c) discuss barriers to implementation of economically justified adaptation measures within the context of specific country-based or regional examples.
2. Preparation of case studies: Case studies would be sector specific and would provide concrete regional or country-based examples. They would be prepared and presented by operational experts involved in project design and implementation in various sectors such as agriculture, water resources management, urban planning, health, ecosystem/biodiversity conservation, etc. Case studies would describe how specific projects incorporate concerns about climate variability and climate change impacts, and give examples of specific adaptation measures that they undertake. They would also describe the barriers to addressing climate change impacts (such as lack of capacity, lack of information, lack of methods, etc.) encountered during project design and implementation.
3. Formation of a panel of experts: During the workshop, this panel, or panels as appropriate, will react to the above mentioned papers. Panel members will include STAP members, climate scientists who have worked on adaptation related issues at the global level as well as experts who have addressed adaptation at sectoral and/or regional

levels. Invited experts would represent scientific knowledge that exists in both developed and developing country contexts and would be associated with various IPCC working groups on adaptation

Proposed sequence for workshop activities:

1. Presentation of latest Convention guidance on adaptation;
2. Presentation of the background paper;
3. Presentation of case studies;
4. Panel discussion(s) on the presentations;
5. Working groups for in depth discussion on priority issues;
6. Presentation of working group results;
7. Preparation of a workshop report.

Proposed timing: TBD (January 21-23 was proposed by Shuzo Nishioka)

Proposed location: TBD (Washington DC, Nairobi were proposed among others)

Proposed audience: Total audience would be approx. 30-35 people including STAP members, representatives from GEF agencies and approximately 10 invited experts.