



Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.21/Inf.15
April 24, 2003

GEF Council
May 14-16, 2003

**REPORT OF THE FIRST MEETING OF STAP III,
SEPTEMBER 26-28, 2002
WASHINGTON D.C.**

(Prepared by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel)

**Report of the First Meeting of the Scientific and
Technical Advisory Panel III (STAP III)**

September 26-28, 2002, Washington, D.C.

**STAP Secretariat
United Nations Environment Programme**

Introduction

In accordance with its Programme of Work, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel III (STAP III) held its first meeting from September 26-28, 2002 at the Regional Office for North America (RONA) of UNEP, 1707 H Street, N.W., Suite 300, Washington, D.C.

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

1. The opening plenary of the First Meeting of STAP III commenced at 10.00 a.m. on September 26, 2002. The meeting was opened by Dr. Julia Carabias, Chair of STAP, 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

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

B. Participation

3. The STAP members attending the meeting were, Julia Carabias, Habiba Gitay, Cristian Samper, Brian Huntley, Peter Schei, Anne Kapuscinski, Peter Hennicke, Dennis Anderson, Anjali Shanker, Saleem Huq, Olanrewaju Smith, Leonard Nurse, Alexei Maximov, and Xu Xiao-bai. Tanabe was absent with apologies.
4. The representatives from the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies who attended the meeting were Herbert Acquay, Kanta Kumari, Yasemin Biro, Eric Martinot, Saima Qadir, Andrea Kutter and Marina Cracco (GEF Secretariat) and Jarle Harstad and Claudio Volonte of the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit; Tim Boyle (UNDP); Lars Vidaeus, Kathy Mackinnon and Rohit Khanna (World Bank); Ahmed Djoghlafl and Kristin Elliot (UNEP); and Anne-Marie Verbeke (STAP Secretariat). Dr. Toepfer also briefed the meeting on Friday 27 September.
5. In addition, a number of task managers from the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies participated in selected segments of the meeting, particularly the working group sessions. Apologies were made for Gonzalo Castro and Alan Miller who were on mission.

Agenda Item 3: The STAP Work programme

6. The Chair of STAP introduced the work programme agenda item, referring to the meeting documentation, and outlined the overall considerations of STAP in the preparation of the triennial work programme and the time table for its finalization. STAP will prepare a triennial plan in consultation with the IAs and the GEF Secretariat, based on the strategic priorities set out in the GEF Business Plan and the policy recommendations of the replenishment process, and taking into account the Priorities paper of STAP II, that is adjustable year by year, responding to the demands by GEF, whilst avoiding dispersion of STAP resources. Instead, STAP would focus on a few issues that are important in the third phase of the GEF, with an emphasis on integrated approaches and interlinkages, aiming for measurable outputs. The strategic priorities and proposals from STAP would be discussed in working groups on Thursday afternoon and the work plan elements ensuing from the working group discussions, would be incorporated into a draft workplan on Saturday and circulated to the IAs and the GEF Secretariat the following week.
7. At the invitation of the Chair, Cristian Samper outlined the broad objectives and related outputs of the STAP work plan proposal to the IAs and the GEF Secretariat as a basis for the plenary and working groups discussions of the work plan. The GEF Secretariat team leaders or their

representatives were then invited to give a brief overview of the strategic priorities and areas where STAP' inputs would be required.

8. The representative of the GEF Secretariat briefed the meeting on the successful outcome of the replenishment process, out of which ensued the policy recommendations for the preparation of a strategic business plan and of the need to have indicators to measure impact. He also drew the meeting's attention to the outcome of the WSSD, resulting in new areas of emphasis, and of a new integrated, multi-disciplinary and cross-sectoral approach with on the ground results.
9. The representative of the team leader for biodiversity, Kanta Kumari, informed the meeting that a draft paper is under preparation, which will be discussed at a task force meeting the following week. STAP would be brought into the process and there is scope for STAP to look at each of the strategic priorities as set out in the GEF business plan.
10. The representative of the team leader for Land and Water, Laurent Granier, informed the meeting of a retreat of the task force in June, where STAP's role had been discussed. STAP is not a research consultancy, but instead brings cutting edge science to the GEF, and identifies the best methodologies and technologies that can help GEF. The priorities for STAP as set out in June at the joint meeting of STAP II and III were briefly outlined.
11. The representative of the team leader for Climate Change, Yasemin Biro informed the meeting of the climate change retreat held in June from which ensued priorities identified by GEF for STAP's consideration, which has also been presented at the joint meeting of STAP II and III. Furthermore, she highlighted GEF's decision to retrofit the GEF OPs for adaptation through inclusion of adaptation considerations.
12. The Chair invited the representatives of the Implementing Agencies or brief the meeting on any developments within their organizations of relevance to STAP and the STAP work programme.
13. The World Bank representative, Lars Vidaeus said the WB had worked closely with the GEF Secretariat on the strategic priorities. The WB is positioning itself on how to assist developing countries in meeting their climate change related targets coming out of Johannesburg, whilst seeking to match regional and global environmental concerns with national sustainable development. He pointed out a few issues from the WSSD of relevance to GEF and STAP: (i) the problem of moving the energy economies in developing countries from heavy dependence on fossil fuels towards REs, which would not only require policy reforms but also the use of clean technologies in the fossil fuel sector; what is the role of OP#7 in this? (ii) the restoration of threatened fisheries, which rests on a broader ecosystem approach; and which STAP could examine (iii) the POPs and toxic chemicals and their impact on health. He expressed concern over the GEF's expanded mandate, which is not matched by and expanded resources base. He further stressed that local priorities for poverty reduction will drive the World Bank's agenda of mainstreaming GEF.
14. The representative of UNDP, Tim Boyle brought the meeting up-to-date on the major restructuring towards decentralization of the organization, which created an opportunity to take up knowledge management, as related to project implementation, as part of the corporate culture. The STAP meeting will be an input into the global retreat of UNDP next week. There is a need to manage and mobilize knowledge better to create more linking and to avoid re-inventing the wheel. In this regard, reference was made to the IW learn network, and to a partnership with IPGRI. UNDP is still exploring ways to mobilize and manage knowledge related to biodiversity project implementation. On the subject of indicators, he questioned the development of programme level indicators, and instead proposed to start at the project level, especially because this was not done well in the past. Lastly, he indicated that UNDP is now more seriously focusing on mainstreaming of GEF, where the message is that it is not the biophysical issues that are

difficult in projects, but the institutional and socio-economic ones, and this is where UNDP's strength lies.

15. The representative of UNEP, Ahmed Djoghlaif, welcomed and supported STAP in the initiative of preparing a triennial work programme. He informed the meeting that the recruitment of the new staff of the STAP Secretariat is imminent and welcomed the new working relation with M&E on measuring the impact of GEF.
16. Lastly, Jarle Harstad, head of the M&E unit, presented the M&E work programme to STAP, indicating where STAP's inputs are required.
17. In response to the presentations by the IAs and the GEF Secretariat, and referring to the debate on biodiversity at WSSD, the question was raised by STAP if it would be useful for STAP to look at some of the regional issues in biodiversity conservation, which are there for a bio-ecological and historical evolution reasons.
18. On Friday 27 September, Dr. Toepfer briefed the meeting on the outcome of the WSSD, and highlighted the following issues:
 - (1) The implementation plan coming out of the summit, and the partnership projects to facilitate implementation. With regard to the latter, he pointed out Finland's proposal to start a new North-South dialogue; Sweden's proposal to establish a task force to discuss the global public goods, and Germany's plan to set up a new Brundlandt commission, as a response to the new globalized world in which we are now living;
 - (2) The relation between biodiversity and cultural diversity;
 - (3) Renewable energy, the link with poverty, and the scientific backing needed in the widespread adoption and transfer of RE. This may best be achieved through a network of RE centers. He recommended that STAP organizes a brainstorming to examine what is missing in terms of networks.
 - (4) Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources will be one of the pressing topics of the future, which will have to be dealt with under the CBD. The message of the mega-biodiversity rich countries is clear, in that they want to make genetic resources an economic asset. Property rights play an important role in this. He invited STAP to look into the issue.
 - (5) Sustainable consumption patterns, for which he suggested a brainstorming.
 - (6) Health and sustainable development, and the question of indicators for the relation between health and the environment, particularly for children.
 - (7) Water and oceans. He stressed the GPA was widely accepted at the summit, and that final recommendation would be made in 2004.
 - (8) The summit gave a clear signal for regionalization, as the level at which activities should be agreed on, with the endorsement of NEPAD. In this regard, he referred to the proposal to formulate a similar plan for Latin America and also Central Asia.
19. The working groups, composed of STAP members, the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies representatives, were tasked with the review of the STAP work plan proposal, taking into consideration the additional guidance provided by the GEF Secretariat, as well as the WSSD outcomes.
20. The working groups held discussions on priorities for STAP, and produced focal area work plans on the basis of the work plan proposal, including emerging issues identified by STAP. A comprehensive work programme was prepared at the end of the meeting, which would be circulated for further review by STAP members, the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies. It was also agreed that the triennial work programme would be finalized at the second meeting of STAP.

Agenda Item 4: The GEF Assembly

21. Habiba Gitay, the lead person for the Science Panel at the Second GEF Assembly, introduced the theme and programme of the panel, contained in UNEP/GEF/STAP III/1/4/Add.1 and outlining the main elements of the presentations, with the exception of the one on POPs, which was not yet received. In their response, the IAs stressed the importance of making the link with implementation in the presentations, and the scientific tools to support implementation.
22. With regard to land degradation, the GEF Secretariat pointed out the panel gives an opportunity to stress the human dimension of land degradation. The presentation should be put in a STAP context, with a link to STAP's work programme, and should take into account past STAP work.
23. Bob Watson, one of the presenters at the panel, was asked to present the topic of the impact of climate change on biodiversity. In the ensuing discussion, STAP stressed the importance of looking into the effect of climate change on genetic diversity, where losses will occur due to a bottle neck effect, because of the rate of change.
24. With regard to the composition of the panel, the meeting agreed that there was a need to replace Olanrewaju Smith, who had to cancel his participation due to a change in position, by an African expert.
25. Habiba Gitay is to revise her presentation on the ecosystem approach in light of the comments that were made.

Agenda Item 5: The STAP Roster of Experts

26. The STAP Secretariat presented the Annual review of the Roster, contained in UNEP/GEF/STAP III/1/5/Add.2 and introduced the background of the roster discussion paper, contained in UNEP/GEF/STAP III/1/5/Add.1. The discussion paper is to form the basis of STAP's roster proposal in response to the OPS2 recommendations, and which is to be submitted at the May 2003 Council meeting. Anne Kapuscinski briefly outlined the elements of STAP's proposal to improve the roster review system and to enhance the utility of the roster. In the discussion of the proposal the following issues emerged:
 - (1) The roster reviews are valued by the IAs and the GEF Secretariat. However, the external review system needs strengthening.
 - (2) The proposal raises the much broader question of STAP's role in the project cycle, which should be strategic, and which should take into account the reviewing mechanisms, such as the pipeline review, the PIR and other M&E reviews, put in place since the adoption of STAP's mandate in 1995. STAP should be involved in the project cycle at the strategic level.
 - (3) STAP's review of the reviews should be discontinued because it does not contribute to the project cycle.
 - (4) Given the volume of concepts submitted every year, and the deadlines for comments and reviews, a systematic review of all project concepts by STAP may be unrealistic, if not unworkable.
 - (5) An independent external review process is indispensable and should ideally be complemented by independent scientific advice, which could take the form of scientific and technical guidelines/criteria/standards for the design of good projects. The latter would strengthen the review process and make the roster reviews more focused on scientific and technical aspects. It would also eliminate the need for a review of the reviews by STAP.

- (6) STAP is of the view that the review should take place at an earlier stage, and that two reviewers are needed for certain categories of projects.
 - (7) STAP should maintain responsibility for the quality of the roster.
27. It was suggested that STAP makes use of the selective review mechanism to make a strategic input into the project cycle through the periodical review of a sample of projects at different stages of development and implementation.
28. The meeting agreed to the following:
- A. Review of the Roster
 - a) STAP Secretariat will send a list of 40 experts to each STAP member, plus an indication of gaps/weak areas; by mid-November
 - b) Each STAP member will review 40 CVs and recommend removal or retaining; by mid-December
 - c) Each STAP members will recommend experts in areas that need strengthening and provide the STAP Secretariat with their contacts; by 1 February
 - d) STAP Secretariat will compile the CVs for new roster and circulate them to IAs, GEF Secretariat and STAP; by 15 February
 - e) STAP Secretariat will inform all the roster experts currently on the roster that a new revised roster is being established, and only for those that are retained the letter will ask them if they want to renew their term on the roster, and to send a new CV if this is the case; by 15 January
 - f) Review of the new roster at the second meeting of STAP, 5-7 March 2003
 - g) Submission of the new roster at the May 2003 Council meeting.
 - B. STAP proposals for improving the project review system
 - a) Revising the proposal on the basis of comments received at the STAP meeting, including the revised role of STAP for submission at the March 2003 STAP meeting.
 - b) At the STAP meeting, the proposals are to be finalized and adopted and recommendation made for their operationalization, including a time table.
 - c) At the second STAP meeting, proposals for the development of framework for the evaluation of science and technology issues will be formulated and lead persons in the STAP working groups designated.
 - C. STAP proposal for a revised role of STAP in the roster review system
 - a) Adoption of the proposals at the second meeting of STAP.

Agenda Item 7: STAP participation in SBST(T)A meetings and other fora, and in GEF project steering committees

29. The following decisions were taken with regard to STAP members' participation in meetings, committees and activities:
- a) STAP representation in corporate activities:
 - 1. Monitoring and Evaluation

STAP provides inputs in a number of M&E activities and STAP participates in some of the meetings organized by M&E. It is envisaged that STAP will participate in the following activities:

- a. The annual Project Implementation Review (PIR). STAP representation will be rotated in order to ensure that all STAP members benefit from and can provide inputs from this exercise. In FY03, the following STAP members will participate in the PIR meeting: Anjali Shanker for climate change; Brian Huntley for biodiversity and Habiba Gitay for land degradation.
- b. Knowledge management/dissemination: Peter Hennicke as reviewer/discussant.
- c. Engagement of the private sector: Anjali Shanker as reviewer/discussant.
- d. Participatory evaluation of social impacts of GEF projects: since there is no social science expertise on the panel, STAP recommended that Christine Padoch, member of STAP II participates in this evaluation.

2. Capacity Development Initiative (CDI) steering committee meetings: Habiba Gitay

b) STAP representation in meetings of SBST(T)A and CST

1. SBSTTA – biodiversity convention: Cristian Samper
2. CST – UNCCD: Olanrewaju Smith
3. SBSTTA, UNFCCC: in light of the findings of STAP II, and following consultations with the UNFCCC Secretariat, it was suggested that STAP participation in climate change SBSTAs is discontinued and that instead, STAP participation is encouraged in relevant technical workshops organized by the secretariat.

c) STAP representation in project steering committee meetings

STAP has been requested to be part of technical steering committees for a number of assessment projects, and STAP III is expected to continue to provide inputs through participation in the meetings of the following project steering committees:

1. Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA): Alexei Maximov
2. Regional Based Assessment of POPs (RBA): Shinsuke Tanabe
3. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA): Peter Schei is already on the steering committee and was requested to also bring a STAP perspective to MEA
4. AIACC: Saleem Huq is already on the steering committee and was requested to also bring a STAP perspective to AIACC
5. Land Degradation Assessment (LADA): Olanrewaju Smith

d) STAP participation in other fora

Participation of Anne Kapuscinski in biosafety related programmes (the UNEP global programme).

28. STAP participation in other fora will be considered on the basis of invitations received, taking into consideration the benefits and relevance of such participation for STAP and GEF and the budget available for travel of STAP members.

In addition the chairs of the STAP working groups were designated as follows:

1. Biodiversity: Brian Huntley
2. Climate Change: Anjali Shanker
3. Land Degradation: Habiba Gitay

4. POPs: Shinsuke Tanabe
5. International Waters: Leonard Nurse

In addition, Anne Kapuscinski was designated as the focal point for the roster.