



Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.21/Inf.16
April 24, 2003

GEF Council
May 14-16, 2003

**REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING OF STAP III,
MARCH 5-7, 2003
WASHINGTON D.C.**

(Prepared by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel)

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

March 5-7, 2003, Washington, D.C.

**STAP Secretariat
United Nations Environment Programme**

1. In accordance with its Programme of Work, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel III (STAP III) held its Second Meeting from March 5-7, 2003 at the Regional Office for North America (RONA) of UNEP, 1707 H Street, N.W., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. The meeting was preceded by informal consultations between STAP and the GEF Secretariat on POPs, and by an executive session of STAP, held on Tuesday 4 March.

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

2. The opening plenary of the Second Meeting of STAP III commenced at 10.00 a.m. on March 5, 2003. The meeting was opened by Julia Carabias, Chair of STAP, who welcomed the participants to Washington, D.C.

3. The CEO and chairman of the GEF, Mohamed El-Ashry addressed the meeting, sharing his thinking on the direction the GEF is moving to and the role STAP could play to enhance the GEF's future work. Foremost, Mr. El-Ashry emphasized the importance of capacity building, including science capacity building, in the transition to sustainable development. He noted that we can't expect science to influence sustainable development if there is no local scientific capacity, and that sustainable development is inconceivable without science and partnerships resulting from capacity building. Subsequently, Mr. El-Ashry detailed how the GEF plans to imbed capacity development activities in each of the six focal areas as strategic priorities, and develop targeted and free standing capacity building projects as medium size projects. According to Mr. El-Ashry, investing in capacity building will make sustainable development more attainable, and increase the impact of the GEF.

4. With regard to the role of STAP, he said that the panel must give greater thought to scientific capacity building. Utilizing the existing science and technology community nodes, STAP should link up with the science community and establish where the research and capacity building needs are. The CEO also emphasized the importance of targeted research (TR) and said that it has not achieved sufficient impact. An independent evaluation will be undertaken and STAP's inputs would be welcome. He said targeted research could be used for capacity building, which is much more valuable than what we have currently in the TR portfolio.

5. He underscored it is STAP's role to bring a longer-term perspective to the GEF and to take a broader look at the issues from a science perspective. He also made it clear that the advice of STAP should be driven by the needs of the GEF, and not of one Implementing Agency, as IAs take short-term views. He said that STAP also has to play an important role in the formulation of the strategic priorities of GEF. Furthermore, he drew the attention to the scientific dimension of programme indicators, inviting STAP to provide inputs. He agreed with STAP that the panel would have more impact if it got involved in the entire GEF process when dealing with one issue, instead of providing input at one point of the process. In response to the question on changes in GEF's approach to targeted research, he replied that, ideally, the GEF would increase its investment in targeted research from less than 1% of its total budget to approximately 30%, and that it would be built into the capacity building framework.

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

A. Agenda and Organization of Work

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

B. Participation

7. 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, Shinsuke Tanabe, Leonard Nurse, and Xu Xiao-bai. Saleem Huq and Alexei Maximov were absent with apologies. Olanrewaju Smith had joined FAO and could therefore not remain on the panel. Also present was Timothy Williams, invited to the meeting as a land degradation expert.

8. The representatives from the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies who attended the meeting were: Ken King, Alan Miller, Herbert Acquay, Gonzalo Castro, Walter Lusigi, Andrea Merla, Laurent Granier, Al Duda, Yasemin Biro, Andrea Kutter (GEF Secretariat) and Jarle Harstad and Claudio Volonte of the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit; Frank Pinto and Andrew Hudson (UNDP); Lars Vidaeus, Rohit Khanna (World Bank); Ahmed Djoghlafl and Kristin Elliot (UNEP); Chris Whaley, Guadalupe Duron, and Anne-Marie Verbeken (STAP Secretariat).

9. 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.

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

10. Brief reports were presented by representatives from the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies on their respective GEF activities, relevant to STAP's work.

11. The representative of the GEF Secretariat, Ken King, briefed the meeting on the four major activities of the last year which affect GEF's direction, namely OPS 2, the replenishment of the Trust Fund, WSSD, and the second GEF Assembly. The number of demands on GEF are increasing and two focal areas were added, namely POPs and Land Degradation. The policy recommendations of the third replenishment were accepted by the Council. The messages of the GEF and the WSSD are in the same direction, with capacity building high on the agenda. The May Council meeting will look at how to address these policy recommendations. With regard to the strategic priorities, he said they are to be reflected in the business plan. Other issues that are on the Council agenda are co-financing, the fee-based system and strengthening the collaboration with the private sector, the latter being an information paper for a strategic elements paper for which further consultations will be held with the Council.

12. With regard to the work of STAP, he stressed the importance of STAP input into the strategic priorities. He also welcomed STAP's input in the area of lessons learnt and dissemination of lessons from projects that impact on science, in order to systematize the scientific and technical assessment of GEF projects. Within this context, the GEF is thinking of revising the project review cycle in November, and STAP input would be welcome. He also referred to targeted research, saying that the procedures need streamlining and that more demand-drivenness has to be built in, although not in the individual country sense. In response to questions from STAP, he said it is important to identify the scientific knowledge barriers in our operations and that project material could be mined for scientific issues.

13. The World Bank representative, Lars Vidaeus, referred to the World Bank's Environment Strategy and briefed the meeting on the continuous debate in the Bank on poverty and environment since Johannesburg. Seven corporate priorities were identified, selected on the basis of their relevance

for development and their visibility, and which include environmental sustainability. The targets of the priority are the integration of sustainable development in country policies (first action will be reversing the downward trend in the Bank's analytical advisory activities on environmental issues); striving to a greater potential of impact, to be demonstrated in a set of priority countries; work in a concerted action with environment partners and the protection of the global environment commons.

14. The UNDP representative, Frank Pinto, informed the meeting that UNDP/GEF has a new deputy coordinator, Mr. Yannick Glemarec and that Andy Hudson has been designated as the STAP focal point. He said that the environment is back on the UNDP agenda, and that the organization went through a massive decentralization process. With regard to a greater involvement of STAP, he cautioned against involvement at the micro level, as this may preclude a review and evaluation role. On the macro-side, UNDP particularly welcomes STAP inputs in the two new focal areas. They would like to see STAP playing a key role in the following set of issues: technical aspects and research needs in POPs, for example on non-combustion technologies for the destruction of POPs; conceptual and scientific analysis of land degradation; synergies between focal areas, as for example in adaptation, integrated ecosystem management and productive landscapes; policy related renewable energy barriers and indigenous knowledge. He also informed the meeting of the follow-up phase of the country dialogue workshops (CDWs), which will have more of a policy orientation to help countries strengthen their capacity on policy understanding, design, and implementation. The follow-up CDW initiative will start with sub-regional workshops, to share experience, followed by national workshops. The suggestion was made by STAP to use the small grants programme as a source of information, including on cross-cutting issues, as for example indigenous knowledge.

15. The UNEP representative, Ahmed Djoghlaif, said that Dr. Toepfer had wanted to be with STAP but that due to last minute developments, he had to cancel his trip to Washington. He briefed the meeting about the Governing Council (GC) meeting, which was the first meeting of Environment Ministers after WSSD, and about NEPAD. UNEP had helped to prepare the environment component of NEPAD and is now working on a similar action plan for Central Asia and the Latin American region. He also mentioned the UNEP proposal submitted to the GC for a panel on global environmental change. He highlighted the crucial phase of the GEF, and the actions taken at the highest level to equip STAP to fulfill its mandate. A high-level segment will be a standard feature at the STAP meetings. The transfer of the STAP Secretariat Washington will also greatly facilitate the coordination between STAP and the GEF.

Agenda Item 4: Key issues of relevance to STAP work emerging from participation of the STAP Chair and other Panel Members in GEF-related meetings and other fora:

16. *GEF Council and Assembly.* The Chair briefed the meeting on her participation in the GEF Council and Assembly, and said that her statements had explained the key objectives of the work programme. She highlighted the high quality of the high-level panel STAP had been asked to organize, and deplored the lack of audience, which had been a general problem at the side events. However, the key issues from the panel presentations and discussions were reflected in the work programme, and had greatly helped to clarify integrated approaches. All presentations will be made available to STAP members. The STAP Secretariat had also prepared a brochure for the Assembly and had organized an exhibition. In addition, Our Planet had featured an article on STAP by the Chair.

17. *Private Sector Review Meeting.* Anjali Shanker reported on her participation in the private sector review meeting, and highlighted the key issues from the meeting. STAP will continue to provide inputs in the formulation of the strategy.

18. *Biodiversity PPR meeting.* Brian Huntley reported on his participation in the Biodiversity PPR meeting. He noted it was a useful exercise of sharing experience between the IAs, and in finding consensus on appropriate responses. The content of the meeting was mostly oriented on immediate operational issues, with strategic matters being set aside for the task force meeting of 12th December. Although no scientific or technical matters were discussed, exposure of STAP to the operational aspects of implementing GEF projects was highly instructive. He observed that STAP members need to familiarise themselves with the operational constraints of implementing GEF projects, as these limit (or in some cases make more important) the use of advanced technologies.

19. Conceptual issues raised which related directly to the STAP Biodiversity work plan, included the need for a clear scientific and technical framework to describe and implement the ecosystem approach; the achievement of biodiversity conservation goals in production landscapes and seascapes, and the application of indigenous knowledge systems in ecosystem management – both within and outside Protected Areas.

20. *The biodiversity task force meeting on “Emerging Directions in Biodiversity under GEF 3”.* Habiba Gitay reported on her participation in the biodiversity task force meeting on “Emerging Directions in Biodiversity under GEF 3”. There was agreement that this was an important meeting for STAP to be involved in, given the strategic directions that were discussed. At the meeting, STAP was specifically requested to see if it could look into “mainstreaming biodiversity into production landscapes”. This has now been included in the draft STAP Work Programme. She indicated that further discussion is needed on how all levels of biodiversity (genetic, species and landscape) can be addressed in the projects, and on the link between “mainstreaming” and “sustainable resource management”, which is the outcome being sought. A second issue is the “interlinkages” between the three focal areas. STAP has proposed a range of activities in its draft work programme. STAP would be interested to participate in any further discussions in GEF on the interlinkages issue.

21. *5th meeting of the Steering Group for the project: “Global International Waters Assessment” (GIWA), Sweden, Kalmar, 8-9 October, 2002.* Alexei Maximov submitted a written report of his participation in the meeting. He recommended that, based on the analysis of considerable volumes of data, information and results of studies generated by GIWA, policy options are worked out, and the use of the results for identifying future priority studies. Examples are studies on mechanisms and conditions for maintaining dynamic balance in watersheds and landscapes, studies to reveal the thresholds for changes in individual ecosystems, and the identification of priority measures for further assessment of the state of the global environment.

22. Other meetings attended by STAP were the PPR meeting.

Agenda Item 5: Strategic priorities for STAP and the STAP Triennial Work Programme

Introduction

23. The Chair outlined the work programme formulation process, from the first draft submitted in September to the version in the meeting documentation, and raised the issue of the strategic priorities, which were only agreed upon recently. The original draft work programme formulated after the first meeting of STAP had been circulated after review to the IAs and the GEF Secretariat in January, and had since been compacted and revised to take into account comments and recent developments in the GEF. The task ahead of the working groups is twofold: to further prioritize the planned activities in order to reduce the work programme into a very focused and strategic document and to flesh out the individual proposed activities, including a time table, process and lead persons in STAP. Attention was drawn to the challenge of cross-cutting issues, in particular integrated approaches. The chair also

expressed concern over the sometimes difficult communication during the work programme formulation, which had made it harder for STAP to finalize its work programme.

24. The GEF Secretariat informed the meeting that no major departures from the priorities set out in June and September 2002 had taken place, but that the strategic priorities had been deepened and refined. The GEF Secretariat recognized that participation of STAP in the task forces is very useful, and that it is very important that sufficient lead time is given to panel members to provide comments on draft documents. It was agreed that STAP members should receive GEF Secretariat documents at the same time as the Agencies. STAP noted that the on-going discussion on indicators is affecting the work of the GEF.

Monitoring and Evaluation

25. Jarle Harstad, Head of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) was invited by the Chair to brief STAP on the M&E work programme. He said that a more effective monitoring system is being set up and that it has started to tackle the complex issue of knowledge management. STAP was invited to make important contributions, and to take part in review meetings. He drew the attention to the lack of in-depth science and technology issues in M&E's work and to the difficult task of linking various dimensions. STAP could contribute through participation in M&E studies, as is now the case for climate change, and could be a discussant and reviewer. STAP could help M&E with advice on the type knowledge that is required. M&E also suggested that STAP looks into indicators for sustainable use through a brainstorming. STAP suggested that for the biodiversity programme indicators it could connect with the conventions as a partner.

26. In the discussion on the private sector, M&E suggested that the final evaluation could form the basis for further STAP work on the issue. Certification was identified by STAP as an important element of private sector involvement in the GEF.

Cross-cutting Issues

27. A number of cross-cutting issues were discussed in plenary, namely CO₂ emissions, interlinkages, sustainable patterns of production and consumption, private sector involvement in the GEF and knowledge management.

28. *CO₂ emissions.* The cross-cutting issue of CO₂ emission achieved in GEF projects was discussed in considerable detail. Ms. Yasmine Biro explained some of the background of the new issue, and informed the meeting that a task force has been set up to bring together the methodologies used by the different IAs. The meeting concluded that it is a very operational need and in light of the other demands on STAP, it is not a priority. However, STAP could play a peer review role in the development of methodologies to measure CO₂ emissions. The meeting agreed that STAP will be part of the CO₂ task force.

29. *Knowledge management.* It was agreed that STAP would start with climate change knowledge management as a pilot. The climate change group intends to identify target groups and key players in sustainable market expansion, and to collect all information available in GEF from projects, and from other sources (the IEA for example). The GEF Secretariat will compile the project information and send it to the STAP Secretariat and climate change group. STAP will prepare a scoping paper to answer a set of questions by June 2003. The follow-up will be determined when the scoping paper is done.

30. *Interlinkages – concepts, methodologies and tools.* A wide ranging discussion took place on this. The issue was raised if interlinkages can be identified and examined through “the ecosystem approach” or if something broader is required. The meeting concluded that STAP needs to be

pragmatic and would start with three concept papers on interlinkages. The papers would address interlinkages between biodiversity and climate change; POPs, biodiversity and international waters; and biodiversity and international waters. STAP would keep in mind the need for the development of tools and techniques to address the challenges of integrated approaches; the inclusion of local and indigenous knowledge and community-based management; and capacity building.

31. *Sustainable patterns of production and consumption.* Participants made the point that there are various international activities that are dealing with these issues, e.g. an international meeting in Morocco. It was recognized that this is a vast topic STAP may not be designed for. Nonetheless, there was a suggestion that STAP could bring the relevant information together and perhaps provide input into the M&E work. Peter Hennicke, climate change STAP member, outlined a proposal to develop broad indicators encompassing consumption and production patterns, which would allow an assessment of the effect of GEF projects on the broader issues of CO₂ reduction, water use and material resource use. This could contribute to the M&E review criteria. However, it was pointed out that it is very difficult to measure those impacts in short time frame. A concept paper will be developed for the next STAP meeting.

32. *Working groups.* The focal area work programmes were reviewed, further prioritized and finalized in the working groups. The outcomes of the working group discussions are summarized in the work programme text.

33. A concise version of the triennial work programme of STAP (FY03-05) is contained as an annex to this report.

Agenda Item 6: STAP Review of Targeted Research

34. The Chair introduced the agenda item, referring to the CEO's views on the role of targeted research in capacity building. She said it is important to reach a common understanding on the role of targeted research.

35. Habiba Gitay, Vice-chair of STAP set out the history of targeted research (TR) in the GEF, including the TR work done by STAP and invited the IAs and the GEF Secretariat to express their views. At the request of the Chair, the STAP Secretariat gave an overview of the experience with TR in STAP II. The GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies admitted that very few TR projects were done, and that the substantive questions of targeted research had not been addressed since the window became operational. In fact, no strategy for targeted research had been developed. Instead, too much time had been spent on the procedures. This has resulted in an opportunistic and ad-hoc TR portfolio.

36. A brief discussion took place on the procedures, in particular on the review role of the SBST(T)A chairs in the TR committee. Whereas the SBST(T)A chairs bring a very valuable convention perspective to the review, in reality it is very difficult to get a response from them. Overall though, the procedures are reasonable. Although the GEF encouraged STAP to be more pro-active in TR, in terms of suggesting TR project proposals, it cautioned against STAP involvement in the operational dimension of TR. With regard to a review at this stage, it was noted that the TR portfolio is not advanced or large enough to justify such an exercise. UNEP indicated that targeted research is more significant than ever, and that it is important that the SBST(T)As are involved.

37. There was agreement that STAP's role should be more proactive and should make TR suggestions that are strategic, as for example in the complex area of interlinkages. STAP also suggested that a process be facilitated to produce TR ideas and proposals. STAP agreed that it is not sufficient to produce lists of TR areas as STAP II did, but that instead, the ideas should be more fleshed out, focused and strategic.

38. The World Bank presented a coral reef TR project that is under implementation, outlining the steps that led to its formulation and its implementation plan. STAP praised the project as a model for the opportunities of TR, but observed that the sustainability of TR projects is questionable if capacity building is not addressed, or if projects are driven by northern countries. The GEF Secretariat indicated that there is room for TR in the Biodiversity envelop for the dissemination of best practices. Another example where TR could bring great value, is in mainstreaming of biodiversity; lessons learnt across projects could be linked with TR as a process. A meeting of STAP and the IAs to guide a joint process was suggested by the World Bank. The biodiversity group in STAP would prepare a concept paper on TR. It was also suggested that a brainstorming be organized to examine the link between TR and capacity building.

Agenda Item 7: STAP Roster of Experts and the Project Review System

Introduction

39. The Chair introduced the agenda item, and referred to the meeting document. She stressed that the re-establishment of the roster is not a pruning exercise. The roster has a limited life span and the old roster will be closed when the new roster will be available on the STAP web site. However, some of the old roster experts will form part of the new roster, provided their expertise meets the GEF's current and evolving needs, and their performance (in case they were used for project review) was very good. The established process of screening by STAP is being followed for new nominations, and the Implementing Agencies had been invited to make recommendations for the selection of experts. The Implementing Agencies will be given the opportunity to review the content of the new roster before the old roster is closed.

40. With regard to the Council's request to include indigenous experts or experts with indigenous and traditional knowledge, STAP was of the view that the roster is not the appropriate medium to engage indigenous experts in the GEF. Not only is the review of complex projects an unsuitable way to communicate with indigenous experts, but it is also unrealistic to expect that indigenous experts will respond to the invitation to do a review in English in one week. Other mechanisms are needed to incorporate indigenous knowledge in GEF projects. The World Bank proposed the refinement of the project review criteria as a possible way to ensure the incorporation of indigenous knowledge. The Chair suggested that the issue be raised at the next STAP meeting.

The project review system

41. At the request of the Chair, Anne Kapuscinski outlined the revised STAP proposal for the roster and project review system, and invited the IAs to make final comments and to adopt the revised operational guidelines for the roster. She said that STAP's proposal is aimed at strengthening the review system. It contains recommendations for conducting roster reviews at an earlier stage in the project cycle, the adoption of a standard management of the review process, the use of two reviewers for certain types of projects and for the development of a shorter but more focused evaluation questionnaire for the Implementing Agencies.

42. The Implementing Agencies emphasized the need for flexibility in the use of two reviewers, and also pointed out that a review at an earlier stage in the project cycle would change the role of the

roster in that of an advisory one as opposed to an evaluating one. The meeting agreed that standard criteria and practice are needed for the management of the review, and that the timing of the review has to be agreed upon by all the partners.

43. Upon further consultation the STAP proposal was revised as follows:

- (i) The STAP recommends that the Implementing Agencies consider involving Roster reviewers earlier in the project cycle – at the pipeline entry stage for projects with scientific and technical elements that are particularly broad or cross-focal in scope, complex, innovative, or that address an area that is new to the GEF (e.g., POPs, Biosafety, OP#12, OP#15) – to strengthen the scientific and technical quality of the project. Roster reviews at the concept stage should be considered more as advisory than as quality control.
- (ii) STAP recommends standard management of the review process to ensure that sufficient lead time is given to reviewers, allowing them time to seek opinions from their networks. The Implementing Agency should contact and invite the Roster reviewer at least 30 days before and send the project proposal to the reviewer at least 10 working days before the deadline for receipt of the review.
- (iii) STAP recommends that the Implementing Agencies consider the use of two Roster reviewers for projects with scientific and technical elements that are particularly broad or cross-focal in scope, complex, or innovative.
- (iv) The adoption of a standard practice that Implementing Agencies provide feedback to the reviewers after the review on how the review has affected the project cycle and how it contributed to the strengthening of the project.
- (v) The development of a shorter but more focused evaluation questionnaire for the Implementing Agencies:
 1. How has the review contributed to the project cycle?
 2. To what extent and how has it strengthened the scientific and technical quality of the project?
 3. How has the review affected the project?
 4. Which aspects were covered poorly/particularly well.
 5. How would you rate the review on a scale from A to E? A: excellent; B: very good; C: good; D: adequate; E: poor.

44. In the case of a roster review at the concept stage, the project proposal's further development would be monitored by the TOR of the review, and the roster reviewer would be asked to indicate at what stage(s) he or she was invited by the IA to look at the project.

Closure of the old roster and establishment of the new roster

45. The STAP Secretariat provided an update of the status of the establishment of the new roster, including information on the application status of the experts on the old roster that were invited to

join the roster, and the new experts nominated to the roster. The working groups were requested to review the expertise of the new nominees and to recommend inclusion or not.

46. The following process was agreed to:

- (a) Applications received after the meeting will be circulated electronically to STAP members for review. The STAP Secretariat will send a reminder to the members of the GEF Family to submit nominations for the new roster. IAs will also be given final opportunity to make recommendations on re-invited experts.
- (b) All experts will be notified of the closure of the old roster, and those experts that are re-invited will be requested in a separate letter to fill out an updated CV form. Experts recommended for inclusion will be given time till the end of April to return their CV forms to the STAP Secretariat.
- (c) The content of the new roster, including a statistical analysis of its expertise content, will be shared with the Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat at the beginning of May. Based on the expertise analysis, recommendations will be made to fill gaps, and balance the geographical distribution of the new roster.

A more strategic role for STAP in the project review system

47. STAP suggested a more strategic role of STAP members in the review system, as well as the discontinuation of the annual STAP review of the reviews because of the lack of impact on the project cycle. These evaluations do not have a role in the project cycle but rather consist of *post facto* “rating” of the reviewers, and although raising critical issues, they constitute a major input in the Annual Review of the roster. STAP also questioned whether these *post facto* reviews are all that helpful for future project cycles.

48. However, as it is STAP’s role to assess the quality of the roster, it was agreed that STAP members undertake one evaluation of the reviews during their term. STAP was of the view that the exercise of reviewing of project reviews is very instructive at the start of a STAP member’s term,

49. A strategic contribution to the scientific and technical quality of GEF projects would be made by STAP through the development a framework for the evaluation of science and technology issues in GEF project proposals. The framework would consist of a set of questions based on scientific and technical guidelines/criteria/standards for the design of good projects for each type of project. The guidelines would be developed in close consultation with the GEF Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies and the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit. STAP’s role would also extend to the periodical updating of the guidelines and standards.

50. It was also suggested that STAP makes use of the selective review mechanism to make a strategic input into the project cycle through the periodical review of samples of project proposals at the early stage of development and implementation.

Agenda Item 9: Any Other Business

51. Dates for the third meeting of STAP are 6-8 October 2003, and for the fourth meeting, 25-27 February 2004.

1. INTRODUCTION

1. As the GEF enters its third phase, marked by a broadening mandate and growing demands, STAP III faces the challenging task of discharging its mandate in a continually evolving and increasingly demanding environment. As the body designed to bring scientific and technical knowledge and emerging issues and gaps into GEF's work, STAP will have to be more strategic in its approaches, and its responses increasingly more attuned to the GEF's needs, requiring close coordination and the best possible communication between GEF and STAP. Given the many demands being placed on the panel, careful prioritization and forward planning will be of utmost importance.

2. The GEF is aware of the strategic and substantive contribution STAP can make to its work, and is committed to strengthen STAP's ability to discharge its mandate as articulated in the recommendations of the third replenishment. STAP III, guided by the experience accumulated by previous panels, intends to build on the measures already taken in the second phase to further improve its impact and effectiveness and enhance the integration of its activities into the work of the GEF.

3. A step towards a more strategic planning of STAP's resources taken at the beginning of GEF III, is the formulation of a STAP triennial work programme in alignment with the GEF Business Plan. The triennial work programme is to serve as a planning tool permitting a strategic programming of resources, while allowing flexibility to make annual adjustments in response to new demands and emerging issues. It will form the basis and offer broad guidance for more detailed annual work programmes that will be reviewed and approved annually.

4. The outcome of the consultations between STAP, the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies, which started at the first meeting of STAP, and continued in the intersessional period, was a draft triennial work programme covering the focal areas, and a range of cross-cutting and corporate issues. It reflected the broad priorities for STAP in the third phase of the GEF, as identified by the GEF, as well as issues brought up by STAP at its first meeting. Developing this first draft was a difficult task due to the many ideas from STAP that needed to be reviewed against GEF priorities whilst a set of complex cross-cutting issues presented new scientific, policy and operational challenges to the GEF and STAP alike.

5. At the second meeting, STAP went through a process of further prioritization of the proposed activities and also started to tackle the cross-cutting issues that were in the draft work programme. All activities were discussed in the working groups and a process, timetable and outputs were agreed upon. The result of the work programme discussions is a triennial work programme that focuses on strategic issues, and makes the best use of STAP as a multidisciplinary advisory body of the GEF. It not only reflects the GEF's strategic priorities as set out in the business plan and further elaborated in the strategic priorities, but also responds to the new emphases in GEF. This is illustrated by specific activities on knowledge management, integrated approaches, capacity building and the planned collaboration with and participation in the work of Monitoring and Evaluation. STAP will utilize different ways of contributing to the GEF, and will combine different modalities to accomplish its objectives.

6. The triennial work programme below is an abridged version of what was produced at the end of the second meeting. Also included is a timetable of its implementation.

2. STAP'S ROLE

7. STAP's role in the third phase of the GEF, ensuing from its mandate, is expressed as follows:

1. To provide input into and strategic advice on the strategic priorities/emerging directions and operational programme development in the GEF.
2. To provide scientific and technical advice in the project cycle, including the project review system and the roster.
3. To collaborate with other scientific and technical bodies, communities and private sector in areas of relevance to the GEF priorities.
4. To advise on capacity building efforts in science and technology relevant for development and implementation of GEF projects.
5. To advise on targeted research relevant to the GEF strategic priorities.
6. To advise on monitoring and evaluation indicators for focal areas and cross-cutting issues.

STAP TRIENNIAL WORK PROGRAMME FY03-05

BIODIVERSITY FOCAL AREA

In carrying out the work program in the biodiversity focal area, the STAP will emphasize (a) bringing priorities of the Convention on Biological Diversity to the work of the GEF; (b) collaboration with other scientific and technical bodies involved in relevant activities; and (c) capacity building for relevant science and technology.

Priority areas for STAP

- 1) Mainstreaming biodiversity into production systems.
- 2) Assess effectiveness of protected areas in protecting biodiversity over the long term.
- 3) Biosafety scientific capacity building relevant to developing countries.
- 4) Generation and dissemination of best practices.
- 5) Better define the interlinkages between biodiversity and the other focal areas (see cross-cutting issues section below).

Planned activities

1) Mainstreaming biodiversity into production systems

Outcome: synthesis of best practices to guide the strengthening of GEF projects.

Output: STAP report on mainstreaming biodiversity that addresses definitions and concepts; list of sectors where there are some success stories; the common elements for defining success; guidelines for achieving mainstreaming of biodiversity.

2) Assess ability of Protected Area Systems to conserve biodiversity in the face of future global change

Outcome: guidelines for GEF family to use in design of protected area programs.

Output: STAP document on scientific and technical criteria for designing effective protected areas, particularly in the context of future global change.

3) Biosafety scientific capacity building relevant to developing countries

Outcome: (1) Scientific tools for needs assessment, risk assessment and risk management for use in development and training in biosafety assessment and management. (2) Indicators for measuring the impact of GEF funding on biosafety capacity building.

Output: (1) STAP edited source books on biosafety scientific tools. (2) M&E Indicators

4) Generation and dissemination of best practices for scientific and technical capacity building (under Pillar V of Emerging Issues Document).

Outcome: scientific and technical capacity building relevant to biodiversity issues.

Output: Incorporation of scientific and technical issues emerging from the CBD into the GEF corporate business plan; and improved decision-making through more efficient knowledge management.

CLIMATE CHANGE FOCAL AREA

Below are the priority areas and associated background information along with issues/questions raised during the breakout group meeting.

Priority areas for STAP

- 1) Policy and market aggregation research for advanced renewable energy technologies (OP7).
- 2) Knowledge management, as an element of implementation research.
- 3) Private sector review and strategy: improving collaboration with the private sector through improved institutional and financial instruments.
- 4) Sustainable market expansion for proven demand and supply side options (OP5 and 6) - Policy and risk mitigation measures.
- 5) Transportation sector.
- 6) Estimating Project CO₂ reductions
- 7) Adaptation

Planned activities

- 1) *Long term supply and demand side technologies and system solutions (technical and policy aspects) (OP7) - Reformulation of OP7 guidance*

Outcome: Strategic advice on different approaches for the support of advanced RE and EE technologies.

Output: STAP report.

- 2) *Knowledge management*

Outcome: the development of a dissemination strategy based on the database of M&E and in response to the M&E request for STAP contribution to the knowledge management activity. The objective is to harness the impact of GEF activities by delivering the appropriate information to specifically identified target groups who are key players in the development of sustainable markets and policy frameworks. Recommendations will be developed through a dynamic collaboration with the GEF cc team and M&E team in order to frame the approach.

Output: Operational guidance paper from STAP to feed into the fall Council meeting and recommendations for targeted research projects.

- 3) *Private sector review and strategy: improving collaboration with the private sector through improved institutional and financial instruments.*

STAP participation in the private sector review.

- 4) *Guidance on how to achieve sustainable market expansion for efficiency and renewable energy technologies (OP 5 & 6)*

Outcome: Building on the private sector work of the GEF, guidance on the type of projects which should now be developed in OP 5 & 6 in order to achieve the goal of sustainable market expansion.
Output: STAP technical paper by August 2004.

5) Transportation

Outcome: Input to GEF in the formulation of its portfolio strategy. Input on the following biofuel issues: (1) the role of biomass and possible conflicting uses of the limited resource as for example food production, energy production; (2) the potential of biofuels in relation to other approaches – more efficient use of fuels - within a climate protection strategy
Output: Technical report.

7) Estimating Project CO2 reductions

Outcome: Inputs into the task force.

8) Adaptation

Outcome: Strategic advice on adaptation to be determined after the review of the information paper the GEF Secretariat is preparing.

INTERNATIONAL WATERS FOCAL AREA

Up to now, GEF's assistance to eligible countries for international waters has focused on foundational work for comprehensive approaches to addressing transboundary water concerns, including the: formulation of science-based frameworks for joint action on strategic priorities, capacity development for regional as well as country institutions, and demonstration of technologies and innovative management measures. Now that many countries have identified the required actions to meet transboundary water concerns and given that significant foundational work has been completed and many approaches have been demonstrated, the strategic priorities for GEF support will be to facilitate implementation.

Priority Areas for STAP

- 1) "Methodologies and practices for addressing ground water components in landscape management
- 2) "Upstream/downstream linkages, with reference to integrated coastal area/river basin management and a focus on economic incentives."

Planned activities

1) Review of methodologies and practices for addressing ground water components in landscape management

This review will focus on the integrated management of surface and groundwater, and over-exploitation, especially saline intrusion in coastal areas, the lowering of the water table in alluvial plains and contamination of aquifers.

Outcome: An in depth understanding of:

- (i) the major threats which are globally affecting groundwaters and deep/confined aquifers,
- (ii) the role of these water resources in view of an ever increasing demand and a changing climate, and
- (iii) the possible ways to promote their protection and strategic-sustainable use.

The review will look into aspects of over-exploitation, artificial recharge, drought management, strategic uses, and the science on "fossil" aquifers, in particular those of Africa: their relations to humid zones and ecosystems.

Output: synthesis of best practices to guide the strengthening of GEF projects.

2) Assessment of upstream/downstream linkages, with reference to integrated coastal area/river basin management and a focus on economic incentives."

Outcome: A review of present experiences on economic incentives and mechanisms for the remuneration of environmental services within the context of basin management, including coastal areas, with focus on upstream/downstream linkages and transboundary issues

Outputs: A report, containing an analysis of case studies, the results of the Workshop, a discussion of the possible implications for the GEF, within the context of the IW focal area. Recommendations for follow up actions, including type of possible demonstration projects.

LAND DEGRADATION FOCAL AREA

This is the focus of the new OP1#5. This OP will link local sustainable development benefits with global environmental benefits, whether the latter fall within existing focal areas (eg. biodiversity, climate change and international waters) or whether they take the form of other reduced transboundary (air or water) impacts.

Priority areas for STAP

- 1) Methodologies, baselines and decision support tools for restoration/rehabilitation particularly in drylands
- 2) Evaluation of technologies and factors influencing the utilization of drylands for food production and land management.

This focal area has some other issues that are critical at project level and maybe considered in STAP's future work. These include methodologies for establishing baselines and developing indicators for monitoring and evaluation of the impacts of the project.

Planned activities

1) Methodologies baselines and decision support tools for land restoration and rehabilitation, particularly in drylands.

Outcome: An assessment of the practices in restoration/rehabilitation, their transferability to different areas/regions and guidance that would help in the implementation of projects.

Output: Concept paper to help in planning the workshop by end of March 2003. A final report of the work by mid 2004.

2) Evaluation and assessment of technologies and factors influencing the utilization of drylands for food production and land management.

Outcome: Input into the interagency task force on the outcome of the evaluation and assessment of technologies and factors influencing the use and sustainability of drylands for food production.

Output: Concept paper to help in planning the activities by end of March 2004

PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS (POPs) FOCAL AREA

The emphasis in the early days of the new POPs focal area is in assisting countries to build capacity to implement the Stockholm Convention through the preparation of a National Implementation Plan (POPs enabling activities). The GEF has also been funding some innovative demonstration projects."

Priority Areas for STAP

Two key priority areas were identified where STAP's advice is requested by the GEF:

- 1) Emerging innovative, alternative technologies for non-combustion disposal of obsolete POPs
- 2) The potential use of bio-indicators, biomarkers, and analytical methods applicable in developing countries.

In addition, STAP's scientific input would be very useful on two other issues, namely innovative methods for remediation of contaminated sites and capacity building in developing countries for the monitoring of POPs.

Planned activities

1) Strategic advice on emerging alternative non-combustion technologies disposal of obsolete POPs

Outcome: An overview and evaluation of emerging promising pre-commercial non-combustion technologies, and advice on their potential use as an alternative to combustion technologies.

Output: A technical paper that provides an overview of promising emerging technologies.

2) Strategic advice on the potential use of bio-indicators, biomarkers, and analytical methods applicable in developing countries

Outcome: A state of the art overview of and advice on existing bio-indicators, biomarkers, and analytical methods that could be used in developing countries, including guidelines for decision-making taking into account the needs of developing countries. STAP will identify those methods that are the most promising and advice the GEF on how the GEF could support their use in developing countries. The overview will be reviewed at a workshop in FY04.

Output: A technical paper providing an overview of existing bio-indicators, biomarkers, and analytical methods, and guidelines on how they could be used in developing countries.

3) Innovative methods for the remediation of contaminated sites

Outcome: A state of the art overview of and advice on the most promising innovative bio-remediation that could be used in developing countries.

Output: An overview paper on existing innovative methods for the remediation of contaminated sites.

4) *Sustainable capacity building in developing countries for the monitoring of POPs*

STAP will prepare a paper on experiences with and good practices for building sustainable capacity in developing countries for the monitoring of POPs.

CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

CO2 emissions

Peer review by STAP in the development of methodologies to measure CO2 emissions.

Knowledge management

It was agreed that STAP would start with climate change knowledge management as a pilot.

Planned Activities:

- Identify target groups and key players in sustainable market expansion,
- Collect all information available in GEF from projects, and from other sources (the IEA for example). Scoping paper to answer a set of questions by June 2003.
- Follow-up will be determined when the scoping paper is done.

Interlinkages – concepts, methodologies and tools

Planned Activities

Three concept papers on interlinkages.

The papers would address interlinkages between biodiversity and climate change; POPs, biodiversity and international waters; and biodiversity and international waters.

Sustainable patterns of production and consumption.

STAP will bring the relevant information together and possibly provide input into the M&E work. A concept paper will be prepared for the third STAP meeting.

TIME TABLE STAP WORK PROGRAMME FY03-05

FOCAL AREA	FY03 (July02-June03)				FY04 (July03-June04)				FY05 (July04-June05)				
	J-S	O-D	J-M	A-J	J-S	O-D	J-M	A-J	J-S	O-D	J-M	A-J	
BIODIVERSITY													
Mainstreaming Biodiversity							W	FR					Peter/Brian
Protected Area Systems							TR						Julia
Biosafety Capacity Building				SB				SB	W			SB	Anne/
Best Practices in Capacity Building			B			W	PC						Cristian
CLIMATE CHANGE													
OP 7			B		FR								Dennis/Anjali
Knowledge Mgt				R									Peter
Private Sector													Anjali
Sustainable Market Expansion					TOR	SR	SR, W	FR					Anjali
Transportation						B							
LAND DEGRADATION													
Land Restoration					W	R	W	FR					Habiba
Dryland Food Production									W	FR			LD expert
POPs													
Emerging destruction techn.				B	R	FR							
Biomarkers						W	R	FR					Tanabe
Remediation									R	FR			
Capacity Building					R								Xu
INTERNATIONAL WATERS													
Ground Water				x	x	B			W				
Coastal River Basin						TOR	B				W		
CROSS CUTTING													
Estimating CO2 reductions													Habiba
Adaptation										W			Saleem
MA assessment			R			W	R	W		W	FR		Cristian

W: workshop B: brainstorming Tor: terms of reference SR: selective review TR: targeted research R: review SB: source book FR: final report PC: project concepts.