



# Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.31/Inf.5  
May 17, 2007

---

GEF Council Meeting  
June 12-15, 2007

## REPORT OF THE 2<sup>ND</sup> MEETING OF STAP IV, 26-28 FEBRUARY, 2007

**(Prepared by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel)**



# United Nations Environment Programme

برنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة · 联合国环境规划署  
PROGRAMME DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT · PROGRAMA DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA EL MEDIO AMBIENTE  
ПРОГРАММА ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ ПО ОКРУЖАЮЩЕЙ СРЕДЕ

## Executive Summary - Report of the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of STAP IV, 26-28 February 2007

1. The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) held its meeting, 26-28 February 2007 in Washington D.C. STAP members held sessions with Monique Barbut, GEF CEO and Chairperson, members of the GEF Secretariat, and Rob Van den Berg, Director of the Evaluation Office (EO) of the GEF. The main objective of the STAP meeting was to review the mid-February 2007 drafts of the focal area strategies and to contribute to their revision in consultation with the CEO and the GEF Secretariat.
2. Yolanda Kakabadse, STAP Chair, opened the meeting, noting the challenges and changes underway within the GEF and the STAP, but also reminded STAP of the interest and support it receives from the GEF CEO, the United Nations Environment Programme's Executive Director and the GEF Council, in order to enable STAP to deliver strategic, independent, and integrated advice to the GEF Council, GEF Secretariat and the GEF Agencies.
3. The results of the plenary and sessions are recorded in the attached minutes. The decisions taken at the meeting are summarized below.
4. **Agenda item 3: Matters arising from the first meeting of STAP 4, 16-19 October 2006 and confirmation of the Minutes**

**Decision 3.1:** STAP approved the minutes from the last meeting.

**Decision 3.2:** STAP agreed to reconsider the GEF's request for advice on marine seascapes and fisheries once the Biodiversity and International Waters focal area strategies were completed, as this would likely re-emerge as a cross-focal area request.

5. **Agenda item 4: STAP members' reports of inter-sessional activities and recommended actions for adoption - Groundwater and Interlinkages in SIDS, 6-9 November 2006, Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago (Angela Cropper)**

**Decision 4.1:** STAP agreed that the Secretariat would perform final editing in consultation with Angela Cropper and submit the report with recommendations to the June 2007 GEF Council.

6. **Agenda item 5: Adoption of STAP reports to the GEF**

**Decision 5.1:** Yolanda Kakabadse asked Anand Patwardhan and Thomas Johansson to complete the conclusions and recommendations on the biofuels report. Consequently, the report will be submitted to the GEF.

7. **Agenda item 7: Development of a work programme with the Evaluation Office**

**Decision 7.1:** Maryanne Grieg-Gran, STAP member, agreed to represent STAP in the EO's work on the methodology for best practices. This is will follow the EO's paper "The Catalytic Role of International Aid: How to measure and evaluate Replication and Scaling-up?"

**Decision 7.2:** STAP Member Paul Ferraro agreed to work with the EO on impact evaluations of protected area pilot projects in East Africa. He will also work with the EO on a project that looks at the links between GEF support and forest coverage in Costa Rica through policy interventions.

**Decision 7.3:** STAP Member Fatima Denton agreed to focus on adaptation in Africa in the development of the International workshop on evaluating climate change and development.

8. **Agenda item 13: GEF4 Focal Area Strategies session 6**

**Decision 13.1:** STAP members agreed that the STAP Secretariat should seek active engagement with the technical bodies concerned.

9. **Agenda item 14: STAP workplan for FY07 and FY08 and preparation for June 2007 GEF Council**

**Decision 14.1:** Michael Stocking and Rashid Hassan agreed to contribute to the GEF review of the Project Cycle. Fatima Denton and Paul Ferraro agreed to work with the EO on developing guidelines for early project reviews.

# Report of the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of STAP IV, 26-28 February 2007

## Introduction

1. The second meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP IV) to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) was held on 26-28 February, in the conference room of the UNEP Regional Office for North America, 1707 H Street, NW, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, Washington DC. In addition, focal area working group sessions were held between STAP Members and the GEF Secretariat. The objectives of the sessions were to provide STAP's input to the mid-February 2007 drafts of the focal area strategies. The principal outcomes from the plenary and working group sessions are recorded in these minutes. Details of those attending are in Annex 1. Annex 2 provides links to a detailed report on STAP's contribution to the draft focal area strategies, and to STAP's presentations.

## **Agenda items 1 and 2: Opening of the meeting by the STAP Chair, adoption of the agenda and annotations, and of the organization of work for the STAP meeting**

2. The meeting was opened by Yolanda Kakabadse, the Chair of STAP. She welcomed the members to the meeting, and introduced Rashid Hassan and Fatima Denton, STAP members, to their first STAP meeting.
3. Yolanda Kakabadse noted the meeting was being held amidst interesting and important changes in the GEF and STAP. She further acknowledged that it would be challenging for STAP to contribute to the various on-going processes, or to those which were about to begin. She asked STAP to acknowledge, therefore, this mood of imminent and substantial change as it delivers its best advice. She further reminded STAP of the support it received from Monique Barbut, GEF CEO and Chairperson, Achim Steiner, UNEP Executive Director, and the GEF Council to deliver strategic, independent, and integrated advice. Yolanda Kakabadse emphasized this would be an important opportunity for STAP, as it is the perfect moment for STAP to be responsive, and creative.

## **Agenda item 3: Matters arising from the first meeting of STAP 4, 16-19 October 2006 and confirmation of the Minutes**

4. Doug Taylor, STAP Secretary, introduced the minutes from the previous STAP meeting in October 2006, and asked STAP to approve them.

### **Decision 3.1:** STAP approved the minutes from the last meeting

Following STAP's approval, Doug Taylor identified actions arising from STAP's meeting in October 2006. For example, STAP's advice was requested on the revision of the project cycle. This task, Doug Taylor noted, would be STAP's next task following, or concurrent to, their work on the focal area Technical Advisory Groups (TAGs). He further remarked that a small group would be convened to work on the revision of the project cycle.

5. Doug Taylor also highlighted further outstanding requests, including Steve Gorman's, World Bank, request for input on the International Assessment of Agricultural Science & Technology for Development (IAASTD). Michael Stocking, STAP Vice-Chair, remarked he had met informally with Robert Watson, former Chief Scientist -World Bank, about the IAASTD, and that further formal follow-up is needed.
6. GEF's request for advice from STAP on marine seascapes and fisheries was also briefly raised, noting that no progress was made to date.

**Decision 3.2:** STAP agreed to reconsider this request once the Biodiversity and International Waters focal area strategies were completed, as this would likely re-emerge as a cross-focal area request.

7. Michael Stocking also agreed to develop a short communication piece on how a landscape and ecosystem approach could be used as a framework to achieve integration across the focal areas. He would also lead a small meeting about this with the GEF Secretariat.

#### **Agenda item 4: STAP members' reports of inter-sessional activities and recommended actions for adoption**

##### **a) December 2006 Council Meeting, Washington DC (STAP Chair)**

8. Yolanda Kakabadse reported that her briefing to the GEF Council in December 2006 was concise as the Council's attention was on other issues. Her briefing focused on STAP's work and deliverables since the last time the Council met (June 2006), the Panel's evolving relationship with UNEP, and STAP's on-going contributions to the focal area task forces. She also informed the Council about UNEP's plan to table STAP revised terms of reference at their next meeting in June 2007. Yolanda Kakabadse remarked this was of utmost interest to the Council.
9. In response to questions on UNEP's and STAP's evolving relationship, Yolanda Kakabadse remarked she was leading discussions with UNEP on raising STAP's level of engagement at the policy level – where science and technology are debated and influenced. In addition, Doug Taylor indicated STAP is invited to submit a paper to UNEP on how STAP's engagement at the policy level would dovetail with a new policy team at UNEP.

##### **b) Groundwater and Interlinkages in SIDS, 6-9 November 2006, Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago (Angela Cropper)**

10. Angela Cropper, STAP member, reported on the results of the STAP workshop on Groundwater, Interlinkages and SIDS (small island developing states), Port of Spain, Trinidad, 6-9 November 2006. The results included the following: a) groundwater and aquifers are key water resources for SIDS; b) the science on groundwater and aquifer is well established, but it is not integrated well into policy decisions influencing management and protection of groundwater and integrated water resource management; c) for targeted action, SIDS could be classified more appropriately according to their geological characteristics instead by geographical region; d) governments could focus more attention to the ecological footprints; and community core management structures could be further strengthened.
11. Based on the outcome of this workshop, and that of the previous two groundwater workshops, Angela Cropper elaborated on what could be the implications for the GEF and its support on groundwater and SIDS. For example, the GEF Agencies could consider groundwater as an entry point for an ecosystem based framework particularly on SIDS. A SIDS partnership could also be encouraged within the context of the RAF. Angela Cropper also raised the possibility of creating SIDS networks based on the model and experience of IW-LEARN. She also noted the potentials for engaging the private sector in groundwater management – as evidenced in the field site visit in Trinidad. She commented that the workshop report is available on the STAP website.+

**Decision 4.1:** STAP agreed that the Secretariat would perform final editing in consultation with Angela Cropper and submit the report with recommendations to the June 2007 GEF Council.

##### **c) International Workshop: GEF Land Degradation Focal Area Indicators: Meeting of the Inter-Agency Task Force on Land Degradation and Initial Meeting of UNDP-GEF MSP on LD Focal Area Indicators, 7-9 January 2007, Rome. (Michael Stocking)**

12. Michael Stocking reported the premise of the workshop was two-fold: 1) to discuss UNDP's medium sized project (MSP) on developing indicators for land degradation; and, 2) the three STAP studies on Land Degradation. He noted that the land degradation TAG's work on indicators had likely by-passed the MSP's indicator work. Michael Stocking remarked there was the additional challenge of the World Bank's project TerraAfrica, which also developed its own set of indicators. He stressed, therefore, the need to better harmonize the indicator work developed in the MSP, TAG, and TerraAfrica.
13. On the STAP studies, Michael Stocking said they were very well received. However, he noted the trade-offs study would be revised. Braulio Dias, STAP member, commented the Strategy Advisory Group (SAG), at their meeting on 23 February, raised the need for further clarification on what global environment benefits arise from the land degradation focal area. Michael Stocking responded the global benefits of land degradation activities are thoroughly identified in the STAP reports, and the challenge ahead was how to better communicate these to the Council.

14. He also remarked that STAP's contributions to the meeting in Rome illustrates how STAP can play an important role in such colloquiums, and recommended that STAP continues to participate in similar processes, which contribute to STAP's visibility and engagement with its scientific networks.
15. Paul Ferraro, STAP member, requested further explanation about what these processes may be. Michael Stocking clarified that the Rome meeting would feed directly into processes and requests made by the GEF Secretariat, GEF Agencies, and Council. Therefore, STAP should look into these opportunities where its engagement could be more sustained and visible compared to workshops.
16. Brian Huntley, STAP member, agreed with Michael Stocking, but also remarked that STAP had successfully engaged in the past with the GEF Secretariat, including through workshops.

#### **Agenda item 5: Adoption of STAP reports to the GEF**

##### **a) Liquid biofuels**

17. Doug Taylor introduced the paper on "STAP's conclusions and recommendations to the GEF on Liquid Biofuels" – a deliverable from STAP's workshop on Liquid Biofuels, September 2005. He requested STAP to consider the draft, identify a STAP lead that would address changes, finalize the draft, and own the report. He also asked STAP to consider whether they are happy to let the workshop report stand, submitted to the GEF Council in December 2006, or whether it should be withdrawn and reviewed based on subsequent comments by Thomas Johansson, STAP member. Doug Taylor added that UNEP commented on it, and is happy with the report.
18. Thomas Johansson expressed dissatisfaction with the workshop report. He stated his comments were technical and that the Brazilian case study was misrepresented in the report.
19. Anand Patwardhan, STAP member, agreed to let the workshop report stand, and said the report was finalized after extensive consultations. He remarked the next step ought to focus on finalizing the conclusions and recommendations, as this was a STAP III activity, which needs to be concluded. Additionally, he expressed the report needs to be owned by STAP III. Furthermore, he reminded STAP of the opportunity to work on biofuels through UNEP's biofuel targeted research proposal (At the October 2006 meeting, UNEP requested STAP's involvement in the project's steering committee.).

**Decision 5.1:** Yolanda Kakabadse asked Anand Patwardhan and Thomas Johansson to complete the conclusions and recommendations on the biofuels report. Consequently, the report will be submitted to the GEF.

#### **Agenda item 6: Progress Report from the STAP Secretariat on STAP reviews (targeted research and Roster) requested since the last meeting and upcoming reviews**

20. Guadalupe Duron, STAP Secretariat, delivered a progress report on STAP reviews – targeted research and roster reviews – undertaken since the last STAP meeting. Anand Patwardhan commented on the need for new terms of reference for projects under the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) window, and remarked that a similar trend may occur with the Least Developed Country Fund (LDCF).
21. Anand Patwardhan remarked STAP would probably recommend two reviewers due to the complexity of adaptation projects, in most cases He recommended keeping this in mind when revising the reviewers' terms of reference.

#### **Agenda item 7: Development of a work program with the Evaluation Office**

22. Yolanda Kakabadse remarked on the close collaboration between STAP and the Evaluation Office (EO) since her appointment, and welcomed Rob Van den Berg, Director of the EO, to the meeting.

23. Rob Van den Berg concurred with Yolanda Kakabadse's words on close collaboration, and noted that regular arrangements had been established to further strengthen communication between the EO and STAP - such as monthly telephone calls with the STAP Chair, as well as Doug Taylor's participation at EO staff meetings.
24. Nonetheless, Rob van den Berg stated that challenges remained to collaborate with STAP. Rob van den Berg proceeded to suggest areas of work which the EO and STAP could work together on. These are the following:
- a) Evaluation of the role of science in the GEF. Rob Van den Berg reported that the EO hired a consultant to work on the evaluation of the role of science in the GEF, which also includes the role of STAP. However, given the difficulty of the subject and the large number of issues identified in the exercise, the EO decided to re-think how best to present the outcomes before delivering an options paper to STAP. As next steps, Rob Van den Berg suggested to work with one, or two, STAP members on the section on the role of STAP, so it is coherent with the EO's work program – to be submitted to Council in June 2007. He also encouraged STAP's involvement in this task so it dovetails with STAP's reform efforts.
  - b) Catalytic role of GEF. Rob Van den Berg reported the EO recently completed a draft paper on "The Catalytic Role of International Aid: How to measure and evaluate Replication and Scaling-up?" The paper considers international aid, catalytic role, and the most common mechanism proposed by the GEF Agencies – scaling-up. He remarked on the need for exploratory work to better understand the commonly used terms related to the Agencies' catalytic role (demonstration, replication, scaling-up), and for methodologies to evaluate these mechanisms. Rob Van den Berg, therefore, believes there is ample scope for further work on how to use these terms, and how to engage with policy makers.

The next steps will include developing a methodology based on best practices. Rob Van den Berg expressed an interest to collaborate with STAP on the methodology, and requested STAP to identify a member who could work on this with the EO. He also remarked that a few Agencies expressed a strong interest to work on this too, such as IFAD and UNEP.

**Decision 7.1:** STAP Member Maryanne Grieg-Gran agreed to represent STAP to collaborate with the EO over methodology.

- c) Impact evaluations. The EO will be conducting impact evaluations of protected area pilot projects in East Africa. For this, the EO has approached Paul Ferraro for advice on the trends in the environmental data. The EO will also collaborate with Paul Ferraro on a project that will look at the links between GEF support and forest coverage in Costa Rica through policy interventions. The role of the GEF will also be considered in the evaluation.

**Decision 7.2:** STAP Member Paul Ferraro agreed to work with the EO on impact evaluations of protected area pilot projects in East Africa. He will also work with the EO on a project that looks at the links between GEF support and forest coverage in Costa Rica through policy interventions.—

Rob Van den Berg also noted the EO is considering a proposal by UNEP (DGEF/DEWA) to look at environmental trends and GEF interventions in the Caribbean. While the EO waits for UNEP's proposal, Rob Van den Berg stated that STAP may also wish to consider collaborating in this task.

- d) International workshop on evaluating climate change and development. Rob Van den Berg stated the EO, along with IUCN, the French GEF, and IDRC, are organizing an international workshop on evaluating climate change and development. Experts on these two issues will be brought together to discuss: 1) how mitigation is linked to development; and, 2) how can developing countries better prepare for adaptation.

**Decision 7.3:** STAP Member Fatima Denton agreed to focus on adaptation in Africa in the development of the International workshop on evaluating climate change and development.

25. Paul Ferraro asked how STAP and the EO can collaborate to help projects be better designed so they can be better evaluated. Rob Van den Berg responded that the EO cannot be involved ex-ante in project design because this represents a conflict with ex-post evaluations. However, he noted the EO is interested in good project design, and would be supportive of STAP's involvement in this. He also noted his involvement and Paul Ferraro's on discussions on the role of experimentation in project design – an active debate in the evaluation community. He said there is an initiative led by a group in Washington D.C. that initially promoted randomization and experimentation as the only design to test projects, and which is now moving away from experimentation by looking at different ways to do testing. Rob Van den Berg noted this was resulting in very interesting and promising new developments for testing projects. He also acknowledged Paul Ferraro's interest in project design, and remarked he would involve Paul Ferraro in future dialogues – events.
26. Braulio Dias concurred with Paul Ferraro about the need to revise the project cycle so that projects include tools and methods that allow for replication and testing at a regional and global scale. Braulio Dias commented that this may, however, pose challenges between the GEF's priorities and country driven ness. Nonetheless, it provides an important opportunity for STAP and the EO to be provocative on improving project design. But it remains unclear whether responding to this challenge is feasible, given the current changes at the GEF, Braulio Dias remarked.
27. Rob Van den Berg replied there are other developments, which move away from testing of interventions through design. He noted that some of the experimentation problems seen in health research are also surfacing in development research. One outcome has been a bias in reporting project results. Rob Van den Berg suggested, therefore, reviewing why earlier attempts failed instead of, immediately, adopting a new project design. He also raised a concern about scientists designing projects instead of development practitioners in the recipient countries.
28. Rashid Hassan, STAP member, asked how the EO's work has influenced STAP's, or the GEF Secretariat's work. Rob Van den Berg replied that now the EO has a tool, "the management action tool", which will assist in tracking their work (Rob Van den Berg will report to the GEF Council about this tool in June 2007.). He also said the EO had taken-up STAP's recommendation on the Roster (Review of Operational Program 12), and he hoped STAP's work would become more integrated with the EO's work.
29. Michael Stocking asked whether the EO would be looking into the development aspects of sustainable land management. He remarked the STAP Land Degradation Studies considered the relationship between environment and development; thus, if the EO were to look at these issues from a sustainable land management perspective, it would be good if STAP were to join the exercise. Rob Van den Berg replied that, currently, there are no plans to do an evaluation on this, but that, perhaps, this would be raised in the evaluation on climate change and development. On a separate note, he said the GEF Council remains unclear how the land degradation focal area contributes to global environment benefits.

#### **Agenda item 8: GEF4 Focal Area Strategies session 1**

30. Doug Taylor introduced this session, and detailed its purpose: 1) receive feedback from the GEF Focal Area team leaders on STAP's contributions so far; 2) update the STAP on the requirements for the GEF-4 strategies; and, 3) ensure that cross-cutting issues are properly integrated and to avoid unnecessary duplication.
31. Peter Bjornsen, GEF Secretariat, thanked STAP members for their contributions to the TAGs. He commented that more work is necessary to focus the strategies, refine long term objectives, harmonize the strategies, and address interlinkages. Peter Bjornsen asked for methodological and substantive advice on these areas. He also listed the type of advice needed from STAP, according to urgency:
  1. Rationale and criteria for the selection of strategic work programs.
  2. Interlinkages and cross cutting issues, linkages to sustainable development.
  3. Clearly defined indicators and targets for GEF interventions.
  4. Outcome indicators.



32. Following these introductions, STAP members and GEF Secretariat team leaders continued discussions on the draft strategies over lunch. Rob Van den Berg also joined the discussions.

#### **Agenda item 9: GEF4 Focal Area Strategies session 2. Progress Review of draft GEF4 Focal Area Strategies**

33. STAP members reconvened in plenary, and reviewed the feedback received during Agenda item 8. Consequently, they set-out to work on their presentations for the GEF CEO and Chairperson. Through their presentations, STAP aimed to critique the draft strategies from a science-based perspective, recommend up to three priority areas for GEF-4 (per focal area), as well as brainstorm on interlinkages.

#### **Agenda item 10: GEF4 Focal Area Strategies session 3**

34. Yolanda Kakabadse welcomed Monique Barbut, GEF CEO and Chairperson, and introduced STAP's presentations (Annex 2). She detailed that STAP members participated in the drafting of the strategies via the TAGs, but that STAP does not own the results. Therefore, STAP is grateful for this opportunity to meet and provide her with direct strategic advice on the GEF priorities, interlinkages, as well as policy examples that can ensure project sustainability.
35. Monique Barbut thanked STAP, and expressed she needs advice on one, or two, areas in which GEF-4 can have an impact. Monique Barbut remarked that so far GEF has spent approximately \$6 billion, and there is no story to accompany it which could say – “thanks to the GEF, we have achieved this objective.” She also feared that by continuing to work on broad strategies as has been done so far, the GEF would not be successful in the next replenishment. Donors are being cautious, giving small amounts of money; therefore, the GEF needs to prove to donors that it can make a difference. Monique Barbut remarked that she remains unclear about *what* GEF can make a difference on. She called on the TAGs to identify indicators, outputs and goals, and said she liked some of the cross-cutting indicators which come from focal areas and wanted to have the best of them used in all focal areas. For example a land degradation project could measure the impact on climate change and biodiversity issues. She also asked for guidance on what the GEF should stop financing.
36. Monique Barbut commented that the 5% allocation for regional projects in biodiversity and climate change would remain frozen until the priorities are defined and agreed by the GEF Council. Yolanda Kakabadse explained that STAP has not yet worked on criteria for regional projects, but that it would work on this soon.
37. On adaptation, Monique Barbut said that although GEF is reportedly the only financial mechanism for this issue, she remains unclear about what is adaptation, and what adaptation activities the GEF should address. Thus far, the adaptation proposals submitted to the GEF are mainly development projects, which should not be funded by the GEF – but by the World Bank, UNDP, and others, stated the GEF CEO and Chairperson.
38. Monique Barbut finalized her intervention by asking for advice on how to address deforestation.
39. Angela Cropper remarked that the questions raised by Monique Barbut are relevant to all multilateral and national funding institutions. She pointed out that the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment findings indicated that action on environmental problems had fallen short so far. She said that perhaps a first limitation was that GEF's portfolio is divided into focal areas, and this may indicate a need to completely change the way interventions are designed. Angela Cropper proposed presenting to the Council a number of high-priority global environmental problems, which the strategies could address.
40. Monique Barbut replied the GEF would not be able to change the existing clusters because of the Conventions, and because replenishment was agreed based on allocating certain resource amounts to focal areas. She asked, therefore, for proposals that could reach the same results without changing the existing focal area structure. For example, she said that by defining indicators and impacts in each focal area, activities relevant across focal areas could also be addressed.

41. Anand Patwardhan commented that one of the reasons why STAP had presented its advice on strategic priorities was to consider and identify areas, which could yield multiple benefits. Anand Patwardhan remarked that quite a lot is known already on “what is adaptation”, and the challenge ahead is to define climate additionality without making it trivial – strictly development activities. He also clarified the reason for proposing three adaptation scenarios (see presentations) is because you would need to address adaptation in conjunction with other environment benefits - that is, climate proofing of other GEF interventions. Anand Patwardhan also raised a scenario where both mitigation and adaptation benefits are generated in a similar way.
42. Monique Barbut reiterated that adaptation is a development issue; therefore, this is a task for the World Bank – not the GEF. Furthermore, she remarked that investing in adaptation may be a risk to investors. Therefore, why should the GEF work on adaptation? Who will bear the loss of investment in adaptation projects?
43. Anand Patwardhan commented that two issues could be considered when assessing the investment risk of adaptation projects: 1) why is there an additional risk – that is, is this relevant? ; and, 2) what mechanisms are in place to ensure the risk is accounted for?
44. Monique Barbut reiterated who would be responsible for bearing the investment loss of adaptation projects. She also noted that the climate change funds, SCCF & LDCF, will likely be replenished (about \$100 million). As a result, she is in need of guidance on what adaptation activities to invest the funds on.
45. Fatima Denton remarked the question is not what is adaptation? She noted African economies are largely agrarian; thereby, dependent on weather fluctuations. She said the relevant question is, therefore, what would it mean if we do not adapt? - What would it mean to African economies if they do not adapt? Fatima Denton also remarked that the GEF and others could assist African economies and institutions understand better adaptation, and ways to address it; otherwise, the benefits of development will be derailed.
46. Braulio Dias commented that if adaptation was not taken into account in biodiversity activities, a number of GEF investments may fail in the long run. Therefore, the GEF may want to consider paying for adaptation measures that could make protected areas more resilient to future climate change scenarios. Monique Barbut answered that perhaps one way to address adaptation would be to make all projects climate resilient. To make this work, she asked for STAP’s help in developing a methodology, and suggested the methodology could also be helpful to other interested partners in the end.
47. Brian Huntley remarked that doing risk assessments of protected area projects with an adaptation component would not be a trivial task. He noted that a number of countries would not have the in-country experience, or time, to do risk assessments on bioclimatic models, and the like, needed to develop these projects.
48. Brian Huntley also shared the concern expressed by the GEF CEO and Chairperson about the multiple meetings that in-country project proponents attend as a means to obtain GEF funding. He remarked this and integration across the focal areas was an institutional management issue – therefore, sometimes the symptoms are not about science, but about institutional management and structural issues.
49. On addressing deforestation, Braulio Dias commented the GEF will not succeed if it merely focuses on protected areas as a means to address biodiversity loss because much of this loss is occurring outside protected areas. This is why STAP believes the GEF needs to address mainstreaming biodiversity to address what is happening outside protected areas - within mainstreaming addressing deforestation could be a focus, remarked Braulio Dias. He also commented that deforestation could be addressed through interlinkages. However, he also raised the concern that deforestation is one area where no ruling exists from the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).
50. Paul Ferraro, STAP member, commented on the GEF CEO and Chairperson’s uncertainty about the impact the GEF has had on the global environment. He noted this uncertainty is, perhaps, attributed

to the types of interventions, which cannot be measure, or which are difficult to measure. He said this was a common challenge of environment institutions. Paul Ferraro advised, therefore, that if a priority for the GEF is to measure the impacts of its interventions, in terms of environmental outcomes, then the GEF should engage in measurable activities. Alternatively, if the GEF wishes to continue in interventions that are difficult to measure (for example catalytic role, enabling policy change), then it could partner with institutions doing similar work in order to evaluate a more comprehensive data set.

51. Monique Barbut stated that biodiversity loss is worse than ever. Could it be said that thanks to the GEF, species have been protected? Monique Barbut answered that it is on this issue, that she needed further clarity – focus on.
52. Thomas Johansson, STAP member, welcomed Monique Barbut's words on how the GEF needs to demonstrate that it is making a difference in order to increase donor's interest in the GEF. He stated it is very important to increase funding to tackle global environment challenges, as evidenced by the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and the Global Change Project. For climate change, change is needed in the way business is being conducted, as well as societal change. Thomas Johansson remarked that the challenges for climate change, especially energy, are daunting. He suggested, therefore, that the GEF accept a broad set of drivers, which can accomplish change. Through these drivers, mitigation could be better addressed than if the GEF were to tackle it alone.
53. Monique Barbut agreed with Thomas Johansson's view. She also remarked that change would likely come by engaging the private sector. However, she recognized that it will be a challenge to draw the private sector's attention towards the GEF. To make a difference in climate change, Thomas Johansson noted it would also be important to address the incentive and policy structures, sustainable transport, energy efficient buildings, and others. For biodiversity, Bráulio Dias stated the GEF could make a difference on invasive species.
54. On indicators, John Buccini, STAP member, remarked that perhaps the GEF could accept that not all the focal areas would need sharp indicators. He asked Monique Barbut whether the GEF is seeking to achieve the same result for every project, or whether the goal was to achieve something more strategic – a big picture result. The GEF CEO and Chairperson replied she was not seeking a methodology that would yield the same results across projects, but the latter.
55. To address interlinkages, Anand Patwardhan asked the GEF CEO and Chairperson whether STAP could address this by thinking of a cross-cutting program – for example biological carbon sequestration. And if so, then perhaps it would be worthwhile for STAP to spend time categorizing the cross-cutting program (including indicators for multiple benefits). Anand Patwardhan also concurred with Thomas Johansson about the need to address change at the policy level, as well as working through the private sector. Therefore, should the GEF consider a private – public partnership, particularly with regards to technology change?
56. Monique Barbut replied that it would not be a problem for STAP to work on a cross-cutting program. On public-private partnership, Monique Barbut unveiled a private sector initiative she would propose to the Council at their next meeting in June 2007. The strategy is a new initiative with its own governance structure, started with a GEF-3 allocation of \$50 million. Subsequently, the GEF CEO and Chairperson sought a minimum leverage of \$3 from the private sector for every \$1 from the GEF. The initiative reached a \$1 to \$1 ratio; therefore, the GEF CEO and Chairperson launched the initiative. In June, she will propose the role of the initiative to the Council, as well as present the members of the fund (private sector representatives and governments). STAP will also play a role in the initiative.
57. The private sector strategy will build "platforms" – for example will start by creating two platforms on biofuels. The initiatives will also be associated with a "Capital Prize", which STAP will be requested to advise on the scientific choices. There will also be "classic tools", which will help small and medium enterprises. The initiative is also seeking to establish a platform with insurance companies to address adaptation (micro-insurance), and build a new way to calculate interest premiums. The initiative will be led by David Reed, World Wildlife Fund (WWF), who will sit at the GEF Secretariat.

58. On knowledge management, Monique Barbut asked STAP to work on this with the EO. She commented that although GEF has invested \$2 million on this issue the results are not yet clear. Anand Patwardhan remarked that knowledge management is an internal challenge for the GEF, and that it is not a task for STAP. However, he noted that capacity building could be looked at as a strategic activity. For example, there is a need to build capacity on adaptation so that individuals and institutions can understand better the science. Working on capacity building would be a targeted and define activity that can have an impact, Anand Patwardhan commented.
59. Monique Barbut noted there is about \$40 million in GEF 4 resources for capacity building. Thus far, she has not seen good proposals on capacity building. Anthony Nyong remarked that Africa has benefited a lot from the GEF's efforts on capacity building. Therefore, he urged to consider strengthening capacity building - make it more focused – so that better results are achieved, instead of doing away with capacity building. Monique Barbut agreed with this, and stated the effort needs to be defined in a focused way – what country, what reason.
60. On targeted research, Monique Barbut advised to consider research on a development issue, and try to look at the responses in a different way. She argued in favor of investing in the next most important trend on research and capacity building – adaptation. This would result in targeted research activities that are well connected to other concerted strides on development and the global environment, instead of targeted research that evolves into silos. When developing targeted research activities, Monique Barbut also remarked about the need to involve stakeholders outside the environment community – such as international trade bodies.

#### **Agenda item 11: GEF4 Focal Area Strategies session 4**

61. Yolanda Kakabadse commented that Monique Barbut asked STAP to design its recommendations in a manner that moves away from the silo approach, with the understanding that GEF must continue to work with focal areas. Anand Patwardhan commented that although the focal areas will remain, STAP could identify a few topics for cross focal area thematic programs with budget from a couple focal areas, and with targets and indicators that bring out cross benefits. He identified what he saw as the four deliverables for STAP: 1) provide feedback to the individual focal area strategies; 2) provide advice on what to do with 5% regional/global funding allocation; 3) provide advice on what to do with capacity building allocation; and, 4) suggest focused cross focal area thematic programs. Michael Stocking commented on the need to be strategic in identifying short term deliverables that would make a difference for GEF programs.

#### **Agenda item 12: GEF4 Focal Area Strategies session 5**

62. STAP and focal area team leaders broke into focal area groups to continue the revision of the focal area strategies. In the plenary that followed, the biodiversity focal area reported the group focused on how to respond to Monique Barbut's call for more focus, on clarifying what lines of work should and should not be included in the strategy and on developing a compelling story line. The climate change focal area reported the group spent time thinking about how to shift the focus/target of interventions from investments to achieving policy change. The international waters group reported that as the resources for this focal area are limited, there is a need to emphasize the interlinkages with other focal areas, such as: addressing the causes of nutrient enrichment from land based sources, glacier melting (linkages to climate change), fisheries (linkages to biodiversity), and groundwater and SIDS. The chemical focal area group called on other focal areas to acknowledge the positive and negative linkages with POPs. For example, interlinkages with climate change in the forthcoming report on best practices for unintentionally produced POPs: biomass burning as significant source of purins and dioxins; and, the need for coordination with the climate change focal area on the issue of 3<sup>rd</sup> generation CFCs. The land degradation focal area reported the group focused its discussion on the need to tell a more compelling story, on indicators, and on key land degradation drivers.

#### **Agenda item 13: GEF4 Focal Area Strategies session 6**

63. The meeting participants reconvened in plenary to present each group's suggestions for: (a) revising the focal area strategies; (b) potential global/regional initiatives; (c) potential themes cross focal area/interlinkages work; and (d) potential themes for targeted research.

64. Brian Huntley commented it would be a shame for STAP to cease work on the difficult and problematic but important issue of mainstreaming, or integrating biodiversity into other focal areas. He pointed out that although the concept is difficult to apply, there have been several successful mainstreaming approaches and encouraged STAP to continue work on this topic.
65. Doug Taylor proposed that the Secretariat seek a more active engagement with the technical bodies of the conventions.

**Decision 13.1:** STAP members agreed that the STAP Secretariat should seek active engagement with the technical bodies concerned.

66. STAP members highlighted the need for the allocation of funding for cross- thematic work. They suggested setting aside an allocation for cross thematic work, setting aside resources from each focal area or using part of the capacity building allocation. Anna Tengberg, UNEP, pointed out that the GEF Secretariat has allocated funding from the land degradation, climate change and biodiversity focal areas for cross cutting work on forests.
67. Michael Stocking agreed to prepare a document elaborating on the ideas discussed for a cross focal area program, and capacity building. He suggested that the topic of forests be removed from the biodiversity focal area, and placed in a cross focal area program.

#### **Agenda item 14: STAP workplan for FY07 and FY08 and preparation for June 2007 GEF Council**

68. Yolanda Kakabase presented ideas, developed in collaboration with UNEP, for revising the structure of STAP as requested by Council. It was proposed that the reconstituted STAP would have a Chair and five members, each having a term of two years, renewable once, with each member selected for and specializing in one of the five focal areas, and with strong interest in interlinkages. The smaller-sized STAP would be complemented by agreements with organizations representing relevant scientific networks, such as the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), the International Council for Science (ICSU), and others.
69. Also, the STAP Secretariat would be strengthened by adding one more professional post. This would facilitate continuous engagement with all focal area task forces. The goal of the proposed changes is to make STAP more effective and better able to meet the GEF Secretariat's needs for science and technology advice. The Chair proposed the creation of a small committee to examine the proposal and create safeguards to minimize risk of experiment. She clarified that the current STAP will continue until the new structure is in place.
70. Anand Patwardhan expressed serious doubts as to whether the scientific networks identified in the proposals would be able deliver results within a reasonable timeframe. He proposed that to create a smaller, more engaged STAP and to attract top caliber people, the Panelists should be hired full time or for a small part of their time. Anthony Nyong also expressed concern over STAP's ability to supervise the relationship with scientific networks.
71. Angela Cropper recognized that STAP has been dysfunctional in terms of the expectations put upon it. She welcomed the STAP Chair's, GEF CEO and Chairperson's and UNEP Executive Director's commitment to look for a better formula. She proposed that STAP take the opportunity to see what is expected of it, and suggested that the new structure follow a clarification of STAP's function. She called for a clarification of the role for the reduced number of members in relation to larger body of scientists being accessed through networks. She cautioned that roping in networks to get access to scientists is very seductive, but that STAP must not underestimate bureaucratic hurdles of creating and managing this relationship.
72. Brian Huntley recommended not making changes to STAP until the changes currently underway in the GEF Secretariat are complete. Fatima Denton expressed concern that STAP maintain its independence.
73. Doug Taylor commented on the need to find a balance between the STAP Secretariat and the scientists that make up the Panel. He felt that having a smaller Panel who dedicates more time to

STAP could provide greater continuity, and highlighted the need for Secretariat staff who understand the issues.

74. Yolanda Kakabadse commented that the Council wishes to see revised terms of reference for STAP at their next meeting in June 2007. She asked Michael Stocking, Anand Patwardhan, and Saburo Matsui to help on the proposal.
75. Doug Taylor reported the work program agreed in October 2006 needs to be revised due to GEF's evolving interests and needs. He reported that STAP has been asked to participate in the project cycle review led by the GEF Secretariat. Doug Taylor also reminded STAP of the EO's interest to collaborate on developing guidelines for early project reviews for certain types of projects

**Decision 14.1:** Michael Stocking and Rashid Hassan agreed to contribute to the GEF review of the Project Cycle. Fatima Denton and Paul Ferraro agreed to work with the EO on developing guidelines for early project reviews.

76. Participants discussed the mainstreaming of biodiversity in marine and freshwater ecosystems.
77. On UNEP's proposal on biofuels, Doug Taylor reported that STAP reviewed the proposal, and that it is awaiting the final proposal. STAP will form part of the steering committee for this project. He also reported that STAP's work on carbon storage and energy efficient buildings is on hold pending a clearer request from the GEF Secretariat.
78. Participants agreed that STAP should wait to see how the GEF Secretariat approaches the issue of adaptation before pursuing work on this topic. If the GEF Secretariat sees adaptation as an issue that needs to be integrated across all focal areas, the issue of adaptation would be a candidate for targeted research.
79. Qisheng Tang presented a proposal for a STAP workshop on coastal dead zones. It was agreed, however, to place the workshop on hold until the strategies are agreed by the Council, and until a clearer request for this workshop is received from the GEF Secretariat.
80. STAP also agreed to wait until the strategies are agreed by Council before defining further STAP activities.
81. Doug Taylor listed items of STAP's work plan that can go ahead regardless of the restructuring of the GEF Secretariat and focal area strategies. This includes:
  - i. Work with Rob van den Berg to establish clear objectives for STAP's collaboration with the EO.
  - ii. Collaborate with the EO on the role of science in the GEF, and other tasks (see Agenda item 7).
  - iii. Draft a proposal for a reconstituted STAP (working group – Yolanda Kakabadse, Michael Stocking, Anand Patwardhan, Doug Taylor)
  - iv. Draft revised project cycle document (working group – Michael Stocking, Rashid Hassan, Doug Taylor)

**Decision 14.2:** STAP agreed to the changes to the Work Plan proposed.

82. It was agreed to hold the next STAP meeting 10-12 September 2007 in Washington, D.C.

**Annex 1** - Those attending (throughout or in part)

**STAP Members**

Yolanda Kakabadse, Chair  
Michael Stocking, Vice-Chair  
John Buccini  
Angela Cropper  
Fatima Denton  
Braulio Dias  
Paul Ferraro  
Maryanne Grieg-Gran  
Rashid Hassan  
Brian Huntley  
Thomas Johansson  
Saburo Matsui  
Anthony Nyong  
Anand Patwardhan  
Qisheng Tang

**GEF Secretariat**

Monique Barbut, CEO & Chairperson  
Peter Bjornsen  
Al Duda  
Laurent Granier  
Richard Hosier  
Andrea Kutter  
Andrea Merla  
Ramesh Ramankutty  
Mark Zimsky

**GEF Evaluation Office**

Rob Van den Berg, Director

**UNEP** (seconded to the STAP Secretariat)

Anna Tengberg  
Catherine Vallee

**STAP Secretariat**

Doug Taylor, Secretary  
Cecilia Blasco  
Guadalupe Durón

**Annex 2** – STAP presentations & STAP’s preliminary analysis of the draft focal area strategies

STAP presentations - <http://stapgef.unep.org/activities/stapmeetings/document.2007-03-09.0495297769>

Report to the GEF Secretariat on STAP’s preliminary analysis of the draft focal area strategies (5 March 2007) - <http://stapgef.unep.org/activities/stapmeetings/folder.2007-03-09.2919042887/file.2007-03-09.4786116345>