



Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.35/ Inf.9
June 2, 2009

GEF Council
June 22-24, 2009

DRAFT REPORT OF THE APRIL 2009 STAP MEETING FAO HEADQUARTERS, ROME

(Prepared by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel)

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility



STAP Meeting April 28-30, 2009. FAO Headquarters, Rome **DRAFT REPORT** (June 5, 2009)

A. Summary and Decisions of the Meeting

1. Background

The Science Panel met in Rome, Italy, in the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), April 28-30, 2009. The meeting was the second of two planned main meetings of the Panel held in GEF financial year 2009. This report records the proceedings of the open sessions. Agenda numbered items refer to the agenda posted on the meeting website¹, which also sets out the detailed objectives for the meeting..

2. Agenda items 1, 2 and 3.

Opening of the meeting, adoption of the Agenda and confirmation of the minutes of the September 2008 Science Panel meeting.

Thomas Lovejoy, STAP Chair, opened the meeting, thanking FAO for hosting the meeting Jan Heino, Assistant Director General, FAO, welcomed STAP and the meeting participants to FAO. The agenda was adopted without change and the minutes of the last meeting of the Science Panel, held on September 15-17, 2008 at the World Bank, Washington DC, USA, were confirmed.

Decision 3.1: The minutes of the September 2008 Science Panel meeting were confirmed.

3. Agenda item 4.

STAP Progress report

The STAP Secretary presented a progress report on the implementation of the decisions taken at the previous STAP meeting (September 2008) and the delivery of STAP's work program activities, referring to the Agenda item paper.

Acknowledging the significant workload for STAP, including project concept screening, contributions to GEF-5 strategy development and advice on the RAF/STAR (resource allocation systems), the GEF Secretariat confirmed that all options for the RAF/STAR presented to Council in 2008 are still open, and that it is important for STAP to continue to provide advice on it. Participants agreed that simplicity and scientific relevance is important in developing the resource allocation system.

Noting that only 16% of project concepts screened were rated as needing improvement ("minor revision required" or "major revision required"), STAP explained that this statistic does not necessarily reflect the overall quality. Participants agreed that further analysis is required and that STAP should maintain its project surveillance in dialogue with GEF Agencies aiming at increasing impact.

Decision 4.1: STAP will continue advising on the developing GEF-5 resource allocation system.

Decision 4.2: STAP will continue to monitor and compile statistics on the outcomes of project (and programmatic approach) concept screening including trends over time and correlation with GEFSEC and Council comments.

Decision 4.3: STAP confirms that it is responsible for ensuring that its project screening comments are addressed through dialogue with Agencies.

¹ <http://stapgef.unep.org/activities/stapmeetings/April2009>.

4. Agenda item 5. Presenting the Panel's advisory products

The Chair introduced the emerging STAP advisory products and services which are described in the FY09 Work Program and comprise guidance on:

- Payments for Environmental Services;
- Experimental and Quasi-experimental Project Designs;
- Marine Protected Areas (MPA);
- Community forest management;
- Biofuel Strategy under GEF-5;
- Dead zones expert consultation (IW);
- Selection of combustion and non-combustion technologies for POPs disposal in developing countries and CEITs;
- Synergies and trade-offs between energy conservation and release of unintentionally produced POPs (uPOPs)

In addition guidance sourced through two expert workshops was provided to the GEF-5 Focal Area Technical Advisory Groups (TAG) on climate change, including on LULUCF, and guidance on a number of projects under implementation. Further work is underway to inform the GEF's work on the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources. Discussion of the advisory work by participants covered the process and the focus of STAP's advice and also revisited PIF screening by STAP. The UNFCCC Secretariat made suggestions for collaborative work with STAP.

Decision 5.1: STAP agreed to contact the UNFCCC Secretariat to discuss further the work requested of it.

(Note that Agenda item 6 was combined in the meeting with the closing session on the GEF-5 strategies, therefore please see Agenda item 13 for the notes from the session).

5. Agenda item 7 (and 13 in relation to multi-focal area natural resource management initiatives) Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) next steps

Session 7 comprised two parts focussed on the role of GEF to deliver actions towards sustainable forest management, including reducing emissions from LULUCF and the role and potential of Ecosystem restoration and recarbonization including REDD. Activities that could assist delivery of the proposed GEF-5 strategies on SFM and related areas were revisited under Agenda item 13.

Participants received two presentations on how GEF funding fits in with the variety of sources of funding available for sustainable forest management, and four presentations which addressed barrier removal for ecosystem restoration and recarbonization, including how global assessments can inform actions towards optimizing land use, enhanced land management and policy support.

Wide-ranging discussion followed the presentations focusing on the potential of biological carbon sequestration, ways that countries can prepare themselves to take advantage of mechanisms that may emerge from negotiations under the UNFCCC, and priorities for GEF investment in various ecosystems, including tropical forests and tropical forest peatlands. Participants also considered the merits of having a framework strategy for SFM, but not for other ecosystems in GEF-5. Finally participants discussed climate risk and adaptation and the need to build these aspects into all focal area strategies.

Decision 7.1: STAP will advise the TAGs for SFM and Climate Change to address capacity building activities to assist countries to report that they are enabled to prepare themselves to take advantage of mechanisms that may emerge that provide positive incentives for climate change mitigation and conservation in specific ecosystems that may be prioritised for GEF interventions.

Decision 7.2: STAP recommends continuing a dedicated framework strategy for SFM, without prejudice to the needs for other important ecosystem, but will work through the SFM and Focal Area TAGs to

clarify what will be supported under the strategy and the ways in which countries can access GEF support for SFM interventions.

**6. Agenda item 8.
GEF-5 strategies, an integrated approach.**

The GEF Secretariat outlined the process for developing the draft GEF-5 strategies. Participants were provided with a hard copy document to the meeting; this document consisted of the draft Objectives by focal area organized within a Results Framework for the GEF focal areas, plus additional frameworks for Sustainable Forest Management and for Adaptation.

Participants discussed the drafts and noted the lack of synthesis in common and little evidence of multi-disciplinary approaches, and several inconsistencies between overlapping objectives scattered across focal areas. Suggestions were made for improvement to each of the draft outline strategies, and to reduce the noted overlaps and inconsistencies.

The Panel concluded that investments in one focal area can have negative impacts on the objectives of other focal areas, and that objectives in different focal areas are frequently best achieved jointly rather than separately. GEF operations should take these cross-focal area relationships into account and, when appropriate, ensure that relationships among focal area objectives are acted upon through cross-focal area coordination and investments. The GEF Secretariat invited further feedback, once the draft strategies have been circulated.

Decision 8.1: As proposed by the GEF Evaluation Office STAP can play a major role in making GEF-wide results-based management framework consistent with the maximized delivery of GEBs across focal areas and including cross-cutting issues at the level of strategic goals/objectives.

Decision 8.2: STAP will start working on ecosystem carbon services. The first step is proposed work on peatlands and post-Copenhagen LULUCF methodology.

**7. Agenda item 9.
Oceans and over-fishing**

The session considered two presentations, one from FAO and another from STAP, followed by a plenary discussion. The objectives for the session were to survey the problems that lead to over-fishing and to identify any opportunities within GEF's comparative advantage. The main messages from the session included that overfishing is a threat to biodiversity, but GEF is not the primary agency to address over-fishing, which is contributed to by:

- Capacity constraints in developing countries;
- Lack of effective application of available legal instruments that needs to be addressed;
- Poverty and lack of property rights
- Lack of an ecosystem approach

Decision 9.1: It was agreed that Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction need to be addressed by GEF, that existing projects such as the CTI which are otherwise well-grounded need fisheries elements, and that GEF fisheries work needs to address legal instruments, in the context of a common resource management approach.

**8. Agenda item 10.
Improved Chemicals Management**

The Session was opened by presentation from STAP on global chemical threats including heavy metals, pesticides, brominated flame retardants, new POPs, and electronic waste followed by two presentations from FAO. Discussion that followed, strongly supported expansion of GEF's support for POPs to other chemicals of global significance suggesting that GEF should promote an integrated chemicals management approach.

Decision 10.1: STAP will continue providing advice in the Technical Advisory Group on chemicals emphasizing promotion of integrated chemicals management as a primary aim of the focal area.

Decision 10.2: STAP Work Program for FY10 will include 1. Study on emerging chemicals for GEF-5 and beyond that will propose, *inter alia*, criteria for supporting particular chemicals in the GEF (potential to deliver global environmental benefits); 2. Guidance document for GEF on electronic waste; 3. Advice on cost-effective methods for POPs monitoring and analysis.

**9. Agenda item 11.
OPS4**

The Evaluation Office led two sessions on the Fourth Overall Performance Study of the GEF, the first a briefing and general discussion in an open session and the second a closed session only with the Panel and its service provider UNEP. The session was supported by two presentations from the Evaluation Office.

**10. Agenda item 12.
Biofuels, food security and biodiversity**

The session considered presentations from STAP highlighting main results of the STAP study on biofuels and STAP's recommendations on strategic programs supporting biofuels in GEF-5, followed by presentations from IFAD, FAO, and UNEP. Participants acknowledged the significance of applying safeguards for both, first and second generation biofuels, and STAP was advised to carefully consider the trade-offs involved.

Decision 12.1: STAP acknowledges the significance of adherence to sustainability criteria in supporting biofuels projects in the GEF. STAP recommends considering biofuels in the context of bioenergy with implications for promotion of sustainable agricultural practices and reiterates its position on biofuels in GEF-5 expressed in the STAP document prepared for TAG on climate change (http://stapgef.unep.org/activities/technicalworkshops/CC_GEF5).

Decision 12.2: STAP will serve as an advisor to GEF targeted research project "Assessments and guidelines for sustainable liquid biofuels production in developing countries".

**11. Agenda item 13.
GEF-5 strategies, an integrated approach (Part 2)**

This session, the second session to consider emerging GEF-5 strategies, also looked at STAP's role in bridging across the strategies and use of its expertise. Topics re-examined included biofuels, the draft adaptation strategy, the need for clearly focused GEBs for chemicals, and opportunities for integrated activities across focal areas.

Decision 13.1: STAP will provide further advice regarding the interlinkages between focal area strategies including the incorporation of adaptation to climate change.

Decision 13.2: STAP will aim at producing a consolidated opinion on biofuels.

Decision 13.3: STAP will contribute to a clear definition of GEBs in a wider chemicals focal area.

Decision 13.4: STAP will contribute to an improved M&E framework for LD

B. Full Report and Decisions of the Meeting

Introduction

1. The Science Panel met in Rome, Italy, in the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) German Room for three days, April 28-30, 2009. The last part of the second day and the last half of the third day were closed sessions, with the remainder open to GEF Agencies, GEF Secretariat, GEF Evaluation Office and representatives of GEF-related multilateral environmental agreements. The meeting was the second of two planned main meetings of the Panel held in GEF financial year 2009, and the objectives set for the meeting were to:
 1. Increase the impact of proposed STAP strategic products through review by GEF partners
 2. Advise on STAP's proposed Strategic Review Paper for the June Council, and orient STAP's future work to maximum effect
 3. Review the role of the GEF within SFM, LULUCF and REDD, including the potential for actions towards ecosystem restoration and recarbonization using an ecosystems approach
 4. Review the draft GEF-5 focal area strategies, informed by STAP's inputs to the Technical Advisory Groups, to support STAP's role in ensuring that ongoing strategy formulation and GEF Council approval process is well informed by science, resulting in effective and well positioned focal area strategies
 5. Consider new and cross-cutting focal area objectives for consideration in GEF-5 and beyond
 6. Inform GEF Agencies and STAP of required work towards OPS4; and convey STAP's self evaluation and feedback on the performance of GEF to the GEF Evaluation Office
 7. Review STAP's proposed Work Program for the GEF financial year 2010.
2. This report records the proceedings of the open sessions. Agenda numbered items refer to the agenda posted on the meeting website².

Agenda items 1, 2 and 3.

Opening of the meeting, adoption of the Agenda and confirmation of the minutes of the September 2008 Science Panel meeting.

3. Thomas Lovejoy, STAP Chair, opened the meeting, observing that it was the second STAP meeting to be held outside of Washington DC at a GEF agency, the first being in Nairobi at UNEP in 2008. He thanked FAO for hosting the meeting and noted that FAO is a very important GEF Agency with much to offer the GEF and the Science Panel.
4. Jan Heino, Assistant Director General, FAO, welcomed STAP and the meeting participants to FAO. He noted the current importance of climate change and that FAO's holistic perspective on environmental, social and economic dimensions of natural resources management is shared with STAP and will be discussed at this meeting. He also stated that FAO's strength in Technical Assistance is particularly relevant to STAP.
5. The Chair called on Panel members, then all meeting participants, to make a brief self-introduction.
6. The agenda was adopted without change and the minutes of the last meeting of the Science Panel, held on September 15-17, 2008 at the World Bank, Washington DC, USA, were confirmed.

Decision 3.1: The minutes of the September 2008 Science Panel meeting were confirmed.

² <http://stapgef.unep.org/activities/stapmeetings/April2009>.

Agenda item 4.
STAP Progress report

7. Douglas Taylor, STAP Secretary, presented a progress report on the implementation of the decisions taken at the previous STAP meeting (September 2008) and the delivery of STAP's work program activities, referring to the Agenda item paper.
8. The GEF Secretariat acknowledged the significant workload for STAP including project concept screening, contributions to GEF-5 strategy development and advice on the RAF/STAR (resource allocation systems). With regard to the GEF's resource allocation system, it was confirmed that all options presented to Council in 2008 are still open, that simplicity is seen as important so that it can be widely understood, that debate will continue for the next six to nine months and that it is important for STAP to continue to provide advice on it.
9. UNEP pointed out the need to balance simplicity and scientific relevance in developing the resource allocation system, stressing that the system and its indicators should not be a constraint to programming but should help programming, noting also that reconciling the scientific and political dimensions of the system will be difficult but important.
10. Regarding a figure in the STAP progress report that only 16% of project concepts screened were rated as needing improvement ("minor revision required" or "major revision required"), UNEP noted that this suggests that the quality of GEF project concepts is very good. It was suggested to analyse trends over time in STAP screens and any correlation with, for example, the review sheets of the GEF Secretariat and the Council member comments on the same projects. UNEP also asked whether proposals for programmatic approaches were also screened in the same way as full size projects.
11. STAP confirmed that programmatic approaches are screened and noted that while the proportion of projects and programs needing improvement appears to be low at 16%, this statistic is likely to increase in future GEF Work Programs, because many of STAP's comments and suggestions are not being addressed when the STAP screening is rated as "consent" and therefore the "minor revision required" rating will be used more frequently. This is justified because the 16% statistic does not necessarily reflect the overall quality and that it does not follow that 84% require no improvement. For example, Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) are generally not well covered in PIFs but this is an important scientific aspect of the project concept.
12. UNEP noted that there have always been different views on the merits of STAP reviewing project concepts, ranging from the practice being too much micromanagement to being necessary scientific quality assurance. As the GEF project cycle continues to change and become more streamlined it will be important to continue to assess how STAP can help the Council. There is complementarity between Council review and STAP screening, therefore if one becomes less involved the other must look at project concepts more closely.
13. The GEF Secretariat noted that STAP has done very well in screening project concepts. However, there is still a need to work on the balance between the proportion of projects STAP can get more involved with after screening and the potential to change these projects significantly. Change in the full project briefs depends on a dialogue between STAP and the GEF Agencies to ensure that STAP advice on the PIFs is taken into account. STAP responded that it has developed a dialogue with some Agencies and invites other agencies to also engage more closely if they have historically been reluctant to take on STAP advice, including for example on experimental project design to contribute to the evidence base for GEF interventions.

Decision 4.1: STAP will continue advising on the developing GEF-5 resource allocation system.

Decision 4.2: STAP will continue to monitor and compile statistics on the outcomes of project (and programmatic approach) concept screening including trends over time and correlation with GEFSEC and Council comments.

Decision 4.3: STAP confirms that it is responsible for ensuring that its project screening comments are addressed through dialogue with Agencies.

Agenda item 5.

Presenting the Panel's advisory products

14. The Chair introduced the emerging STAP advisory products and services which are described in the FY09 Work Program, and invited Panel Members to introduce their progress reports.
15. Under the biodiversity focal area, Paul Ferraro introduced the four main products that are in the final stages of production and peer review:
 - Payments for Environmental Services, aimed at providing guidance to the GEF Council, GEF Agencies and Secretariat in the design and evaluation of Payments for Environmental Service (PES) projects, and also to ensure that the GEF is aware of the current evidence base for the effectiveness of PES and the implications for project and program design. This document, which was recently finalized, will be provided to the June GEF Council meeting.
 - Experimental and Quasi-experimental Project Designs, developed further at a workshop in March 2009 that examined opportunities and constraints in designing GEF projects with experimental variation in project implementation to aid learning about what works and under what conditions and which will result in a guideline document for the GEF Secretariat and Agencies to assist in understanding such designs and identifying opportunities to use them. Completion is expected in June 2009.
 - Marine Protected Areas (MPA), a review of empirical evidence base for the effectiveness of marine protected areas (MPA), implications for the inferences drawn from this evidence, and implications for GEF-funded MPA project designs, which is expected to be completed in July 2009.
 - Community forest management, a systematic review of empirical evidence for the impacts of community forest management on outcomes related to global environmental benefits and socioeconomic welfare. The review will be available in time for the November Council meeting
16. For the climate change focal area N.H. Ravindranath briefed the meeting about two principal products which are aimed at informing development of the GEF-5 focal area strategy and a third which updates the former guidance from STAP on liquid biofuels. The products cited were:
 - GEF- 5 Science vision for Climate Change Focal Area Strategic Programming in GEF -5, which updates the Panel's Science Vision, and highlights the Technology Development / Innovation Chain.
 - Review of the GEF-4 Strategic Program on LULUCF, to identify new directions and changes and enhance the enabling environment within the Forest Sector in GEF-5 strategic programming.Both of the above products were tested within expert workshops and peer reviewed prior to their use within the GEF-5 TAGs and are available on the STAP website
 - Biofuel Strategy under GEF-5, a review of sustainable biofuel production including on second generation biofuels to update the 2007 guidance provided by STAP. This is expected to complete by September 2009. This product will be published by STAP.
17. Within the international waters focal area, Meryl Williams summarized three main activities:
 - Review of potential indicators for their suitability in guiding a Resource Allocation Framework for IW; this work is informed through three separate consultancies and the first stage review took place in a December meeting jointly convened by STAP/GEF Secretariat at UNESCO Paris and published on the STAP website. Further work is underway to inform the GEF's work on the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources ("STAR", the GEF Secretariat has renamed the former Resource Allocation Framework – RAF).
 - Guidance provided to the newly started IW Science Project. This is a strategic advisory activity which will continue through the life of the project
 - Dead zones expert consultation, a terms of reference was designed and experts identified for a China-based workshop.
18. For the chemicals focal area, Bo Wahlstrom highlighted two main products:
 - Guidance on selection of combustion and non-combustion technologies for POPs disposal in developing countries and CEITs, this work reflects the fact that GEF interventions on POPs have shifted from National Implementation Plans (NIPs) to implementation, and considers whether some technologies meet the intentions of the Convention, pays attention to emerging technologies and

- notes that substantial experience has been gathered since NIP work started. The guidance paper will be completed in June 2009 and published later.
- Guidance on synergies and trade-offs between energy conservation and release of unintentionally produced POPs (uPOPs). This guidance addresses the need for chemicals proofing of the GEF portfolio, and the study is the first towards meeting this request by providing analysis and policy advice on synergies and trade-offs between energy efficiency and POPs. The paper will be completed in June 2009 and published later.
19. In the land degradation focal area, Michael Stocking provided a summary of STAP's advisory work which includes:
- Continuing advice on the KM: Land UNDP project (MSP), responsible for providing guidance on indicators for GEF's work in the land degradation focal area.
 - Advice to the newly started UNEP-led Carbon Benefits Project (CBP), which aims to provide a cost-effective tracking and support system for C benefits in GEF and other natural resource management projects.
20. Collectively, the Panel as a whole is also advising the GEF on a number of major corporate issues, such as the future positioning of the GEF with respect to enhanced impact of science and technology including specific advice on future development of global benefit indices in the STAR (successor to RAF in GEF-5). Recent responses have included STAP's response to the Evaluation Office's Mid-Term Review of the RAF³, to the GEF paper 'Strategic Positioning of the Global Environmental Facility for Its Fifth Phase', and to the draft paper 'Options for a GEF-wide Resource Allocation Framework.'^{4 5}]

Discussion on STAP's advisory work

Following the presentations, the general discussion sought further clarification about the guidance products and approach that STAP is taking.

21. UNDP requested clarification about peer review of STAP's products, and the Panel confirmed that all of its published guidance is subject to independent peer review. For example the two workshops convened under the climate change focal area consisted of independent experts to review proposals from the climate change Panel Member, and the output from the work was separately reviewed externally. Similarly the biodiversity focal area guidance documents have independent peer review applied.
22. UNFCCC Secretariat stated that regarding LULUCF and carbon sequestration, UNFCCC's SBSTA would welcome STAP's input while the UNFCCC Secretariat wanted more discussion by STAP of the technical development and innovation chain. Also given that UNFCCC's definition of Land Use Change excludes forestry STAP is asked to ensure that it reflects the correct definition.
23. UNEP asked how outcomes of the Terrestrial Carbon Workshop organized jointly between H. John Heinz III Center for Science, Economics and the Environment and STAP on January 28-29th in Washington, DC⁶ contributed to the UNEP-WCMC commissioned Rapid Response Assessment on Biological Carbon Sequestration.
24. UNEP commended STAP's proposed approach to using the technology innovation chain as a guiding principle for developing GEF-5 strategies in the climate change focal area and recommended using "similar" frameworks for other focal areas.
25. UNIDO questioned the balance between the length and purpose of the PIF, suggesting more streamlining, and expressing concerns about the increasing length of the PIF. Participants agreed that the PIF should be restricted in size but STAP requested that the PIF must adequately outline the problem statement and global environmental benefits sought. There was a consensus that the present system of PIF screening by STAP was a reasonable compromise between scientific depth and practical utility in the project cycle. The GEF Secretariat reminded the meeting that STAP is screening rather than reviewing

³ http://stapgef.unep.org/docs/Guidance/STAP_MTR_RAF.pdf;

⁴ <http://stapgef.unep.org/docs/Guidance/RevGEFwideRAF.pdf>

⁵ <http://stapgef.unep.org/docs/Guidance/RevStratPosGEF5.pdf>;

⁶ <http://stapgef.unep.org/activities/technicalworkshops/Recarbonization>

PIFs, with a view to selectively improve project design from the point at which PIFs are made available.

Decision 5.1: STAP agreed to contact the UNFCCC Secretariat to define further the work requested of it.
Agenda item 6.

26. This agenda item was combined in the meeting with the closing session on the GEF-5 strategies, therefore please see Agenda item 13 for the notes from the session (also preceded by Agenda item 8, the opening session on the GEF-5 strategies).

**Agenda item 7 (and 13 in relation to multi-focal area natural resource management initiatives)
Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) next steps**

27. Session 7 comprised two parts focussed on the role of GEF to deliver actions towards sustainable forest management, including reducing emissions from LULUCF and the role and potential of Ecosystem restoration and recarbonization including REDD. Activities that could assist delivery of the proposed GEF-5 strategies on SFM and related areas were revisited under Agenda item 13.

Overview of the presentations

28. The meeting heard two presentations on how GEF funding fits in with the variety of sources of funding available for sustainable forest management (comparative advantage of GEF funding as well as SFM funding needs that are currently unmet but may be of interest to the GEF):
8. Jim Carle, for Adrian Whiteman (FAO) – “Opportunities for GEF to support production of global environmental benefits through SFM.”
 9. N.H. Ravindranath (STAP) – Science-based vision for GEF-5 SFM and LULUCF: “Sustainable Forest Landscape Carbon Management”.
29. Four presentations addressed barrier removal for ecosystem restoration and recarbonization, including how global assessments can inform actions towards optimizing land use, enhanced land management and policy support:
10. Thomas Lovejoy (STAP) – “Can We Restore Carbon in the Terrestrial Biosphere?”
 11. Barney Dickson (UNEP-WCMC) – “The Natural Fix? The role of ecosystems in climate mitigation: Provisional findings”
 12. Michael Stocking (STAP) – “The Carbon Benefits Project: Modelling, Measurement and Monitoring”
 13. Mette Løyche Wilkie (FAO) – “The Global Forest Resources Assessment 2010 (FRA 2010): Forests and Climate Change”.
30. A wide-ranging discussion followed, which can be grouped into major issues and questions that the Science Panel and the GEF more broadly can consider in strategic planning.

What is the global potential for forests and other terrestrial ecosystems to mitigate climate change?

31. The meeting discussed the potential of biological carbon sequestration, including opportunities to direct land use towards the goal of increasing soil and above ground biomass carbon. While there is still a need to evaluate carbon sequestration potential across terrestrial ecosystems, some preliminary quantitative assessments are becoming available through, for example, a UNEP Rapid Assessment and a recent STAP/Heinz Center workshop.
32. It was noted that terrestrial ecosystems have lost around 200 billion tonnes of Carbon in the last couple of centuries. While it is proving complex to scope what recarbonization would look like because soil carbon is difficult to model and datasets are incomplete, there is considerable potential, up to 150 billion tonnes could be sequestered over a 50 year period. This is a significant number that correlates with an atmospheric CO₂ level of 350 parts per million which is dangerous to go beyond for ecosystems.
33. UNEP-WCMC reported that reducing deforestation rates by 50% by 2050 and then maintaining them at this level until 2100 would avoid the direct release of up to 50 Gt of carbon this century. The agricultural sector could be broadly carbon neutral by 2030 if best management practices were widely adopted

(equivalent to up to 2 Gt of carbon per year). Peatland degradation contributes up to 0.8 Gt of carbon a year.

How can the GEF position itself to help countries access financial incentives for forest conservation, including REDD?

34. It was noted that inclusion of forests in the UNFCCC was a long and difficult process over 4 years. There are still very few forest projects in the Convention's Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) when hundreds were expected. Accounting for carbon under REDD is complex, with different techniques being proposed. The UNFCCC Secretariat stressed that timing is important. The Convention's COP later in 2009 will most likely make general decisions with details on REDD to come later. Therefore it is important that GEF strategies be adopted in November 2009 or June 2010 that are able to respond to COP guidance. The GEF Secretariat responded that it is too early to confirm the timing of the GEF-5 strategies, which could be developed by September 2009, but there is a need to maintain flexibility to get as far as possible for the replenishment by December 2009.
35. It was further suggested that replenishment negotiations will be challenging because the UNFCCC COP may endorse a REDD mechanism or a range of mechanisms which will affect the countries actions in their attempts to better manage carbon. STAP should be suggesting ways that countries can prepare themselves to take advantage of mechanisms that may emerge. Also consider how GEF can spend to maximize benefits.
36. UNEP and STAP noted the need to maintain flexibility on the design of GEF interventions so they are inclusive of carbon markets, not just CDM and other formal mechanisms but also voluntary payments. From the financial perspective, options are opened up by barrier removal and capacity building and this is a niche that GEF should occupy, promoting access to carbon finance. The GEF Carbon Benefits Project is necessary now to support current GEF initiatives, independently of an emerging REDD mechanism.

Should the GEF focus on specific ecosystems likely to generate large and rapid climate change mitigation benefits or take a broader approach to SFM?

37. STAP pointed to the need to do more on aquatic systems, including land based ecosystems like wetlands and peatlands. The Ramsar Convention Secretariat noted its current work on the role of wetlands and peatlands in the carbon cycle. There appears to be big store of carbon in tropical forest peatlands and other wetlands also appear to be important including tidal systems like mangroves and mudflats. However, the science is not yet strong on the carbon cycle for these ecosystems and while the Convention has worked on carbon offset systems involving wetlands the science is not strong enough yet for carbon market purposes.
38. Non-forested peatlands are outside current carbon finance mechanisms for forests and they vary much more in what is known about their ability to sequester carbon, for example in boreal areas. There is a need for good intelligence across all ecosystems to understand where the most gains are actually to be made over different timescales, including through restoration or avoiding emissions from degradation.
39. While the uncertainty about peatlands was noted, it was put to the meeting that with limited resources, the GEF could still achieve a greater impact by investing in ecosystems most likely to generate large and rapid climate change mitigation benefits such as tropical forests and tropical forest peatlands. UNEP and FAO stressed that capacity building and institution strengthening should be the priority for the GEF, not specific ecosystems or specific forestry practices. This is because the GEF is intended to be catalytic and its limited resources can have a domino effect if invested in building capacity and institutions to generate GEBs over the long term. Others suggested further that since every GEF Focal Area could benefit from climate change mitigation, it is more suited to a catalytic approach and not an ecosystem based approach.
40. UNDP noted that the debate about priority ecosystems ignores the political dimensions of the GEF. Because peatlands or grasslands are not common in some countries, each country will need to look at how it can maximize its carbon storage. It was suggested that STAP can work on a GEF-6 strategy in

terms of which global ecosystems should be the focus of where money should be directed. For GEF-5, STAP should consider how all GEF recipient countries can maximize their carbon storage.

Decision 7.1: STAP will advise the TAGs for SFM and Climate Change to address capacity building activities to assist countries to report that they are enabled to prepare themselves to take advantage of mechanisms that may emerge that provide positive incentives for climate change mitigation and conservation in specific ecosystems that may be prioritised for GEF interventions.

Should the GEF continue to have a framework strategy for SFM, but not other terrestrial ecosystems?

41. A substantial number of meeting participants questioned why the GEF SFM Framework Strategy exists at all, noting that the Climate Change Focal Area had a LULUCF objective, the Land Degradation Focal Area had a forests objective and the Biodiversity Focal Area implicitly includes forests. UNDP pointed out that there is strong country interest in SFM but there is confusion about what GEF support can be used for.
42. The meeting discussed the need to understand the incremental role of the GEF with regard to SFM, including defining the GEBs of forests and what the GEF expects from investing in SFM. For example, plantation forests can also deliver GEBs but the GEF needs to think about the costs and benefits of climate change interventions as well as other environmental goods and services to decide where to invest. A cross-ecosystem approach is therefore needed to deliver GEBs.
43. It was suggested that the current SFM strategy is not coherent, that forests provide multiple services and so appropriate interventions in forests can maximize GEBs and bringing all forest interventions under one strategy would avoid disintegration. On the other hand, it was noted that forests are only one area where multiple focal areas need to be integrated. Integrated land management for multiple benefits is critical for a wide range of GEF activities.
44. Agencies recalled that earlier GEF replenishments were structured with a range of ecosystem-specific programs. It is difficult to make a case for a separate results framework for forests because other ecosystems are also important. An alternative option may be to extract elements from the Focal Areas for Land Degradation, Biodiversity, Climate Change and International Waters to establish a standalone framework focusing on production landscapes, for example a "Landscape Management Focal area". Under this approach, only very specific interventions would be left in the other focal areas, for example biosafety and genetic resources access and benefit sharing under biodiversity. One reaction to this was that each GEF Convention would be giving up something but the total GEBs provided would not necessarily be greater.
45. Three reasons were offered that could justify a dedicated SFM Framework Strategy: (1) its existence increases the chance of funding or the amount of funding for forest-related programs that generate multi-focal area benefits but none in a large enough quantity to justify a single focal area funding it; (2) its existence reduces the transaction costs of financing and managing multi-focal area interventions in forests; and (3) its existence induces greater replenishment or co-financing from donors interested in forests and who need to see forests as an explicit program rather than simply embedded in other focal areas.

Decision 7.2: STAP recommends continuing a dedicated framework strategy for SFM, without prejudice to the needs for other important ecosystem, but will work through the SFM and Focal Area TAGs to clarify what will be supported under the strategy and the ways in which countries can access GEF support for SFM interventions.

What is the potential for synergies and co-benefits and how could they be achieved through a broader view of the global environmental benefits of forests?

46. FAO observed that GEF projects currently focus on high biodiversity value forests and that these are important but represent small areas, often not under threat. GEF should try to increase biodiversity value by investing in better forest management in other types of forest, with a lower starting point but larger

area, including degraded forests and agricultural landscapes with low forest cover. These also have the potential for biodiversity and other benefits including social. For example, under Land Degradation the GEF could address areas with agroforestry potential, under Climate Change the highest potential is in production forests, degraded, planted and (for adaptation) protection forests.

47. The potential for synergies between focal areas, for example, biodiversity and climate change, was discussed. When the meeting was asked why a single large investment in biodiversity and climate change was likely to yield more benefits than two separate smaller investments specifically targeting biodiversity and climate change objectives, one theory was offered. This was that the single coordinated investment could avoid the possibility of the benefits from the investment in one outcome being cancelled out by negative consequences of the other investment for that outcome. [While not explicitly discussed, it was implied that this synergy could operate at the portfolio scale, not just individual projects].

How can the GEF strategies achieve an integrated approach to SFM?

48. A number of meeting participants were concerned that the SFM discussion appeared to have a narrow focus on carbon whereas there is a need to maximize all ecosystem goods and services provided by forests under an integrated approach including people. This prompted a discussion on how to move to an integrated approach in the GEF-5 strategies and away from the "silo" approach with different focal areas including forests such that countries are uncertain about which category to put their funding requests in.
49. FAO noted that monitoring is currently focused on carbon stocks, whereas it should include broader environmental services of forests. Integrated information systems are needed to scale up to national systems and an important synergy for SFM is to address priority watersheds and watershed management. There is little support for countries to address inter-sectoral issues and the GEF could support this as it is not covered well by other funding sources.

How can the GEF deal with climate change risk and adaptation?

50. It was noted that adaptation doesn't appear to be included under the draft results framework for SFM. Discussion on mitigation-adaptation synergies followed with one issue being how to quantify adaptation benefits to support investment decisions. It was suggested that methods are not mature enough yet to measure the impacts of adaptation practices and this has been one reason to focus on mitigation which can be more easily quantified. However, certain adaptation practices, options and strategies also mitigate climate change. It was noted that there are still a range of ideas that could be explored and that adaptation will be covered in a separate results framework which could apply to all programs.
51. UNEP pointed to the risks that climate change presents to all focal areas and the need to acknowledge this in the GEF-5 strategies. For example, for every degree Celsius increase there could be a 5% decrease in productivity with major implications for ecosystems and food production.

Indicators and tools

52. Indicators for GEF strategies are needed that can be aggregated up to tell a story about change and trends. The draft GEF results framework document does not list SFM indicators but outcomes are listed for area of forests etc. The meeting was asked for suggestions for data and tools to inform the development of indicators for SFM.
53. FAO suggested that nine ecoregional criteria and indicators developed for SFM could be useful where they are available. FAO is currently looking at links between forest livelihoods and poverty, however the results won't be available for the current Forest Resource Assessment. The potential to use a greenness index as a process indicator as opposed to a state of a biome indicator was discussed with issues including fluctuations over time in MODIS and other data being problematic.

Agenda item 8.

GEF-5 strategies, an integrated approach.

54. On behalf of the GEF Secretariat, the Session Chair Peter Bjornsen, outlined the process for developing the draft GEF-5 strategies, including the role of the Panel Members and their participation in the Technical Advisory Groups (TAGs), coordinated by the GEF Secretariat.
55. Peter Bjornsen provided a hard copy document to the meeting; this document consisted of the draft Objectives by focal area organized within a Results Framework for the GEF focal areas, plus additional frameworks for Sustainable Forest Management and for Adaptation. Except for Adaptation, it was noted that Panel Members were members of each of the focal area TAGs, but had not seen the most recent versions of the draft documents provided to the meeting by the GEF Secretariat
56. Following the introduction provided by the GEF Secretariat, there were several observations made by participants about the architecture of the drafts. For the GEF Evaluation Office, Rob van den Berg noted that there is lack of synthesis in common and little evidence of multi-disciplinary approaches. Furthermore, GEF EO noted the importance of integrating linkages between GEF focal areas at the level of strategic goals/objectives. For UNDP, John Hough identified several inconsistencies between overlapping objectives scattered across focal areas.
57. Each Panel Member was invited in turn to introduce their advisory work performed within the TAGs to enable the meeting to compare scientific advice provided against the emerging strategy.
58. For the Biodiversity focal area, Paul Ferraro for STAP outlined his input to the TAG, based on the STAP's science vision, and additional consultations with practitioners, which was followed by discussion by participants of the Goal, objectives, outcomes and outputs.
59. Participants suggested that proposed outcomes for the Cartagena Protocol needs effectiveness testing, not just within the national context, and also that use of the biosafety tracking tool needs to be examined in the context of biosafety system enforcement, not just as a measure of legislation in place. For biofuels, which does not appear in any of the results frameworks, STAP feels that this should be explicitly mentioned under the climate change strategy rather than the biodiversity strategy, nevertheless potential threats to biodiversity needs to be mentioned.
60. FAO recommended that "sufficient revenue" under Objective 1 be changed to something more precise and achievable, such as "reducing the funding gap for PA systems." Some participants were concerned that "enhanced capacity" was not reflected in first two objectives or their outcomes or outputs, whereas it was part of Objectives 3 and 4.
61. Michael Stocking for STAP, next outlined the work performed within the Land Degradation TAG in close collaboration with UNCCD.
62. UNEP and other participants identified a lack of clear linkage regarding the Global Environmental Benefits expected to be delivered through the stated impacts for this focal area, and also that as a cross-cutting strategy that the overlap with the Sustainable Forest Management strategy was unclear. The LD TAG was advised to examine the consistency of objectives with other focal areas. Additionally UNEP pointed out that Objective 1 was closely aligned with the UNCBD objective on sustainable livelihoods, so a clear definition to distinguish the role of the land degradation as distinct from the biodiversity strategy would be required.
63. UNIDO suggested that the land degradation strategy should address the land water interface, e.g. role of agriculture and linkages in formation of Dead Zones, a view supported by the Ramsar Convention Secretariat, which pointed out the lack of reference to water in the strategy. The World Bank, asked STAP to advise on how to achieve consistency between outcomes and related indicators in the strategy, which need reconciliation.
64. Meryl Williams for STAP highlighted the main changes within the draft International Waters strategy compared to GEF-4, which consist of proposed objectives for work in high seas and on joint work with the

chemicals focal area. Otherwise the draft strategy consolidates previous GEF-4 strategic programs and is at present assumed not to be subject to the RAF, thus permitting proposed work on high seas issues.

65. Regarding specific objectives proposed in the International Waters strategy, participants asked for clarification on which of the two focal areas, International Waters or Chemicals would “own” Objective 5 dealing with Persistent Toxic Substances, how fisheries bycatch and learning objectives would be addressed, and raised concerns about apparently isolated objectives creating “silos”.
66. In response the GEF Secretariat clarified that it is proposed that both focal areas would “own” Objective 5, that bycatch would be considered, and that learning objectives will be proposed.
67. Paul Ferraro for STAP introduced the advisory work that had been provided to the Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) TAG, but noted that at the recent inter-TAG meeting more time had been spent within the Biodiversity rather than the SFM TAG. He also noted that the draft strategy appears to be too broad to effectively program GEF funds.
68. FAO noted that the existing SFM strategy does not consider forest restoration and climate adaptation issues in the forestry sector. Ramsar Convention challenged the audience whether GEF should consider introducing the concept of ecosystem carbon services across the portfolio? UNEP called for the importance of attracting carbon finance in SFM projects. UNDP proposed to move from SFM-centered approach to integrated carbon management in the GEF and advised STAP to commission a study that will investigate the ways of how to maximize carbon sequestration by selecting priority ecosystems and proposing methodology for measurements of carbon benefits. UNEP-WCMC emphasized a need for promoting comprehensive carbon management approach by introducing national carbon accounting.
69. Bo Wahlström for STAP introduced the Chemicals strategy, noting that the present draft appeared to omit some text discussed within the TAG on extending the chemicals window beyond the core and limited number of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs).
70. Participants supported the new costed twin track short term and long term approach within the proposed expected outcomes but requested that the focal area window be broadened beyond the core POPs to also encompass chemicals life cycle concerns regarding pesticides, impacts on biodiversity, etc.
71. N.H. Ravindranath for STAP presented the Climate Change strategy highlighting the need for the GEF to invest beyond simple greenhouse gas reduction targets.
72. Participants noted that cross-focal attention to resilience needed to be built in to the strategy UNEP welcomed the addition of urban development issues in CC strategy for GEF-5 and questioned whether other GEF focal areas take into account urban development. UNFCCC Secretariat raised the issue of introducing additional indicators to track the progress in CC focal area by including, social-economic indicators in e.g., transport projects and explicit reference to actions proposed in countries’ National Communications.
73. The UNFCCC Secretariat, commenting on the results framework for climate change, suggested that STAP should, in the context of enabling activities to be funded by global projects, advise on enabling activities (Objective 6).
74. The Panel concluded that the GEF focal area strategies must explicitly recognize that investments in one focal area can have negative impacts on the objectives of other focal areas, and that objectives in different focal areas are frequently best achieved jointly rather than separately. GEF operations should take these cross-focal area relationships into account and, when appropriate, ensure that relationships among focal area objectives are acted upon through cross-focal area coordination and investments.
75. Peter Bjornsen, for the GEF Secretariat, in closing the session, thanked participants for their contributions and invited further feedback once the draft strategies have been circulated to the GEF partners for comments in the beginning of May.

Decision 8.1: As proposed by the GEF Evaluation Office STAP can play a major role in making GEF-wide results-based management framework consistent with the maximized delivery of GEBs across focal areas and including cross-cutting issues at the level of strategic goals/objectives.

Decision 8.2: STAP will start working on ecosystem carbon services. The first step is proposed work on peatlands and post-Copenhagen LULUCF methodology.

Agenda item 9. Oceans and over-fishing

76. The session considered two presentations, one from FAO and another from STAP, followed by a plenary discussion. The objectives for the session were to survey the problems that lead to over-fishing and to identify any opportunities within GEF's comparative advantage.
77. Participants agreed that over-fishing was a symptom of many interlocking problems, such as the need to address legal frameworks governing flag states, and port agreements. The meeting discussed alternative livelihood approaches to fisheries problems.
78. The Panel suggested that fish may be a 'food of last resort', used by poorer people without property rights at the coast, and asked whether fisheries become better managed when incomes rise? Alternative livelihood initiatives are based on the idea that poverty increases pressure on natural resources and therefore that wealth will reduce pressure on natural resources. However, when asked, nobody could point to evidence that increasing incomes and standards of living were associated with reducing pressure on fisheries. On the contrary however, evidence was cited that, for example, deforestation can increase with increasing incomes and that some wealthy developed countries have severely depleted fisheries. The Panel also asserted that declaring Marine Protected Areas is not an answer to the over-fishing problem.
79. UNDP challenged the conventional 'property rights' issue, as the practical realities leading to over-fishing were more complex, while the Panel agreed that there were no 'silver bullets' and therefore questioned whether GEF can really expect to have impacts, given the extent of the challenge.
80. FAO advised that an ecosystem approach is necessary involving integrated planning and fisheries planning, which identifies priorities in their context to deliver sustainability goals, including norms and standards for the subject, including by the GEF. This integrated approach is recommended.
81. The main messages from the session included that overfishing is a threat to biodiversity, but GEF is not the primary agency to address over-fishing, which is contributed to by:
 - Capacity constraints in developing countries;
 - Lack of effective application of available legal instruments that needs to be addressed;
 - Poverty and lack of property rights
 - Lack of an ecosystem approach

Decision 9.1: It was agreed that Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction need to be addressed by GEF, that existing projects such as the CTI which are otherwise well-grounded need fisheries elements, and that GEF fisheries work needs to address legal instruments, in the context of a common resource management approach.

Agenda item 10. Improved Chemicals Management

82. The Session was opened by presentation from STAP on global chemical threats including heavy metals, pesticides, brominated flame retardants, new POPs, and electronic waste followed by two presentations from FAO. The latter emphasized integrated management of agrochemicals promoted by FAO as an example for other chemicals of concern and novel techniques for measurement and monitoring POPs and pesticides in the environment using as an example GEF project in West Africa two river basins.

83. Discussion that followed strongly supported expansion of GEF's support for POPs to other chemicals of global significance suggesting that GEF should promote an integrated chemicals management approach. This view was equally shared by STAP, FAO, UNIDO and UNEP. FAO mentioned that life-cycle approach to chemicals management should guide GEF support in the focal area.
84. UNEP highlighted GEF's comparative advantage in supporting enabling environment for chemicals management through capacity building, policy and regulatory reform, and promotion of global/regional approach.
85. UNEP also raised a question about the STAP's role in defining criteria for including chemicals of global significance for GEF support including environmental and economical (trade) factors.
86. Concluding the session, STAP emphasized a stronger GEF role in supporting upstream interventions aimed at chemicals reduction and removal in places where they enter the market chain.

Decision 10.1: STAP will continue providing advice in the Technical Advisory Group on chemicals emphasizing promotion of integrated chemicals management as a primary aim of the focal area.

Decision 10.2: STAP Work Program for FY10 will include 1. Study on emerging chemicals for GEF-5 and beyond that will propose, *inter alia*, criteria for supporting particular chemicals in the GEF (potential to deliver global environmental benefits); 2. Guidance document for GEF on electronic waste; 3. Advice on cost-effective methods for POPs monitoring and analysis.

Agenda item 11. OPS4

87. The Evaluation Office led two sessions on the Fourth Overall Performance Study of the GEF, the first a briefing and general discussion in an open session and the second a closed session only with the Panel and its service provider UNEP. The session was supported by two presentations from the Evaluation Office.

Agenda item 12. Biofuels, food security and biodiversity

88. Dr. Ravindranath opened the session on biofuels, food security and biodiversity with a presentation highlighting main results of the STAP study on biofuels and STAP's recommendations on strategic programs supporting biofuels in GEF-5. It was followed by presentations from IFAD, FAO, and UNEP.
89. IFAD's presentation highlighted interlinkages between biofuels production and poverty calling for adherence to sustainability standards when investing in biofuels.
90. FAO presentation emphasized GEF's role focusing on sustainable systems approach for biofuels that can play a catalytic role for agricultural production in general. FAO supported coordinated policies for biofuels support in the GEF using landscape-centred approach to environmental services. STAP's recommendation for exclusive support of second generation biofuels in GEF-5 was questioned as the latter can compete for inputs to agricultural production and may not reduce negative impacts of first generation biofuels. In contrast, promoting first generation biofuels in the GEF with an adherence to environmental and food security safeguards, can have "spill-over" effects contributing to scale-up of sustainable agriculture and forestry.
91. UNEP's presentations covered the impact of biofuels production on food security and future directions for biosafety projects in the GEF. It was noted that lessons from using Mock application in biosafety projects can be used for biofuels projects.
92. Discussion that followed acknowledged the significance of applying safeguards for both, first and second generation biofuels. STAP member on land degradation and UNEP joined FAO with a caution that second generation biofuels may also have trade-offs such as loss of biodiversity on degraded lands and

other ecological costs including changed land-use patterns. When supporting second generation biofuels, GEF should try to capture multiple benefits such as increased rural income, carbon sequestration, PES, improved quality of degraded lands). Furthermore, FAO highlighted GEF's innovative role in helping developing countries in scaling-up use of bioenergy including biofuels by supporting alternative crops and crop production as well as integrated food/energy systems.

93. UNDP questioned potential to deliver global environmental benefits promoting projects on biofuels because of significant environmental trade-offs. UNFCCC called for the use of national Technology Needs Assessments as guidance for supporting particular technologies in GEF projects.

Decision 12.1: STAP acknowledges the significance of adherence to sustainability criteria in supporting biofuels projects in the GEF. STAP recommends considering biofuels in the context of bioenergy with implications for promotion of sustainable agricultural practices and reiterates its position on biofuels in GEF-5 expressed in the STAP document prepared for TAG on climate change (http://stapgef.unep.org/activities/technicalworkshops/CC_GEF5).

Decision 12.2: STAP will serve as an advisor to GEF targeted research project "Assessments and guidelines for sustainable liquid biofuels production in developing countries".

Agenda item 13.

GEF-5 strategies, an integrated approach (Part 2)

94. Under this agenda item, the second session to consider emerging GEF-5 strategies, participants also looked at STAP's role in bridging across the strategies and use of its expertise.
95. The draft results framework for the proposed strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change was presented by Michael Stocking. Several Panel members emphasized the need to better incorporate and mainstream adaptation to climate change into the focal area strategies, while maintaining a balance between climate change and other stress factors. Participants requested further clarification on the balance between global environmental benefits (GEBs) and national (environmental) benefits related to climate change.
96. Participants also noted the need for better understanding and modeling of the numerous secondary and indirect effects of climate change, e.g. rainfall patterns in terrestrial systems and currents and stratification in marine systems.
97. The second discussion of the focal area strategy for Climate Change, introduced by N.H. Ravindranath, focused on primarily on biofuels. Projects on biofuels are eligible under CC objectives 3 and 4 and, as noted by UNEP, also under LD objective 3. Some Panel members emphasized the need to consider the entire production cycle for biofuels and include all possible environmental impacts. The discussion showed different views on biofuels among the Panel members and the GEF Secretariat expressed a request for a consolidated position from the Panel.
98. The second discussion on the focal area strategy for Chemicals focused on the proposed expansion of the scope to cover chemicals and sound chemicals management more broadly in GEF-5. Some Panel members cautioned that such an expansion would need to define the global aspects of chemicals management and the role of the GEF. Increased trade makes chemicals a global issue but trade is not the only vector; chemicals are increasingly dispersed across the globe through the atmosphere and through the rivers to the ocean.
99. Michael Stocking introduced the second discussion on the focal area strategy for Land Degradation. Land degradation as a global issue cannot be directly measured but is measurable through ecosystem services including livelihoods. UNEP stated that livelihood is an important co-benefit but cannot stand alone in a GEF context. A forthcoming UNEP EA review will produce cross-cutting indicators for LD. IFAD put emphasis on the social aspects of land degradation and wanted to see explicit outcome statements on livelihoods. FAO proposed to include ecosystem services as well as goods in the definition of GEBs from LD. Several participants stressed the need to further develop the M&E framework for LD.

100. The second discussion on the focal area strategy for International Waters, led by Meryl Williams, highlighted several opportunities for integration across focal areas. IW objective 4 on Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJs) would include MPAs in collaboration with the BD focal area. IW objective 5 might focus on endocrine disruptors (EDS) or aim at a broader scope, depending on the eventual budget amount. FAO emphasized the transversal land/sea benefits in the coastal zone and the linkages between upstream land management (LD) and downstream water supply.

101. Paul Ferraro introduced the second discussion on the focal area strategy for Biodiversity and noted that the outcome statements will be further refined. Participants requested a specific approach to agrobiodiversity noting the fundamental difference with biodiversity in other types of ecosystems.

Decision 13.1: STAP will provide further advice regarding the interlinkages between focal area strategies including the incorporation of adaptation to climate change.

Decision 13.2: STAP will aim at producing a consolidated opinion on biofuels.

Decision 13.3: STAP will contribute to a clear definition of GEBs in a wider chemicals focal area.

Decision 13.4: STAP will contribute to an improved M&E framework for LD

Agenda item 14.

Closing of the Meeting

102. Thomas Lovejoy, Chairperson, invited the representative of FAO, Parviz Koochafkan, Director, Land and Water Division, to close the meeting, followed by a concluding statement from Angela Cropper, Deputy Executive Director of UNEP.