

GEF Council Meeting
June 29 – July 2, 2010
Washington, D.C

REPORT OF THE STAP MEETING, MARCH 2010

(Prepared by STAP)

Report of the STAP Meeting, March 8, 2010 (Including a clarification note from STAP)

Introduction

1. A summary of discussion held in the open session of the STAP meeting held at IFAD, Rome on March 8th 2010 is presented in this Report. IFAD provided services and hosting for this meeting of the Panel, for which STAP is very grateful.
2. The Report with its associated decisions is presented in agenda item order. Participants to the meeting are listed in the Annex.

Agenda for the Meeting

1. *Welcome remarks.*
2. *Adoption of the Agenda*
3. *Confirmation of the Minutes*
4. *Progress Report*
5. *Report to the GEF Assembly; GEF4 and outlook*
6. *Presenting the Panel's advisory products.*
7. *Knowledge Management in the GEF and GEF M&E*
8. *Review of STAP's Work Program for FY2011*
9. *Role of STAP in LDCF and SCCF*

Clarification note

3. The Meeting, under Agenda item 6, considered STAP's emerging advisory products and provided feedback to STAP including some criticism regarding biodiversity focal area advisory products that STAP considers may have been prompted by misunderstandings about STAP's methodological approach and intentions. In order to address these criticisms, STAP has provided a clarification note which follows and forms part of this Report. It is hoped that the note will improve understanding of STAP's approach and intentions towards the gathering of evidence for popular interventions.

STAP Clarification Note, April 21, 2010

Response to partner feedback received in the STAP Meeting, March 8th, 2010, on STAP's advice provided under the Biodiversity Focal Area (Agenda item 6)

Introduction

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel at its March 8th 2010 Meeting held at IFAD, Rome, noted critical comments about its practice of fully evaluating the evidence base for popular GEF interventions. While welcoming constructive and critical feedback from partners, STAP is nevertheless concerned that misunderstandings have arisen about its work. STAP emphasizes its track record of providing impartial and objective advice based on firm scientific principles in the evaluation of existing knowledge. This clarification note has been prepared to put on record STAP's position on the advice that it is providing to the GEF.

In preparation for the STAP Meeting, the paper "Presenting the Panel's advisory products" (Agenda item 6) was circulated which summarised the main findings and recommendations of five advisory products. The summaries were used as the basis for discussion in the STAP Meeting about forthcoming advisory products, and the feedback received is summarized below together with a presentation of the Panel's response.

The advisory products that were considered in connection with the feedback were within the Biodiversity Focal Area and included:

- Payments for Environmental Services and the Global Environment Facility: A STAP advisory document (STAP Activity BD#1, completed)
- State of the Evidence Base: Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) (STAP Activity BD#3, in draft)

Related advisory products include:

- The Evidence Base for Community Forest Management as a Mechanism for Supplying Global Environmental Benefits and Improving Local Welfare (STAP Activity BD#2)
- The Evidence Base for Environmental and Socioeconomic Impacts of 'Sustainable' Certification (STAP Activity BD#4)
- Measuring the Success of GEF Investments and Catalyzing Change through Experimental Project Design (STAP Activity C#4)

Summary of criticisms received at the STAP Meeting:

- STAP focuses excessively on issues of experimental design, thus ignoring available evidence from projects that had not used an experimental design approach and could through lack of evidence dismiss presumed effective interventions, such as the use of Payments for Environmental Services (PES) or Marine Protected Areas (MPAs).

The Key Points of STAP's response:

- With the exception of STAP Activity C#4, which is intended to focus on experimental designs in GEF projects, none of the other advisory products focuses on experimental design. The criteria used for selecting what constitutes strong evidence are explicitly defined in every advisory document and in no case do the criteria exclude non-experimental designs. In contrast, all advisory products include evidence from non-experimental designs that take seriously the imperative to eliminate rival explanations for the observed patterns in the data (i.e., explanations that have nothing to do with the conservation intervention).
- Identifying weaknesses in the evidence base is not the same as dismissing an intervention, such as PES or MPAs, as ineffective. In fact, STAP is broadly supportive of interventions such as PES and MPAs and offers its advice as a way to make them even more effective.

Please see the following table for a more detailed treatment of comments received at the March 2010 Meeting, as recorded in the Report of the Meeting.

<i>Feedback from participants</i>	<i>Panel response</i>
<p>The Evaluation Office does not believe that the evidence base for GEF interventions is as small as some STAP advice has recently suggested, which may be due to the fact that STAP presents this in the light of its call for more randomized controlled trials. It should be noted that many GEF interventions are also based on natural and technical improvements. Randomized Controlled Trials will not help in evaluating these improvements. Furthermore, especially on technical issues more rigorous methods are available (laboratory experiments and testing), which seems not to be recognized by STAP in its enthusiasm for "rigorous" methods in the social sciences.</p> <p>On changes in human behaviour randomized controlled trials are considered to provide a rigorous assessment of a counterfactual, but there are limitations, for example that the evidence will only relate to short term effects and not to longer term effects, whereas the time horizon of GEF interventions to reach impact is often very long. Furthermore, innovations like payments for environmental services may well require scaling up beyond certain levels before lasting effects will emerge, and STAP's emphasis on rigorous demonstration of a causal mechanism through short term randomized controlled trials could thus lead to dismissal of an instrument that would not (yet) work on a trial basis. The Evaluation Office invites STAP to reconsider its narrow approach on socio-economic issues.</p>	<p>STAP has always emphasized that randomized treatment design for GEF projects should be used "advisedly" (i.e. "not with great frequency"). However, the current weight of "0" on such approaches in the GEF portfolio is surely the wrong weight. Nowhere in STAP BD advice does it say that randomized controlled trials are the only valid evidence. In fact, in all public presentations, the exact opposite has been stated. What has been stated by STAP is that good evidence takes seriously its effort to eliminate rival explanations for any observed changes, or absence of changes, in conditions. This is true no matter what the evaluation design. Even randomized controlled trials are prone to various randomization biases that can confound inferences. Note also that the design has nothing to do with the time scale of the impacts. In other words, the idea that randomized controlled trials are only good for short-term impacts and that some other evaluation design is uniformly better for longer-term impacts is incorrect. Different designs have different tradeoffs. The category of outcome (socioeconomic versus biophysical) that one measures does not dictate the design.</p> <p>STAP is not asserting that innovations such as payments for environmental services or marine protected areas should be discarded merely because the available evidence base is weak. Instead STAP is advising on what can be done to increase GEF's likely impact. STAP would like to emphasize, however, that in the case of PES, the contracts are indeed "short-term". Thus the burden is upon the proponents to explain how longer-term impacts are possible if shorter-term ones are not observed. Similarly, there is nothing in the theory (or logic models) of PES to suggest that impacts (behavioural or biophysical) cannot be observed in a pilot project. However, if proponents argue that effects cannot be detected until the project is scaled-up and given ample time to affect the causal pathways, STAP would be supporting of scaling a program up and establishing a long-term monitoring program in the context of a rigorous evaluation design. With so few studies available, STAP has not, and would never, suggest that PES as a class of interventions should be dismissed because of the paucity of evidence.. We instead are encouraging caution in project design and a greater commitment to evaluation.</p>

<p>Regarding specific examples of advisory documents, the GEF Secretariat challenged the emerging STAP advisory product on Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) as perhaps too narrowly focused on issues of experimental design, thus ignoring available evidence from projects that had not used an experimental design approach. This led to an overly general conclusion that sufficient evidence did not exist to support MPAs as an effective tool.</p>	<p>In the MPA document, STAP is not focused on issues of experimental design but rather on scientific issues of empirical design: the extent to which existing studies acknowledge rival explanations and make efforts to either eliminate them or describe how they might bias inferences. STAP agrees that the MPA paper needs to be more constructive in tone in order to get its message across properly. STAP wishes to emphasize that identifying weaknesses in the evidence base is not the same as saying MPAs do not work or that the GEF should be cautious about investing in them. STAP's draft MPA advisory document is simply pointing out all the holes in the current evidence base and urging the GEF to help plug them because these holes are very likely preventing GEF investments from being as productive as they can be. It is not saying that the holes tell us anything about MPA ineffectiveness, or that because there are holes in the evidence base, the return to GEF investments are zero.</p>
--	--

STAP Meeting, March 8, 2010, IFAD, Rome

Report of the Open Session, March 8, 2010

Agenda item 1. Welcome remarks

1. The STAP Chairperson, Thomas E. Lovejoy, opened the Meeting, provided a welcome to participants and introduced the proposed agenda.

Agenda item 2. Adoption of the Agenda

2. The Meeting adopted the Agenda without changes

Agenda item 3. Confirmation of the Minutes, October 13, 2009

3. The Evaluation Office asked that its name be included in the list of participants attending the previous meeting.

Decision 3.1: The Report of the meeting was confirmed subject to the changes noted.

Agenda item 4. STAP Progress Report

4. The STAP Secretary presented a report on progress made since the last meeting and highlighted work in the Project Cycle, STAP's Work Program for the current financial year, liaison with Conventions and matters arising from decisions of previous meetings, including under what circumstances STAP meetings shall be held away from Washington DC.
5. Regarding the Progress Report and its omission of references to work with the Evaluation Office, also related to the draft Work Program of STAP for the next financial year

(FY11), the Evaluation Office requested that STAP's involvement on the Technical Advisory Group of the Evaluation Office Impact Study of International Waters be added to the Work Program.

6. STAP stated that work in collaboration with the Evaluation Office's evaluation of the Strategic Pilot on Adaptation will be undertaken over the coming months.
7. On tracking the impact of STAP's work, the GEF Secretariat confirmed that it will assist STAP to increase its impact, noting that the GEF Secretariat is not routinely tracking Project Identification Form (PIF) screen compliance, but will consider doing so under the Results Based Management framework.
8. Regarding the location of STAP meetings, the GEF Secretariat requested that meetings should be Washington DC based unless a technical meeting is planned and a STAP meeting can be added, but this would be in exceptional cases only. UNEP, however, recalled that STAP rules state that meetings can be located in Nairobi or Washington, and sought agreement that normally meetings should be held in Washington but that flexibility should be maintained.
9. The meeting discussed STAP's screening of projects and programs; a STAP Member noting that STAP is conservative with its comments but remains concerned about the quality of PIFs and how to improve the quality of GEF agency work. The GEF Secretariat, noting that STAP intends to produce a report on PIF screening, asked what analysis will be done and whether STAP had defined what is expected from its advice given in PIF screens. STAP responded that its PIF screens are now worded to elicit clear responses.
10. UNEP stated that it is important that STAP advice is taken up at project and policy levels, identify needs and products to track advice and draw out lessons learned and best practice. STAP should be a source to enable this. It will be useful to make reviews more standardized at the same time a re-design of the GEF's PIF to OECD standards could be a good thing. UNEP also noted that STAP's role in Programmatic Approaches be kept under review and that its website be upgraded to have status within the science community.
11. Pakistan noted that on the project cycle, science is evolving; countries have limited awareness on some topics; could not STAP advice be used to enable technical clearance before the GEF administration process (rather than the other way round)?
12. UNFCCC Secretariat, noting that STAP advisory products could be presented as part of advisory toolkits, supports this approach including the scope of technical assessment and transparency of expectations, including the need to build the capacity of countries to understand how the toolkits are to be applied.
13. The GEF Secretariat raised its concerns about STAP's past decision to offer all its advisory documents to the GEF Council for formal approval, and instead suggested that STAP should first work with GEF Secretariat to determine which advice should be tested in this way.

Decision 4.1: The STAP Toolkits approach was accepted; STAP should identify and prioritize advisory toolkit preparation tasks and consult its partners on rationale, transparency issues and preferred formats.

Decision 4.2: STAP confirmed that it will continue to monitor/track its advice on PIFs, will prepare a review and identify the lessons learnt from the PIF review, including whether advice can be delivered effectively upstream before investments are made in PIFs.

Decision 4.3: STAP should examine its proposed role in the GEF's Programmatic Approach and test the result with the GEF partnership.

Decision 4.4: The STAP website (and other communication products) should have adequate science stature in the GEF community; STAP will consider what improvements are required.

Decision 4.5: The location of future STAP meetings should be flexible according to need, subject to the norm that at least every other meeting will be held in Washington, DC.

Agenda item 5. Report to the GEF Assembly; GEF4 and outlook

14. The Panel outlined its approach and introduced a draft paper including the topics climate change effects on biodiversity/soil fertility; Multi-Focal Areas; learning – translating science into global action.
15. On STAP's approach, partners urged STAP to provide a big picture critical analysis to rise above single issue lists (e.g. STAP could choose to report on "if ocean acidification is a problem why work on saving corals?") noting that STAP was in the best position to do this.
16. The Evaluation Office noting that STAP's Work Program could be better organized, requested that more focus be given to deciding what STAP's key messages are.
17. The GEF Secretariat suggested that STAP should prioritize its advice and link to Conventions and outcomes for GEF from CoP decisions; STAP's draft paper to the GEF Assembly does not yet provide that focus. So STAP should advise on e.g. how to do Sustainable Forest Management in the context of REDD+; what an adopted Access and Benefit Sharing regime might mean for the GEF; the state of science in the field of bio-prospecting. The GEF Secretariat is not concerned that STAP's agenda contains many different items provided that there is a map of what has influenced the STAP work program selections regarding the Conventions.
18. Pakistan suggested the need to educate country representatives at the Assembly about science.
19. UNEP suggested that STAP address whether 'micro-level modelling' should be considered in GEF projects to address difficulties in linking impacts of climate change on a specific geographic area.
20. The USA supports scaling up of programmes in developing countries as proposed by GEF but understanding the monitoring reporting and verification of these approaches is critical for discussions in Conventions. STAP could look at the feasibility of Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) approaches to assist members of the Council for use in their Convention discussions.
21. The meeting next discussed the options for side events at the Assembly, the GEF Secretariat noted that several side events are planned and two round table discussions will also be convened at the GEF Assembly. A two hour time block had been designated for a STAP-led side event. GEF Secretariat is interested in learning about the themes for STAP's event. The specific topics on which the GEF Secretariat is convening side events are on: emerging architecture of forest financing, adaptation, technology transfer, POPs and chemicals, and on country support. STAP will be invited to participate in these and to contribute to the Secretariat's work.
22. STAP noted that at the UN Convention on Biological Diversity's COP9, CBD agreed a set of criteria for designating ecologically and biologically sensitive areas in waters beyond national jurisdiction as Marine Protected Areas; science-based efforts are now underway to illustrate how these criteria apply in practice and the scientific results will be discussed at SBSTTA14 and the CoP10.

23. UNEP asked that STAP be more actively included by the GEF Secretariat in future discussion about planning; UNEP also indicated that its Executive Director would provide a side event which takes a systems view of emerging issues in the environment and a 10 year outlook.
24. The World Bank is interested in ecosystem services (TEEB) collaboration with STAP, but expected that STAP would with regard to vision, perspective and challenges link the report to the use of a side event and questioned whether the issues highlighted are the most crucial issues to highlight.
25. STAP stated that it would be interested to participate in a POPs and chemicals side event in collaboration with the GEF Secretariat.

Decision 5.1: STAP will revise its GEF Assembly paper to reflect the advice received.

Decision 5.2: STAP will contribute to the forest financing side event and also offers to contribute to the POPs/chemicals side event organized by GEFSec in collaboration with Uruguay;

Decision 5.3: STAP, noting the interest shown by the USA in MRV will consider how to address the suggestion to assess MRV in programmatic approaches.

Agenda item 6. Presenting the Panel's advisory products

26. STAP, explaining that advisory products were developed in collaboration with GEF Focal Area Task Forces, and noting that it wishes to see its advice used in development of projects, sought:
 - support for the use of its advisory products and
 - advice on maximizing the impact of the products
27. UNEP suggested that STAP needs to assist agencies to better understand the upcoming products and gain agency ownership. STAP agreed that it needs to fully align advice to project development needs.
28. On the question of whether focal area Task Forces are the best test of an advisory product's fitness for purpose the meeting agreed that the Task Forces are useful but that another upstream step may be needed from GEF Secretariat and Agency focal points to test Task Force assumptions.
29. IFAD asked how STAP services can be delivered to the agency on a basis of a direct request; STAP clarified that it welcomes direct requests and will be happy to help.
30. The Evaluation Office does not believe that the evidence base for GEF interventions is as small as some STAP advice has recently suggested, which may be due to the fact that STAP presents this in the light of its call for more randomized controlled trials. It should be noted that many GEF interventions are also based on natural and technical improvements. Randomized Controlled Trials will not help in evaluating these improvements. Furthermore, especially on technical issues more rigorous methods are available (laboratory experiments and testing), which seems not to be recognized by STAP in its enthusiasm for "rigorous" methods in the social sciences. On changes in human behavior randomized controlled trials are considered to provide a rigorous assessment of a counterfactual, but there are limitations, for example that the evidence will only relate to short term effects and not to longer term effects, whereas the time horizon of GEF interventions to reach impact is often very long. Furthermore, innovations like payments for environmental services may well require scaling up beyond certain levels before lasting effects will emerge, and STAP's emphasis on rigorous demonstration of a causal mechanism through short term randomized controlled trials

could thus lead to dismissal of an instrument that would not (yet) work on a trial basis. The Evaluation Office invites STAP to reconsider its narrow approach on socio-economic issues..

31. The World Bank welcomed the systematization of STAP's advice into toolkits instead of project by project, but warned that offices in agencies dealing with operations also need to advise on STAP's products and called for a STAP dissemination strategy for each product to define the expected:
 - change outcome
 - target group
32. Regarding specific examples of advisory documents, the GEF Secretariat challenged the emerging STAP advisory product on Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) as perhaps too narrowly focused on issues of experimental design, thus ignoring available evidence from projects that had not used an experimental design approach. This led to an overly general conclusion that sufficient evidence did not exist to support MPAs as an effective tool.
33. The UNFCCC Secretariat welcomed the advice on unintended POPs and energy efficiency as an example of the type of advice that might interest the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Executive Board and that STAP might wish to have a discussion with the Board.
34. UNDP regards the STAP advisory products as useful, but questions whether STAP should prioritize how to do projects better (e.g. for MPAs), which is not considered to be a priority for STAP, instead STAP should address the higher levels of policy and strategy. Before embarking on a new advisory task STAP should decide what the target of the work is and the expected result.
35. UNEP asked STAP to consider how to deal with cross-focal area issues, given that focal area Task Forces do not interact, and recommended that the biannual meeting be used to bridge this gap and ask STAP to prioritize for its Work Program. UNEP suggested products on:
 - STAR – what are the possible areas for integrated multi-focal projects across three focal areas (LD, BD, CC), STAP could review the existing barriers to achieving this type of project;
 - Ecosystem resilience and social resilience. The sustainability of projects is the outcome
36. UNEP also recommended that STAP work to identify when Council decisions should be sought to establish “case law”, these should be instances when a policy implication is involved for STAP advice. The GEF Secretariat agreed to assist STAP to refine what needs to go to the Council.

Decision 6.1: a STAP communication strategy is to be written including how to determine the target audiences for each STAP product/advice and the change outcomes expected to result from the product/advice.

Decision 6.2: STAP will work with the GEF Secretariat to review emerging advice and decide on items for Council decision to establish “case law”.

Decision 6.3: STAP will consider GEF Agency advice regarding the need to set overall priorities for STAP advice including for the Work Program and how to best to work on cross Focal Area integration among GEF Focal Areas, objectives, outcomes and outputs.

Agenda item 7. Knowledge Management in the GEF and GEF Monitoring and Evaluation

37. The Evaluation Office presented a paper on the steps proposed to produce a new GEF M&E policy, followed by a summary from the GEF Secretariat on progress in Knowledge Management in the GEF.
38. STAP was asked to consider whether the M&E policy could be improved, whether its own role is adequately described, and any substantive issues in M&E that STAP wishes to propose to the Evaluation Office when it is writing the policy.
39. The meeting noted that there is a need to identify the details of how the GEF Secretariat will work on monitoring and results-based management to complement the evaluation function of the GEF Evaluation Office. In considering how it will deliver its monitoring role, the GEF Secretariat has identified the need for a new annual reporting system on projects, with standardized PIRs across agencies, that includes oversight of the whole cycle from PIF through implementation.
40. STAP noted that it had reviewed the recent technology transfer projects for India and found difficulties in locating information about monitoring; project managers do not appear to value monitoring activities. STAP asked how monitoring can be internalized within GEF projects. The meeting noted that STAP's comments reflected a sample and questioned whether it was of adequate size to be significant.
41. The World Bank recommended that the process for review of the M&E policy be fully inclusive for the Agencies, also harmonization of the policy to reflect changes which are underway in agencies is also required. Another survey is not required to identify issues; instead it was suggested to revisit the Fourth Overall Performance Study (OPS4) to gain a view of what needs to be improved with follow up direct consultations with agencies.
42. UNEP suggested that the GEF Secretariat consider monitoring from an adaptive management point of view, rather than tracking service standards.
43. STAP noted that the knowledge management in GEF is weak and that science appears not to be mentioned in the process of revision of the M&E policy. However, the Evaluation Office responded that many projects predated the M&E policy (pre-2006), but that improvement of M&E at entry has improved. OPS4 covered a sample of 50 projects and the impact of science was found to be positively reflected in them.
44. On knowledge management, the GEF Secretariat identified the difficulties, recognizing the good work being done by agencies, but stated that knowledge management is not a current priority for the GEF until other immediate processes are completed. There is first a need to test the availability and use of existing products, catalog all the existing ones, but stay within focal areas at first. The GEF Secretariat also confirmed that there is no existing knowledge management policy but that the debate is open.
45. Referring to the "IWLearn" example of a knowledge management portal, UNDP suggested that its comparative success is because GEF is the major player in International Waters, but this is not the case for other GEF focal areas.
46. STAP expressed the need to at least know what GEF had done and that knowledge management should address this. The GEF Secretariat proposed that a series of meetings be held and agreed that there is a need to plan and strategize starting with the demand side then it will be easier to define how to reach that strategy. It would be useful for the partners to first say what the problem is. The GEF Secretariat cannot write a strategy on its own, but is willing to work with partners as and when time permits. UNEP agreed and suggested that agencies first identify what is available in terms of their knowledge management portals to learn from.

Decision 7.1: STAP agrees to provide an input into the review of the existing M&E policy to the Evaluation Office (on evaluation issues) and to the Secretariat (on monitoring and indicator issues).

Decision 7.2: STAP will collaborate with the GEF Secretariat and agencies to survey existing GEF partner KM systems and to define a structure for GEF knowledge management

Agenda item 8. Review of STAP's Work Program for FY2011

47. STAP had previously circulated in the agenda papers a draft of the proposed Work Program of STAP for the GEF financial year 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2011, and recommended that discussion focus on the policy and outcome aspects of the Work Program rather than the detail of individual activities
48. The GEF Secretariat sought clarification on sequencing of targeted research (TR) and related advisory activities and clarification of cross cutting and climate change items in the Work program and also on LULUCF and SFM/REDD relationships.
49. UNEP clarified that on sequencing of TR that STAP normally looked at an emerging area and identified any needs for TR follow-up. However, if an issue is urgently promoted by an agency, then STAP can follow up by reviewing the broader context within which the TR is being conducted.
50. The World Bank suggested prioritising the products to match the limited absorptive capacity of the whole system of GEF going into GEF-5 and include only those items that have direct implication on operationalizing GEF-5 reforms and policies. Also be clear on who is the target audience or key actor.
51. UNDP suggested establishing a priority sequence for high level policy change, strategic program change, project change. Defining what change is expected, emphasizing cross-cutting areas and looking at interactions across the whole of the GEF would be desirable.
52. The GEF Secretariat, with respect to STAR-related LD indicators, is expecting more from STAP, since UNCCD is prioritizing impact indicators. UNEP reminded the GEF Secretariat that GEF had financed Fourth National Reports which assists with indicators. UNCCD Secretariat stated that two indicators were adopted at the recent CoP, and also reminded the meeting that STAP produced a review of impact indicators now being used in a science review to be followed by a task force.
53. GEF Secretariat said that the STAP work program was ambitious and that it might need to be more focused. The Secretariat questioned the feasibility of the cross-cutting item for advice for making GEF projects climate resilient given the GEF's limited resources.
54. STAP noted that its attempts to deliver cross-focal advice in climate change has not been very popular with the GEF Secretariat and agencies, however, in response a participant encouraged the STAP to challenge the GEF anyway with its advice on interlinkages and that incentives could be built into the project cycle for projects that exhibit interlinkages.
55. UNEP noted that STAP should allow time in the Work Program to review its own role in a GEF-5 world. The UNFCCC Secretariat asked STAP to think about how its Work Program is linked to delivery of GEF-5 focal area strategies and suggested, for example, that UN-REDD work is also assessed by STAP.
56. The IADB recommended that STAP advice should be aligned to the needs of the overall project cycle, specifically that reflecting changes made to the cycle to make it more strategic regarding selection of projects/programs that STAP can inform decisions about priorities relating to regions and countries. Also IADB asked if STAP can offer a 'help-desk' to agencies/countries before the PIF is created?
57. STAP noted the questions and suggestions and undertook to circulate a version of the Work Program after review in the closed sessions to follow.

Decision 8.1: Taking into account the need to be clear about use and change expected from STAP advice, STAP will review the draft Work Program in the light of GEF-5 needs and strategic opportunities to advise the GEF including -

- The need to advise on choices for regional and country programming informed by science, noting that STAP needs to balance long term and strategic advice with GEF-5 related tasks.
- prioritizing the STAP Work Program: considering PIF/programmatic screening, Strategic Advice, GEF-5 related tool kit preparation, Science driven long term and GEF-wide issues (not immediately relevant to GEF-5)

Decision 8.2: STAP will consider setting up and promoting a “help-desk” to assist partners with their scientific design upstream of PIF finalization, provided that resources permit and that the role is first considered within a wider review of STAP’s role in GEF-5.

Agenda item 9. Role of STAP in LDCF and SCCF

58. The meeting discussed the draft options paper provided by STAP regarding the need for scientific and technical advice to be provided to inform the GEF regarding use of the SCCF and LDCF funds.
59. UNEP, noting that NAPA implementation challenges and needs for advice are evident, supported the paper. UNEP also noted that STAP had in the past provided advice to the funds and went on to propose that of the options explored in the paper that option (iv) is viable and that STAP should be considered as a least cost option.
60. UNFCCC Secretariat advised that there is a need to keep the procedural issues separate from the substantive issue of whether there is need for such advice. While it is up to the LDCF/SCCF Council to decide if they actually need the advice, nevertheless it is likely that such advice is needed for implementation of the LDC NAPAs. Technology transfer in particular needs strong scientific advice, which is one area covered under SCCF; the role of a scientific body is crucial.
61. The GEF Secretariat cautioned against getting too far out in front on this issue since neither the GEF Council nor the LDCF/SCCF Council had asked for STAP to offer scientific and technical advice for the funds. Moreover, donors had not decided on the level of funding for the two funds, so it would be difficult to know whether the administrative budget could be increased. The Secretariat pointed out that in previous Council decisions, the GEF Council delegated power to the LDCF/SCCF Council on matters related to the LDCF/SCCF and that the Council also oversaw the STAP. So, the GEF Council might also need to take a view on whether STAP advice might be needed. Per previous GEF Council decisions, if a Panel Member were to be added, then the cost would have to be met from LDCF/SCCF funds.

Decision 9.1: STAP will explore with the GEF Secretariat the need for an options paper to be presented to future GEF Council and LDCF/SCCF Council meetings, noting that STAP’s proposed work on Climate resilience could be a starting point for a possible enhanced role on adaptation.

Any other business

62. STAP requested further advice on defining criteria for sharpening its advice to the GEF. The GEF Secretariat suggested that GEF-5 strategy implementation support be one priority, and proposed to work with STAP on how to present this to Council. Synergies are important, and selected issues as needed to discuss with Council, but first discuss with

GEF agencies and the GEF Secretariat. STAP is also recommended to focus on outcomes and policy implications of the advice.

Close of the meeting

63. The Chairperson expressed his thanks on behalf of STAP to Council Member Observers, participants, and to IFAD which kindly acted as host for the STAP meeting.

ANNEX: List of Participants

GEF Agencies

Jesus Quintana (IFAD)
Maryam Niamir Fuller (UNEP)
Marieta Sakalian (UNEP)
John Hough (UNDP)
Siv Tokle (World Bank)
Siham Mohamedahmed, (AfDB)
Ricardo Quiroga (IADB)
George Anestis (UNIDO)

GEF Secretariat

Chris Briggs
Gustavo Fonseca
Andrew Velthaus

Conventions

David Ogden (Stockholm Convention Secretariat)
Yolando Velasco (UNFCCC Secretariat)
Hakan Marstorp (UNCCD Secretariat)

GEF Council Observers

Tui Dewes (New Zealand)
Katherine Delhotal (USA)
Zaheer Fakir (South Africa)
Javad Talat (Pakistan)

Evaluation Office

Rob van den Berg, Director of Evaluation

STAP

Thomas E. Lovejoy, Chairperson
Meryl Williams, Vice Chair and Panel Member (International Waters)
N.H. Ravindranath, Panel Member (Climate Change)
Bo Wahlström, Panel Member (POPs and chemicals)
Mary Seely, Panel Member (Land Degradation)
Sandra Díaz, Panel Member (Biodiversity)
Michael Stocking, STAP Consultant (Land Degradation)

Douglas Taylor, STAP Secretary