

**REPORT OF THE SEVENTH MEETING OF THE  
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL**

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

**INTRODUCTION**

1. In accordance with its program of work, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) held its seventh session in Washington 25-27 November 1996. The meeting was preceded on 22 November 1996 by a brainstorming session on biological diversity convened by the STAP Working Group on Biodiversity in collaboration with the Implementing Agencies the GEF Secretariat and the Convention on Biological Diversity.

**SECTION I: BRAINSTORMING SESSION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY**

2. The brainstorming session on biological diversity was opened and chaired by Prof. Pier Vellinga, Chair of STAP, on 21 November 1996. It was convened to review the biodiversity focal area with the view of identifying and prioritizing issues which STAP could address in the short, medium and long-term.

3. The brainstorming session was attended by 18 participants from STAP, UNDP, UNEP, the World Bank, the GEF Secretariat and the Convention on Biological Diversity.

4. Participants were presented with a note (UNEP/GEF/BRAINSTORMING/3/2) prepared by the STAP Secretariat containing the aims and objectives, the organization of work and expected outcomes.

5. The report of the brainstorming session is presented in Annex 1.

**SECTION II: SEVENTH MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL**

**Agenda item 1: Opening of the meeting**

6. The seventh meeting of STAP was held in Washington, D.C. from 25-27 November, 1996. It was opened by Professor Pier Vellinga, Chair of STAP. He welcomed all participants and underscored the importance of the meeting in identifying the "demand" issues which STAP could address in the short, medium and long-term.

**Agenda item 2: Adoption of the Agenda and Adoption of Organization of Work**

*Agenda and Organization of Work*

7. The Panel adopted the agenda contained in document UNEP/GEF/STAP/7/1 and the draft organization of work as contained in document UNEP/GEF/STAP/7/1/ Add.2.

*Participation*

8. The STAP members attending the meeting were Dr. Rokhayatou Fall, Dr. Stein Hansen, Prof. Jyoti K. Parikh, Prof. Pier Vellinga, Prof. Chihiro Watanabe, Dr. Robert H. Williams, Dr. Helen T. Yap, Dr. Stephen Karekezi, Dr. Mary Allegratti and Dr. Jorge Soberon.

9. Prof. Peter Schei, Co-chair of the SBSTTA, Convention for Biological Diversity, Dr. Gunilla Bjorklund, Executive Secretary of the Comprehensive Freshwater Assessment at the Stockholm Environment Institute, Mr. Mohamed El Ghaouth, Chairman of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation of Climate Change, Mr. Robert Ryan, Special Advisor, UNCCD also attended the meeting.

10. The representatives from the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies who attended the meeting were Dr. Walter Lusigi, Dr. Alfred Duda, Dr. Mario Ramos, Mr. Hamantha Mishra and Mr. J. Harstad (GEF Secretariat), Mr. Lars Vidaeus, Ms. Kathy MacKinnon (World Bank), Mr. Rafael Asenjo (UNDP), Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaif, Mr. John Tyehsen, Dr. Cyrie Sendashonga and Mr. Rohit Khanna (UNEP), and Dr. Mark D. Griffith and Ms. Danae Issaias (UNEP/STAP Secretariat).

**Agenda item 3: Address of the Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the GEF**

11. The CEO in his address reported on his participation in the Third Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, 4th - 15th November 1996 and reported that the relationship between the Convention Secretariat and the GEF Secretariat is good, this he anticipated will continue to be strengthened in the future.

12. Reference was made to the complexity of global environmental problems and the role of STAP in providing a long-term perspective on these issues; providing answers based upon knowledge; defining strategies to address these issues and outlining the role of GEF. It was emphasized that STAP should be used as a mechanism for attracting input from the wider scientific community, a function that is very important in the context of the

GEF.

13. The CEO touched on a number of issues he indicated were important to the GEF. These included:

(a) **Relationship with the Conventions:** He stressed the importance of the relationship between the GEF and the Convention Secretariats of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Framework Convention on Climate Change. With respect to the scientific and technical bodies of the Conventions he indicated that STAP should represent the GEF at these meetings commencing with the FCCC SBSTA and extending it to the CBD-SBSTTA. He emphasized the need for the entire GEF family to be aware of what was happening;

(b) **Replenishment:** Reference was made to the process of replenishment which will commence with a meeting in Paris during the month of March 1997. The CEO indicated that questions are likely to be raised on the global impact of the GEF and on how effective the various GEF processes have been. In the context of preparation for replenishment, he underscored the importance of the follow-up to the STAP Expert Group Workshop on Land Degradation. He indicated that careful consideration should, therefore, be given to the nature of the follow-up and what STAP could do to facilitate project development; and

(c) **Involvement of the Wider Scientific and Technical Community:** The CEO underscores the importance of the involvement of the scientific community at the national level in countries where GEF projects were being implemented. He indicated that this was very important to the scientific underpinning of the GEF and that STAP had a role to play in this regard. He, however, emphasized that there was a need for a strategy to point the way forward on this issue.

#### **Agenda item 4: Report by STAP Chairman on the Eight Meeting of the GEF Council**

14. The Chairman of STAP reported on the Eight Meeting of the GEF Council convened from 8-10 October 1996. To assist the meeting in the consideration of this agenda item, documents UNEP/GEF/STAP/7/2, UNEP/GEF/STAP/7/2/Add1 and UNEP/GEF/STAP/7/2/Add2 prepared by the STAP Secretariat were made available.

15. The Chairman reported that overall the report of the STAP Chair and the STAP outputs presented to Council were well received and STAP was complimented both on the quality and quantity of its work, especially the RET documents, the Ecosystems and Sustainable Use paper and the Report of the STAP Expert Group Workshop on Land Degradation.

16. With respect to the substantive issues he indicated that in the focal area of International Waters, STAP's recommendation for an International Waters Assessment, which was received more positively by the GEF Council than before, has since been taken up by UNEP, for implementation.

17. He indicated that concern still exists with respect to the participation of STAP in the new GEFOP process.

18. Specific reference was made by the STAP Chairman to the follow-up activities to be undertaken by STAP resulting from the GEF Council. These were summarized as follows:

(a) recommendations concerning follow-up to the STAP Expert Group Workshop on Land Degradation;

(b) an issue paper on the recommendations contained in the documents on RETs on how these recommendations could be incorporated into the work of the GEFSEC and the IAs;

(c) STAP's role in Monitoring and Evaluation. The Chairman indicated that it was not yet clear how STAP would be involved;

(d) selective Review of medium-sized projects and the modalities for doing so; and

(e) the publication of STAP/GEF papers.

19. With respect to Targeted Research, the CEO informed the meeting that comments were being awaited from the Council Members before the document could be finalised for re-submission to the GEF Council either for Inter-sessional Work Plan or for the Ninth Meeting of the Council to be held in May 1996. The final decision on this will be determined by the nature of the responses received from Council Members.

20. The STAP Chairman informed the meeting of the substantive issue raised by Council members and NGOs with respect to the Ukraine CFC phase-out project that includes HFC 1314-a as an alternative and the concerns expressed about the choice of this alternative being used in that project in view of its effects on climate. STAP, the Chairman indicated, should provide advice on this issue.

21. The Chairman also reported on STAP's participation and interaction with the NGO community. Specific reference was made to the NGO's recommendation for the need of "local" STAPs to support GEF Operational Focal Points at the national level. The Chairman recommended that National Committees be formed around the GEF focal point and should include scientists, private sector and NGO representatives. Such Committees could serve to further mobilise the wider scientific community at the national level.

#### **Agenda item 5: Strategy Session an Expected Demand for STAP to Address in Accordance with STAP Mandate, GEF Portfolio and Thematic Areas.**

22. In introducing this agenda item, the STAP Chairman made reference to the decision taken by STAP at its Sixth Meeting to place more emphasis on the demand driven nature of STAP's work while recognising the need for forward-looking products initiated by STAP. In this regard, the Chairman identified the three main areas of STAP's focus, namely, (i) operation oriented advice to the GEF Council the GEFSEC and the IAs on the portfolio (i.e. projects, papers, etc.); (ii) development oriented advice with an emphasis on advanced thinking on the subject and (iii) outreach, namely mobilisation and linking the wider scientific and technical community with the GEF.

23. The Chairman's remarks were followed by presentations by the GEFSEC and the IAs on the possible issues STAP could address in the short,

medium and long-term. This was addressed systematically, firstly with general comments and followed by specific suggestions in the various focal areas.

24. The discussion on possible areas which STAP could address was lead by the CEO of the GEF, who on the basis of his earlier discussions with the STAP Chairman, identified a number of areas he felt were critical at this juncture in the GEF. The issues identified included:

the processes of technology transfer and the area of technology assessment capability, particularly in developing countries. The need to address the types of technologies and how they should be transferred was underscored. In this regard, it was felt that emphasis should also be placed on technology development;

the interplay between local and global benefits, particularly in the area of biodiversity. Closely linked to this is the issue of incremental costs which needed further clarification;

the concept of Sustainable Use and its implications for GEF in terms of what types of projects could result; and

the concept of benefit sharing and its implications for GEF in terms of what types of projects could result. In this regard, the CEO indicated that a joint paper should be prepared by GEFSEC, the IAs and STAP on this issue for submission at the Fourth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

25. In terms of general comments with respect to STAP, its future demand and work a number of issues were raised including:

the continuous development of the STAP Roster of Experts including quality control. Specific reference was made to increasing the number of experts from the developing countries and the need to place more emphasis on experts in the social sciences;

in the area of project review it was felt that STAP should at least once a year, review a cluster of projects on a particular theme and draw out the strategic issues, which could then be used to guide the IAs in future project designs;

the need for STAP to undertake analysis of the state of science in the context of the GEF portfolio was emphasised. This request is consistent with STAP's mandate as set out in its Terms of Reference approved by the GEF Council in October 1995; and

in the area of Monitoring an Evaluation, it was suggested that STAP could constantly keep under review the Operational Programmes and where appropriate, suggest new ones based on the implementation of conventions guidance; evaluate global results and impacts of GEF work from a scientific and technical perspective; analyse characteristic features of project, namely best practices and play a role in the annual monitoring an evaluation review. It was felt that a clear distinction should be made between strategic review of science and technology in projects and monitoring evaluation.

26. In response to the general issues raised, a number of concerns were stated by STAP members, including the lack of feedback to STAP from the GEFSEC and the IAs on how their comments on projects have been used, the need for a feedback mechanism to address this issue was emphasised. The new GEFOP procedure and its implications for STAP was also raised particularly with reference to the time frame within which projects are made available for review. In this regard, STAP Chairman outlined a number of pre-conditions under which STAP can effectively undertake project reviews namely:

the project pipeline should be made available STAP to enable it to undertake a pre-selection of projects which STAP will comment on;

advance warning should be given to STAP about the time schedule of the bilaterals between the GEFSEC and the IAs, and GEFOP project discussions. A more structured agenda for project review is therefore required; and

there is need for a mechanism to ensure systematic feedback to STAP on the comments it made on projects.

27. In terms of mobilizing the wider scientific and technical community, it was suggested that a STAP Newsletter on the Internet could be used as a means of strengthening the scientific and technical network including the STAP Roster of Experts.

28. The meeting then focused its attention on the specific demands identified by the GEFSEC and IAs. In the focal area of biological diversity, the 'demand' identified at the Brainstorming Session on Biodiversity held prior to the STAP meeting was presented by the STAP Chairman. The demand issues raised by the GEFSEC and the IAs are summarised according to focal area.

#### *Climate Change*

lessons and best practices, from a scientific and technical standpoint, that could be used to update the GEF Operational Criteria for Climate Change Enabling Activities;

evaluation of the extent to which science and local scientists were taken into account in the development of national plans and national communication;

models for technology transfer particularly with regard to the agreeable conditions under which such transfers including private sector cooperation would be most effective;

accelerating efforts on the learning curves on RETs building on work already started by STAP;

scientific and technical issues and options in the transport sector in view of its rapidly growing emissions;

permanent updating technologies which have implications for the (GEF) Operational Programmes. (i.e. related to the use of coal);

assimilation of COP guidance into science and technology;

energy conservation issues;

energy efficiency for developing countries, with emphasis on innovative technologies particularly in the basic material industries (i.e. cement, steel, basic chemicals, food, etc.); and

further scientific analysis on the relationship between climate change and biodiversity.

#### *Biodiversity*

(a) sustainable use of various ecosystems (forest, dryland, mountain ecosystems, coastal and marine, etc.) including consideration of local knowledge systems, and local and global benefits;

(b) Agrobiodiversity;

(c) follow-up to the STAP Expert Group Workshop on Land Degradation;

(d) development and use of indicators for biodiversity;

(e) networking of science in developing countries and the better use of local/national/regional knowledge;

(f) incremental costs;

(g) best practice analysis;

(h) transboundary conservation activities;

(i) follow-up to the Global Biodiversity Assessment;

(j) mountain ecosystems hot spots;

(k) knowledge based assessments in the field of biodiversity;

(l) assessment of the relationship between climate change, biodiversity and land degradation particularly in land use; and

(m) stand alone targeted research on issues such as the "species approach." It was felt that if basic research is not done in some areas, it will be difficult to address a wide cross-section of other issues in the field of biodiversity.

#### *International Waters*

(a) the implementation of the International Waters Assessment which will be executed in a two phase approach, namely (a) a preparation phase and (b) an implementation phase;

(b) pursuing initiatives to put the case for a longer-term strategic approach for GEF in this focal area that Council may consider some years in the future to update the Operational Strategy and Ops; and

(c) actively addressing the food security issue with all its cross-sectoral and multifocal area implications.

29. This was felt by some as of utmost importance to the world and underscores the importance of the International Waters focal area. This, it was indicated, involves the broad range of water resources issues related to food from oceans, coastal zones, floodplain, irrigation and international rivers

or fossil aquifers, and land degradation linkages to water (soil erosion, watershed management, desertification, changes in flood and low flow hydrologic regimes and in water storage in soils). The complexity of issues in this focal area was underscored. It was pointed out that issues ranged from villagers using sustainable harvesting methods (stop dynamiting, poisons, destructive trawls); to engaging flag states/fishing fleets/private sector/artisinal fisher folk in reducing catch; to protecting important nursery areas and stopping destructive trawls in these areas; to addressing land degradation linkages; to promoting best management practices for efficient irrigation to institutional best practices for allocating water among nations for irrigation and other uses while providing needed quality, quantity, and timing of water for downstream ecosystems; to retrofitting dams in international basins for artificial floods and release improvements to restore floodplain recession agriculture, recharge of village water supplies, rewatering wetlands for riverine fish production, etc. There are many science, technology, and social science issues to be addressed.

30. STAP Chairman responded that this may be a desired approach but it is not realistic that GEF and STAP take such a full scope on board;

(a) initiatives on using recent developments in technology so that

International Waters projects can benefit from modern tools for resource management and prediction, including GEF funded, reviews of best practices, modern technology such as simulation modeling, etc. to determine lessons learned and provide opportunities for GEF

International Waters projects to use them;

(b) STAP's active participation to bring the science community in each

country co-operating on an International Waters project into the processes for improving management of the resources or solving problems;

(c) social science and institutional best practices to solve International Waters

problems - especially with Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM).

Pilot projects have shown how to involve coastal villages in protecting their resources, and how this is done in a widespread fashion and among multiple countries. How best can multiple countries work together

institutionally to change sectoral practices and policies that degrade their shared waters. A whole host of participation/stakeholder/private sector

set of social issues demands that STAP mobilize social science and

political science communities to help out; and

(d) multifocal area linkages. The importance of ocean-climate interactions

and ICZM should be done everywhere with biodiversity/climate change/ and international waters considerations so as not to duplicate initiatives,

to solve a greater set of issues in one project, to multiply potential global

environment benefits from GEF projects. GEF could promote a

holistic/comprehensive approach to coastal zone management rather than

a convention-by-convention piecemeal and duplicative approach. STAP

could provide guidance on how GEF should approach this issue.

31. There is need for bringing science into projects to help management make the transition to more sustainable water resources management approaches. STAP may be able to guide GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies and in fact build their capacity in this regard.

(a) given the importance of institutional issues in the context of regional

water bodies as a major constraint, the need exists for an analysis of the

pros and cons of various institutional models for the conservation and

sustainable use of such water bodies and the resources they provide;

(b) more emphasis needs to be placed on low cost, effective monitoring

systems and critical issues pertaining to technology options;

(c) specific issues related to land based sources of pollution;

(d) sustainable use of coastal zone biodiversity and marine resources;

(e) more attention needs to be directed to the pros and cons of drawing systems boundaries in the focal area of international waters;

(f) in addressing the international water focal area, concerns were expressed about the tendency by the GEF of mixing freshwater and ocean issues together. It was emphasized that given the nature of these systems, approaches may differ greatly. The view was, therefore, expressed that programmatically one should only relate the issues when there is a scientific underpinning of the relation; and

(g) the positioning of STAP/GEF to influence the "Year of the Oceans" which will be celebrated in 1998. This it was felt could be beneficial for the GEF.

#### *Land Degradation*

(a) the follow-up to the STAP Expert Workshop on Land Degradation. In this context reference was made to the projects concepts UNEP is currently developing in this area;

(b) further consideration needs to be given to the interrelationships between land degradation and the other focal areas and how they are going to fit within the context of GEF operations;

(c) further work was required on what options there are at the local levels in the context of demonstrating local and global benefits;

(d) modernised biomass energy systems and their implications for land restoration of the system including the economics of this process. It was felt that GEF resources could be used in a catalytic way to jump start this process; and

(e) reference was also made to the efforts being undertaken by the World Bank in this area.

32. After further consideration of the "demand" issues identified by the IAs and the GEFSEC, it was agreed that STAP in the short term should focus on the following issues in the respective focal areas;

#### *Biodiversity*

(a) sustainable use including related indicators, local and global benefit issues and best practice analysis with the remaining issues being addressed over time.

#### *Climate Change*

- (a) models for technology cooperation;
- (b) transport;
- (c) further work on renewable energy and coal; and
- (d) on other issues STAP would provide advice in a responsive mode.

*International Waters*

- (a) the international waters assessment; and
- (b) the regional approach including the issue of system boundaries and institutional aspects of a scientific and technical nature.

*Land Degradation*

- (a) the follow-up to the Dakar Workshop implementation issues; and
- (b) sustainable use of dryland biodiversity including the interplay of local and global benefits in the context of biodiversity priorities.

**Agenda item 6: Consideration of STAP Budgetary Situation for FY97, STAP Business plan and draft Budget FY98-2000**

33. The STAP Secretary provided an overview of the financial situation for FY97 and the resource requirements for FY98. It was agreed that FY98 budget would take into consideration the additional activities such as selective reviews and priority areas such as the Roster of Experts. The STAP Secretary was requested to follow preparation of the budget in terms of content and process.

**Agenda item 7: Discussion on Outstanding issues in the Various Thematic Areas including Budgetary Implications**

34. To assist the Meeting in the consideration the agenda item, the Secretariat prepared documents UNEP/GEF/STAP/7/6 and UNEP/GEF/STAP/7/6/Add1.

35. The meeting reviewed the outstanding issues resulting from the work of the STAP ad-hoc Working Group and/or Task Teams that the Meeting with the view of finalizing it. These are in the Work Programme for the remainder of FY97. The issues were addressed according to thematic areas as summarised below.

*Land Degradation*

- (a) Scientific and Technical Analysis of the Outputs of the STAP Expert

Group Workshop on Land Degradation. It was agreed that this

document will be prepared in collaboration with the GEFSEC. It was also agreed that STAP should provide constructive advice to assist the design of evolving projects;

- (b) report on Scientific and Technical Issues arising out of the International

Negotiating Committee for the Convention on Desertification was

submitted for the Consideration of the Panel by the STAP member who

attended the meeting on behalf of STAP;

- (c) Incremental cost and global benefits. It was agreed that a brainstorming

session should be convened prior to the Ninth Meeting of STAP in June

1997 to be held in Amsterdam on Incremental Cost and Global Benefits in

the area of Land Degradation; and

- (d) Representation at INC on the Convention to Combat Desertification. It

was agreed that STAP continue to be represented at these meetings

subject to the availability of resources. The next meeting of the INC/CCD is scheduled for January, 1997.

*International Waters*

- (a) Progress and further elaboration of the International Waters Strategy. It

was agreed that further advice will be provided by STAP in the regional approach and its implications for the GEF;

(b) International waters assessment: It was agreed that STAP actively participate in the preparations of the IWA;

(c) Progress on the study on best practice with regard to the application of Science and Scientific tools in GEF projects. The report will be submitted for review at the Eight meeting of STAP to be convened in March 1997;

and

(d) Application of Best Practice Methods: It was agreed that the Ad-Hoc Working Group in collaboration with the GEFSEC and IA develop plans for a workshop on the application of best practice methods.

#### *Climate/Energy*

(a) STAP/GEF Assessment of urban transport related GHGs Mitigation Options: The meeting was informed of the plans for this workshop which will be held on March 14-15, 1997 in Nairobi, Kenya, prior to the Eighth Meeting of STAP. The plans as outlined were approved by the Panel;

(b) Consideration of a possible new operational program on sequestration: It was agreed that consideration of this issue will not commence until FY98;

(c) Report on Adaptation Stage 1 Activities and Priorities. It was agreed that progress report on this issue will be submitted for the panel's consideration at the Eighth Meeting of STAP;

(d) Clean Coal Workshop: It was agreed that the Clean Coal Workshop will be convened on 16-17, June 1997 prior to the Ninth meeting of STAP to be held in Amsterdam, The Netherlands. The meeting was informed that the workshop will focus on two major sets of issues, namely, improvements in performance in structural reforms in the industry with an emphasis on case studies and technological innovations; and

(e) Follow-up to the RETs papers: It was agreed that a teleconference be convened early in January 1997 with the IAs and the GEFSEC to discuss the RETs papers and the nature of the follow-up and the presentation to the GEF Council.

#### *Biodiversity*

(a) The Brainstorming Session on Biological Diversity. The results of the Brainstorming Session were submitted for consideration of the Panel;

(b) Workshop on Sustainable Use: It was agreed that STAP should convene a Workshop on Sustainable use in collaboration with the GEFSEC, IAs and the Convention on Biological Diversity in October/November 1997;

(c) In order to facilitate the preparation for the workshop which could be held in Brazil, Dr. Maria Allegetti was given the responsibility to develop a plan for such a Workshop working closely with the STAP Secretariat; and

(d) It was also agreed that papers will be initiated by STAP, namely, papers on the economics of sustainable use, the anthropological aspects of sustainable use as well as the ecological aspects possibly focusing on a number of case studies. In parallel papers with case studies examples would be prepared for the various ecosystems operational programmes (i.e coastal and marine, drylands, mountains and forests). The first draft of these papers will be available for review by the Panel at the Eighth Meeting of STAP to be held in Nairobi in March, 1997.

36. In finalising the STAP Work Plan for the remainder of FY97, the meeting assigned responsibilities for the various tasks to be undertaken. These are contained in Annex 2 of this report.

#### *Relationship between STAP and INC/CCD*

37. Robert Ryan, Advisor for the Convention to Combat Desertification informed the Panel of the activities of the Secretariat and the preparations for the First Meeting of the Parties to the Convention. He informed the Panel of meetings of the INC planned for January and August 1997 and the First Meeting of the Conference of the Parties scheduled for September 1997, and meeting annual, thereafter.

38. He also informed the Panel of the Committee for Science and Technology which will meet along with the COP. Reference was made to two papers prepared by the INC/CCD Secretariat which of relevance to STAP, namely, "Bodies and Organisations, the Subsidiary Body of the Convention Would Want to Co-operate With (i.e. IPCC, STAP, etc.)" and "The Work Programme for the Committee for Science and Technology for the first few years of the Convention" The latter document, it was explained, contained issues of relevance to STAP's work such as indicators, both impact and implementation type indicators; inventory of traditional technologies; networking and research priorities areas for addressing land degradation:

39. The STAP Secretariat was complimented for its cooperation with the INC/CCD Secretariat in making available information requested.

#### *Monitoring and Evaluation*

40. A presentation was made by J. Harstad, the Monitoring and Evaluation Co-ordinator to the Panel to solicit views on the on-going work on M & E and the role of STAP in this process. Three documents were presented during the presentation to the Panel for feedback on selected assignments which will be undertaken in the coming years. These related to: (i) Project Implementation Review (whole portfolio, mid-term review of GEF Results and Impacts; (ii) Characteristic Features of Effective and less Effective Projects; and (iii) Identification of Indicators for the Operational Programmes.

41. After discussion, it was agreed that STAP will operate in a responsive mode responding to the specific request of the M&E Coordinator.

#### **Agenda item 8: Ongoing work and Planning of Selective Review of GEF Projects.**

42. To assist the meeting in the consideration of this agenda item, the following documents were prepared by the STAP Secretariat UNEP/GEF/STAP/7/7/1, Add1, 11, and 111.

43. On the Rajasthan Solar Thermal Project the Team Leader presented the results of the external reviews of the project and indicated that a draft report will be circulated to the STAP members and the IAs responsible for the project during the next few months. A final report will be presented to STAP at its Eight meeting for approval. The report will include a strategy for the monitoring of the project through the implementation phase.

44. With respect to both the Lake Victoria Project and the Alternatives to Slash and Burn, the Panel adopted a programme of work which is summarised below.

#### *Lake Victoria Project*

- (a) STAP to clearly define the Terms of Reference for the Selective Review and its scope. This should be done in collaboration with World Bank Task Manager for the project (November-December, 1996). In this regard, a meeting was convened between the Task Team for the Selective Review and the World Bank Task Manager of the project- Graeme Donovan;
- (b) Review of relevant documentation (December - January, 1997);
- (c) Based upon the Terms of Reference, the Project Managers of the Project in the three participating countries will, in collaboration with the Project Secretariat, produce a synthesis document of the scientific and technical issues affecting the project site (January-February, 1997);
- (d) Selective Reviewers Site Visit, 12-13 March, 1997;
- (e) Review Meeting 14 March, 1997, UNEP Headquarters; and
- (f) Revision of Terms of Reference and detailed plan for undertaking the Technical Review including cost implications.

*Alternative to Slash and Burn*

- (a) STAP to clearly define the terms of reference for the Selective Review, its scope and the cost implications. This should be done in collaboration with the UNDP's Task Manager(s) for the project (November-December, 1996);
- (b) Review and Selection of relevant documentation (November-December, 1996);
- (c) Evaluation of the various components, namely the Cameroon, Brazil and Indonesia including site visits by STAP members. A maximum of 5 man days per site. (January-February, 1996); and
- (d) Meeting with the International Center for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF) and Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility Programme (TSBF) (Nairobi, March, 1997).

**Agenda item 9: The STAP Roster of Experts, Review of the Ongoing Work**

- 45. A presentation was made of the STAP Roster of Experts now on the World Wide Web. It can be found as part of the GEF Secretariat and UNEP home pages. The possibility was also mentioned of cross fertilization of experts by linking to other rosters such as that of the Desertification Convention. The database is continuously being improved accommodate new requirements.
- 46. The ongoing work on the roster was discussed also in terms of the nominations of new experts, mainly from developing countries. This will be done through GEF focal points, UN Permanent Representatives and Institutes of Higher Learning and Universities. The initial screening of the nominations will be performed by the STAP Secretariat and a preliminary list will be submitted to the Eighth Meeting of STAP in March 1997
- 47. Quality control of the Roster through the Evaluation Questionnaire has started and data is being computerized. The questionnaires will be forwarded to the Panel who will be required to add their own comments on the quality of the reviews. A concern was raised, however, that the new GEFOP procedures may not facilitate the tracking of experts used for reviews by the implementing agencies. A draft evaluation report will be presented at the March meeting of STAP to prepare for the Annual Evaluation Report to the May meeting of the GEF Council.

**Agenda Item 10: Preparations for the First GEF Assembly**

- 48. The meeting was informed that the revised GEFSEC paper on the structure of the GEF Assembly has not yet been fully formulated. The Panel decided, however, that STAP should be represented on any Task Force which may be set up to plan for the Assembly. STAP will be represented by either the STAP Chair or the STAP Secretary.

**Agenda item 11: Any Other Business**

- 49. Under this agenda item a number of issues were considered, namely:
- 50. **Targeted Research:** The Comments on the Targeted Research received from Council Members were received and circulated to Panel members. After consideration of the comments it was decided that STAP will review the comments and in collaboration with the GEFSEC finalise a document in time for the Inter-Sessional Work Plan.
- 51. **National Academy of Sciences:** National Research Council Project: Building Scientific Capacity into the GEF Enabling Activities and Operational Programmes. The Chairman introduced this item and informed the meeting that a workshop was planned for January or February 1997 to brainstorm on ways and means of involving the wider scientific community in GEF activities.
- 52. STAP members raised a number of issues with respect to the purpose of the exercise. The actual nature of the project and the budgetary implications. Members expressed concern about the role of STAP in the GEF since it was their understanding as set out in STAP's mandate, that STAP was the GEF conduit for mobilizing the wider scientific and technical community. The Panel was unanimous that the way the proposal was handled constituted a breach of protocol on the part of the GEFSEC and it would have been appropriate to bring the terms of reference in the contract with the National Academy of Sciences to the attention of STAP first. The view was expressed that such a breach in protocol should not occur in the future. Fortunately the issue can still be redressed. STAP will now advice and guide the work of NAS in the preparation of the workshop.
- 53. STAP Chair in collaboration with the STAP Secretary will develop STAP's strategic thinking on this issue and circulate same ideas and approaches to STAP members for further input.

54. A suggestion was made by a number of STAP members that the STAP Secretariat should consider a World Wide Web communication mode to facilitate involvement of STAP Roster of experts as well as the wider scientific community. The suggestion will be considered again at the Eighth Meeting of STAP.

*Communication Cost to Support STAP Work by Panel Members*

55. A number of STAP members raised the issue with respect to the pre-financing of telecommunication cost to support STAP work. The STAP Secretary informed the meeting that this was not permissible under UNEP financial rules. The Secretary promised to discuss this issue with the Fund Managers of both UNEP and the GEFSEC.

56. The STAP members commented that STAP productivity had increased significantly over the last two meetings. Much of the success was attributed to the work of the STAP Secretariat for the business like manner in which STAP meetings are organised and supported.

**Agenda Item 12: Adoption of the Report**

57. The meeting took note of the draft report and entrusted the Secretary with the guidance of the Chair, to finalise it before submission to the GEF Council members.

**Agenda Item 13: Closure of the meeting**

58. The meeting was closed at 13:00 hrs on 27 November, 1996. In accordance with the STAP Programme of work for FY97, the eighth meeting of STAP will take place in Nairobi, Kenya, 17-19, March 1997.

---

**Annex I**

**REPORT OF THE BRAINSTORMING ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY**

**WASHINGTON D.C., NOVEMBER 22 1996**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. STAP at its Fifth Meeting held in June 1996, agreed that in order to provide the GEF Council with strategic advice in the biodiversity focal areas, it was necessary to convene a brainstorming session in collaboration with the GEF Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

**AIMS AND OBJECTIVES:**

2. The main objectives of the brainstorming session were to:

- (a) review the GEF biodiversity focal area with the view of identifying the scientific and technical issues arising there from;
- (b) identification of the scope of work to be addressed by STAP in the context of a short, medium and long-term approach;
- (c) examination of the complementary roles of SBSTTA and STAP in the context of implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity and the GEF; and
- (d) review of emerging concepts in the biodiversity focal area and the identification of a strategy for further elaborating them within the context of the GEF.

3. The brainstorming session was held on November 22, 1996, prior to the seventh meeting of STAP

**PARTICIPATION**

4. The session was opened and chaired by Professor Pier Vellinga, STAP chair. Eighteen participants from STAP, the GEF Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies and the Subsidiary Body of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SBSTTA) participated in the session. The list of participants appears in this document.

5. The Chairman in his introductory remarks reviewed STAP's activities with respect to biodiversity. Specific reference was made to STAP's theme paper on Biodiversity; the Ecosystem and Sustainable Use papers which was submitted to the GEF Council at its eight meeting in October 1996 and the draft paper on Targeted Research, elements of which were incorporated into the STAP paper on Target Research, which formed the basis of the GEF Council discussion on this issue at its eight meeting.

6. STAP's contribution to the biodiversity focal area within the GEF was outlined in three broad areas (i) implementation oriented advice to the GEF Council, the GEFSEC and the Implementing Agencies on the portfolio (i.e. projects, discussion papers, etc.); (ii) development oriented advice with emphasis on advance thinking with regard to the GEF in its role in the light of the evolving conventions and (iii) outreach oriented namely, linking the broad scientific and technical community with the GEF.

**SUBSTANTIVE DISCUSSION**

7. The substantive discussion at the brainstorming session focused on three main themes, namely:

(a) the scientific and technical issues which were addressed at the Third Meeting of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, 4 to 15 November 1996 and the implications for the work of STAP and SBSTTA respectively;

(b) a review of the GEF biodiversity focal area and the identification of issues and/or areas where STAP could focus its work in the short medium and long-term; and

(c) the prioritization of the issues arising from (b) and the further elaboration of a number of specific concepts activities (i.e. targeted research, incremental cost, etc.).

### **SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ISSUES WHICH EMERGED DURING COP3**

8. A number of general observations were made on the Third Meeting of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity which was considered to be a success. These may be summarized as follows:

the increasing acceptance of science and technology advice by the COP; and; the greater acceptance of the complementary roles of STAP and SBSTTA.

9. The main scientific and technical issues which were identified during COP3 as possible areas where both STAP and SBSTTA could collaborate include:

(a) the equitable sharing of benefit and the need to identify options for

implementation of this goal of the convention;

(b) STAP clearly believe that this is an area where political issues are

dominant and that the main challenges to STAP and SBSTTA would be to

help formulate approaches to trace and measure the incidence of benefits

between competing stakeholders;

(c) the conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biological diversity.

It was strongly felt that the GEF needs to give more attention on this area;

(d) terrestrial biological diversity particularly in the forests, drylands and

mountain areas;

(e) the human and socio-economic aspects of biodiversity including

traditional cultural practices and knowledge, indigenous people, etc.;

(f) the clearing-house mechanism to promote and facilitate technical and

scientific cooperation and the need for more effective co-ordination;

(g) biosafety;

(h) conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity particularly the role of

stakeholders;

(i) bio-prospecting; and

(j) transfer of technology. It was generally felt that the issue of transfer of

technology was not clearly reflected in the GEF Operational Programmes

on biodiversity.

10. A number of specific suggestions resulted from the discussion which took place on the technical and scientific issues arising from COP3. It was pointed out however that a clear distinction should be made between the issues emerging from COP3 that are scientific and technical in nature as against issues that are political and legal.

(a) given the importance of agrodiversity it was recommended that

consideration be given by the GEF to developing an Operational

Programme on agrobiodiversity;

- (b) greater emphasis need to be directed to the human and socio-economic aspects and the local benefits of biodiversity projects, to this end it was suggested that STAP in collaboration with SBSTTA and the Convention Secretariat should convene a technical workshop on this issue;
- (c) the need was recognized for strengthening the scientific capability of countries at the national level to better implement the various articles of the Convention. In this regard, the need was recognized for further consideration by both STAP and SBSTTA on how to draw upon the scientific and technical communities particularly at the national level where projects are coordinated. The meeting was informed by a representative of the GEFSEC of the initiative taken by the GEFSEC to engage the services of the US Academy of Science in assisting in mobilizing technical and scientific communities in developing countries;
- (d) in terms of response to the guidance provided by COP3 it was generally agreed that the need exists for a meeting between the GEF family (GEFSEC, Implementing Agencies and STAP) to discuss these issues and to agree on the implications for the GEF. As a consequence of this process a number of specific tasks could be identified for STAP to address.

**IDENTIFICATION BY GEFSEC AND IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES OF ISSUES AND /OR AREAS WHICH STAP COULD ADDRESS.**

11. A number of issues were identified by the GEFSEC and IAs which STAP could focus his attention on the short, medium and long-term. These has summarized as follows:

- (a) as a follow-up to the STAP Expert Workshop on Land Degradation, STAP in collaboration with the GEFSEC and the IAs prepare a scientific and technical analysis of the outputs of the meeting as the basis for providing further advice to the GEF Council;
- (b) STAP was requested to undertake an analysis of the Report entitled "The Role of the GEF in Helping Protect Agro-biodiversity of Global Significance" commissioned by the GEFSEC and to provide advice on how the issue of Agrobiodiversity could be addressed by the GEF;
- (c) further work was required on the sustainable use of coastal and marine resources including social, economic, policy and technological options;
- (d) the need was identified for the development of indicators for addressing the programmatic side of GEF work;
- (e) prioritising the hotspots in mountain ecosystems and operationalising the ideas contained in Agenda 21 on this ecosystem were mentioned as

important areas requiring further work;

(f) with regard to Enabling Activities, it was suggested that STAP advises the GEF on what kind of issues should the IAs be looking for in order to derive lessons for underpinning the GEF operations given that this is probably the only category of GEF-financed activities in which all recipient countries will participate in a relatively short time period. This was felt offered a tremendous and unique opportunity to draw some lessons for the GEF. Two areas which were suggested as an example: i) lessons and best practices from a technical scientific standpoint that could be used to update the GEF Operational Criteria for Biodiversity Enabling Activities, and ii) an evaluation of the extent to which science and local scientists were taken into account in the development of biodiversity strategies and action plans;

(g) in the context of the Operational Programme, the issue of targeted research remains unclear and restrictive. It was felt that restricting GEF funding for targeted research activities only to the extent of operational programmes may be rather narrow/partial approach which will not optimize global environment benefits. Given the definition of targeted research in the Operational Strategy which includes information collection, dissemination and analysis, there is a case for the GEF to support activities of a global nature that are aimed at strengthening and complementing activities at country level as well as integrating and relating them to an overall global framework. In this regard, examples included a global species index, development of bioindicators; documenting knowledge, practices and innovations of local and indigenous communities relevant for conservation and sustainable use of Biodiversity; a global strategy for dealing with alien invasive species;

(h) some of these activities cannot be presented on behalf of a specific country or group of countries because they represent issues of a global nature. Even if they were to be presented on behalf of a few countries, that would simply lead to a piece-meal approach to a global problem. Country approaches need to be complemented by global strategies which of course need in turn to be translated into national actions. Since there are obviously several potential areas where a global approach may be called for (e.g. some of the major causes of biodiversity loss identified in the

Global Biodiversity Assessment), STAP could identify some of the priority ones where critical gaps exist. Against the background of priority programmes identified by the COP this far for funding by the interim financial mechanism of the CBD, STAP could in close collaboration with SBSTTA, advise the GEF which areas to focus on for a global approach;

(i) the Global Biodiversity Assessment was undertaken at the recommendation of STAP during the Pilot Phase of the GEF. A number of ideas where more in-depth assessment should be carried out were identified by the GBA;

(j) STAP could provide advice on which priority themes should a follow-up to the GBA be undertaken; and

(k) transboundary actions and regional conservation activities focusing particularly on endangered and migratory species represent another area where GEF support would undoubtedly bring a value added. Among other activities, establishment of "Biological corridors" is under consideration (e.g. Mesoamerica, Central Asia, Eastern Europe in the context of the Pan European Biodiversity and Landscape Conservation Strategy). STAP could provide advice on the scientific and technical issues to be borne in mind in designing the implementing projects of this nature in order to lead to the establishment of effective "biological corridors".

#### **Prioritization of Issues**

12. The meeting then sought to prioritise the issues which STAP should address in the short and medium/longer term demand as follows. These included:

##### *(a) Short-term demand*

- (a) sustainable use of various ecosystems (forest, dryland, mountain ecosystems, etc.) including consideration of local knowledge systems, sharing of benefits and incremental costs;
- (b) agrobiodiversity;
- (c) follow-up to the STAP Expert Group Workshop on Land Degradation.
- (d) use of indicators biological diversity; and
- (e) outreach of science in developing countries and the better use of local knowledge.

##### *(b) Medium and long term demand*

- (a) best practice;
- (b) transboundary conservation activities;
- (c) global biodiversity assessment; and

(d) mountain ecosystems hot spots.

**List of Participants**

**Brainstorming Session on Biodiversity**

**22 November, 1996 - Washington**

Dr. Pier Vellinga

Chairman of STAP

Director, Institute of Environmental Studies, Netherlands

Dr. Maria Helena Allegretti

Secretary, Planning and Environment Dept.

State of Amapa, Brazil

Dr. Stein Hansen

President, Stein Hansen Consulting Ltd

Norway

Dr. Jorge Soberon

Executive Secretary

National Commission on Biodiversity,

Mexico

Dr. Rokhayatou D. Fall

Ministere de L'Agriculture

Chief of Bureau Pédologie du Sénégal

Senegal

Dr. Walter Lusigi

Senior Environmental Specialist

Land Resources Management

GEF Secretariat

Washington, DC, U.S.A.

Dr. Mario Ramos

Environmental Specialist (Biodiversity)

GEF Secretariat

Washington, D.C., USA

Dr. Avani Vaish

GEF Secretariat

Washington, D.C., USA

Dr. Eduardo Fuentes

Principal Technical Advisor on Biodiversity

United Nations Development Programme

New York City, U.S.A.

Ms. Kathy MacKinnon

Biodiversity Specialist

The World Bank

Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaif

GEF Exec. Co-ordinator

UNEP, Nairobi

Dr. Cyriaque Sendashonga

Programme Officer, Biodiversity

UNEP, Nairobi

Dr. Rohit Khanna

UNEP/GEF

Washington

Prof. Peter Schei

Chairman of SBSTTA

Convention for Biological Diversity

Oslo, Norway

Dr. Robert Ryan

UNCCD, Switzerland

Dr. Mark Griffith

STAP Secretary

STAP Secretariat

Ms. Danae Issaias

STAP Secretariat

UNEP, Nairobi

Annex II

STAP Work Programme FY97

**(December, 1996 - June, 1997)**

---

Activity	Co-ordinator *and STAP team Members	Deadline
<b>1. Selective Review</b>		
<b>((a) Lake Victoria</b>		
- Definition of TOR for the Selective Review and its scope;		Nov-Dec, 1997
- Review and Selection of relevant documentation (Dec. 1996 - Jan. 1996);	Dr. Helen Yap*	
- Production of synthesis document of the scientific and technical issues affecting the project site;	Dr. Pier Vellinga	Dec-Jan, 1997
- Selective Reviewers' Site Visit;	Prof. John Woods	Jan-Feb, 1997
- Review Meeting, UNEP Hqs;	Dr. Daba Fall	March 13-14, 1997
- Revision of TOR and detailed plan for undertaking the Technical Review including cost implications	Dr. Stein Hansen	March 15, 1997

**(b) Alternative to Slash and Burn**

- Definition of TOR for the Selective Review, its scope and the cost implications; Dr. Stein Hansen\* Nov-Dec, 1996

- Review and Selection of relevant documentation; Dr. R.D. Fall Nov-Dec., 1996

- Evaluation of various components; Dr. M. Allegretti Jan-Feb, 1997

- Meeting with ICRAF and TSBF (Nairobi, Three case studies) Dr. Mohd Salleh March 15, 1997

- Preparation of Report March, 1996

**(c) Rajasthan Solar Thermal**

- Analysis of external reviewer's comments; Dr. R. Williams\* November, 1996

- Draft report on Selective Review; Dr. Jyoti Parikh Jan-Feb, 1997

- Presentation of Report to Council. May, 1997

**2. Strategic Advice**

(a) Transport Workshop Dr. S. Karekezi\* Dec-Feb, 1997

- Preparation for TW Dr. R. Williams

- TW, Nairobi, Kenya Dr. J. Parikh March 14-15, 1997

Dr. C. Watanabe

Dr. S. Hansen May, 1997

(b) Report to be submitted to GEF Council on scientific and technological issues and options

**3.(a) Coal Workshop**

- Preparation for CW Dr. R. Williams\* Jan-May, 1997

- CW, Amsterdam, The Netherlands Dr. C. Watanabe June 16-17, 1997

(b) Report to be submitted to GEF Council Dr. S. Karekezi October, 1997

Dr. J. Parikh

4.(a) Technical Paper-Scientific and Technical Aspects of Stage 1 Adaptation with respect to the Identification of Vulnerable Area. Dr. Pier Vellinga\* March 1997

(b) Progress Report to be submitted to GEF Council and final report in October 1997 May, 1997

5. Analysis of RET papers as input into the GEF Secretariat paper Dr. R. Williams\* January, 1997

Dr. S. Karekezi

Dr. C. Watanabe

Dr. J. Parikh

6. Review of a cluster of Projects on Energy Dr. J. Parikh\*

7.(a) Scientific and Technical Analysis of the Outputs of the STAP Expert Group Workshop on Land Degradation as input to GEFSEC paper for GEF Council Dr. R.D. Fall\* January, 1997

Dr. Mohd Salleh

(b) GEFSEC Paper to be submitted to GEF Council in May, 1997 March, 1997

---

8. Brainstorming On Incremental Cost And Local And Global Benefits - Land Degradation Dr. R.D. Fall\* June 1997

Dr. S. Hansen

9. Constructive Advice to Assist the Design of Evolving Projects - Land Degradation Dr. R.D. Fall Ongoing

10. Participate in meeting of the INC/CCD Meetings Dr. R.D. Fall January 1997

11. Relations with UNESCO - Land Degradation Ongoing

12. Elaboration of International Waters Strategy Including Further Advice on the Regional Approach and Institutions, and the implications for GEF. Dr. Helen Yap\* March 1997

Prof. J. Woods

Prof. P. Vellinga

13. Report on the Study on Best Practice with Regard to the Application of Science and Scientific Tools in GEF International Waters projects Prof. John Woods\* March, 1997

Prof. P. Vellinga

14. International Waters Assessment Prof. Pier Vellinga\* Prof. John Woods Dr. Helen Yap Ongoing

15. Preparation for STAP Expert Group Workshop on Sustainable Use. Dr. M. Allegretti December 1996

Identification of scope, TOR, and aims and objectives to be done in collaboration with GEFSEC, IA and Convention on Biodiversity

**.. Preparation of background papers**

<b>Economic Aspects of S.U.</b>		December
<b>Anthropological Aspects of S.U.</b>		1996-February 1997
<b>Ecological Aspects of S.U.</b>	Dr. S. Hansen	
<b>Coastal and Marine aspects of SV</b>	Dr. M. Allegretti	
<b>Forest Ecosystems</b>	Dr. J. Soberon	
<b>Drylands</b>	Dr. H. Yap	
<b>Maintain Ecosystems</b>	Dr. M. Salleh	
	Dr. D. Falls	March 1997
	Dr. J. Soberon	
<b>.. Submission of First Draft of Papers</b>		
16. Formulation of STAP Strategic Thinking on Mobilisation of wider scientific community as an input to the NAS workshop	Prof. P. Vellinga* STAP Secretariat	
17. Tenth Meeting of STAP		June 18-20 1997

---

\* Team Leader

**ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

CBD - Convention on Biological Diversity

COP - Conference of the Parties

GEF - Global Environment Facility

GEFOP - GEF Operations Committee

IPCC - Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

RET - Renewable Energy Technologies

STAP - Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

SBSTTA - Subsidiary Body for Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice

UNCCD - United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification

UNDP - United Nations Development Programme

UNEP - United Nations Environment Programme

ICRAF - International Centre for Research in Agro-Forestry

TSBF - Tropical Soils Biology and Fertility Programme