



Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.15/Inf.20
May 1, 2000

GEF Council
May 9-11, 2000

REPORT OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND
TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL II (STAP II)
BRIDGETOWN, BARBADOS
FEBRUARY 23-25, 2000

(Prepared by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel)

Report of the Fifth Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel II (STAP II)

February 23-25, 2000, Bridgetown, Barbados

Introduction

1. In accordance with its Programme of Work, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel II (STAP II) held its fifth meeting from February 23-25, 2000 at the Conference Room of the Grand Barbados Beach Hotel, Bridgetown, Barbados. Consistent with the decision taken at the Fourth Meeting of STAP, an Executive Session of STAP was convened on Monday, February 23, 2000 from 8.00 a.m. – 9.30 a.m.

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

2. The opening plenary of the Fifth Meeting of STAP II commenced at 9.30 a.m. on February 23, 2000 at the Grand Barbados Hotel, Barbados. The meeting was opened by Prof. Madhav Gadgil, Chairman of STAP. The Hon. Rawle Eastmond, Minister of Environment and Natural Resources, Government of Barbados who welcomed the participants to Barbados. He expressed appreciation on behalf of the Government to UNEP and the GEF for convening the Brainstorming Session on Small Island Developing States as a means of focusing GEF attention on the special circumstances of these states. He reiterated the Government of Barbados's commitment to the successful implementation of the Programme of Action on SIDS and called upon the international community and in particular the GEF to assist in this regard.

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

A. Agenda and Organization of Work

3. The meeting adopted the draft provisional agenda and organization of work with minor modifications contained in documents UNEP/GEF/STAP II/5/2/Add.1 and UNEP/GEF/STAP II/5/2/Add.3.

B. Participation

4. The STAP members attending the meeting were Prof. Madhav Gadgil, Dr. Christine Padoch, Prof. Setijati Sastrapradja, Prof. Jose Sarukhan, Prof. Paola Rossi Pisa, Dr. Michel Colombier, Dr. Zhou Dadi, Prof. Shuzo Nishioka, Prof. Eric Odada and Prof. Angela Wagener. The outgoing STAP member, Dr. Peter Bridgewater, also attended the meeting.
5. The representatives from the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies who attended the meeting were Dr. Colin Rees; Dr. Allan Miller (GEF Secretariat); Rafael Asenjo (UNDP); Dr. Lars Vidæus and Dr. Kathy MacKinnon (World Bank); Ahmed Djoghlaif, (UNEP); Dr. Mark Griffith and Ms. Anne-Marie Verbeken (STAP Secretariat).
6. Dr. David Copper of the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD) Secretariat and Mr. Ndegwa Ndiang'ui of the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) Secretariat also attended the meeting. Ms. Linda Collette of FAO attend the meeting as an observer.

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

7. The representatives from the GEF Secretariat gave an overview of some of the main programmatic activities undertaken in recent months, namely: the Programme Status Review (PSR), the Corporate Business Plan and the Programme Implementation Review (PIR). In addition, an update was given on the implementation of the fee-base structure; the extended opportunities to Regional Development Banks; development of indicator, the strategic partnership between the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies and the shift to a programmatic approach.
8. In the focal area of climate change, issues were highlighted which could benefit from STAP's input, including the second national communication and how the GEF should proceed; adaptation and capacity building in the context of climate change. Immediate priority areas in the climate change focal area were identified as the Renewable Energy Technology partnership between the GEF Secretariat and the World Bank; the Operationalization of the Transport and the Multi-benefit Operational Programmes and the review process of some twenty climate change projects as a pre-requisite for the workshop on Off-Grid PV to be convened later this year.
9. Emerging issues which were identified in the biodiversity focal area included a further definition of the ecosystem approach; sustainable agriculture and biosafety. With respect to the latter, a critical issue which was raised related to how biosafety can be linked to the existing operational programme. The Land and Water Initiative for Africa and sustainable management of fish stock, particularly as it relates to eligibility criteria for project preparation were identified as priority areas in the international waters focal area.
10. The representative from the World Bank highlighted the main elements of the Bank's progress report submitted to the GEF Council in May 1999. The major challenge was identified as how to achieve poverty alleviation and reduction while at the same time addressing issues of the global environment. The trend towards a programmatic allocation of GEF resource for specific activities (i.e. RETs) was highlighted as a means of increasing impact and reducing transaction cost in managing GEF resources. The co-ordination of GEF assistance at the national and/or regional level in the view of the increasing number of institutions accessing GEF resources, was raised as an issue which requires further consideration by the GEF.
11. Priority areas which were highlighted by the World Bank representative for STAP consideration included the need for indicators to monitor progress of the implementation of programmatic initiatives such as the Land and Water Initiative for Africa; guidelines for GEF interventions in fish stock assessment; further refinement of Operational Programme 12; sustainable agriculture and how this relates to OP12; and targeted research as it relates coral reefs.
12. In response to the issues raised by the representative of the World Bank the Panel highlighted the need for the GEF Operational Programmes on Climate Change to be re-configured to address a programmatic approach. In addition, the issue of whether the GEF Operational Programmes were flexible enough to respond to changing national, regional and global environment was raised. The role of science and the participation of the scientific and technical community in shaping these new directions was emphasised by the Panel.

13. To facilitate more meaningful and in-depth discussion of these issues, it was agreed that the GEF Task Teams Presentation meeting be convened by coincide with the Seventh Meeting of STAP to be convened in September, 2000.
14. The representative from UNEP brought the meeting up-to-date on the progress made to-date on the implementation of the UNEP's Action Plan on Complementarity with GEF activities, approved by the GEF Council at its Thirteenth Meeting. In this context, specific reference was made to UNEP/GEF Strategic Partnership and more particularly, the ongoing electronic fora being undertaken to facilitate input of the wider scientific and technical community on specific issues relevant to the GEF (i.e. the Land and Water Initiative for Africa; Agrobiodiversity etc).
15. The representative of UNDP gave an update and overview of two current GEF initiatives which are being co-ordinated by the UNDP, namely the Capacity Development Initiative (CDI) and the Country Dialogue Workshops. With respect to the latter the meeting was informed that two regional and thirteen national workshops have been planned, commencing with a national workshop for South Africa in April 2000.
16. A number of issues were raised by the Panel about the Capacity Development Initiative. There was consensus among Panel Members that the process for the Capacity Development Initiative as outlined was far too top down. The point was made that a critical element in designing the Capacity Development Initiatives should be clear commitment on the part of the recipient countries, since there can be no capacity building without commitment. The Panel also emphasised the need to pay attention to the scientific and technical community in the implementation of the Capacity Development Initiative.
17. A number of specific recommendations were made by the Panel which should be taken into consideration in the implementation of the Country Dialogue Workshops and the Capacity Development Initiative, namely:
 - Scientific and Technical nodal points should be established in each country to facilitate the interface between the scientific and technical community and the operational focal points and to enhance interaction between STAP and the nodal part; and
 - Consideration should be given to the establishment of ad-hoc scientific and technical communities to support the work of the GEF operational focal points.
18. In addition, the Panel stressed the need for the Implementing Agencies to include in the Stakeholder Participation Annex specific reference to the involvement of the scientific and technical community in the project preparation and implementation processes.
19. The representatives of the CBD and CCD Secretariats also addressed the meeting. The representative from the CBD Secretariat gave an update of the biosafety protocol as well as the conclusion of the recently concluded SBSTTA meeting. Key areas were addressed by SBSTTA which STAP could possibly address including the ecosystem approach, agrobiodiversity, drylands, access to genetic resources and sustainable use issues. The representative of the CCD focused primarily on the positive collaboration between the CCD Secretariat and the GEF, including STAP, in the preparation and finalization of the "*Action Plan for Enhancing GEF Support to Land Degradation*" adopted by the GEF Council at its December 1999 meeting. He reiterated the CCD Secretariat's view, that the Action Plan provide a useful framework, not only for enhancing the

GEF pipeline of land degradation projects, but also for strengthening further collaboration between the CCD and the GEF.

Agenda Item 4: Report of the STAP Chairman, other Panel Members and the STAP Secretariat on Intersessional Activities

20. The STAP Chairman and the other Panel members reported on a number of intersessional activities including the first meeting of the Subsidiary Scientific and Technical Bodies of Environmental Conventions and a Consultative Meeting on Collaboration among Multilateral Environmental Conventions, convened by UNEP on October 25, 1999; the meeting on the Reconstitution of the Expert Group Meeting on Interlinkages, convened by UNEP on October 26, 1999; GEF Workshop on Land Degradation Interlinkages, convened by the GEF/CCD Secretariat during the third meeting of the Conference of Parties held in Recife, Brazil in November, 1999; the World Congress on Sustainable Development – Technical Challenges of the 21st Century, convened by the World Federation of Engineering Organisation (WFE0), January 20-23, Calcutta India and the Fourteenth Meeting of the GEF Council held in Washington, D.C. December 8-10, 1999.
21. With respect to the latter the Chairman informed the meeting that the Council in its deliberations suggested that the biosafety protocol and possibly forests be included as emerging issues for GEF's attention. He also informed the meeting that a request was made by the GEF Council for an assessment of the implications for GEF activities of the negotiations on persistent organic pollutants. The recognition by the GEF Council of STAP's contribution to the GEF efforts on Land Degradation Interlinkages was also acknowledged.

Agenda Item 5: Potential Priorities for Targeted Research

22. The Panel reiterated its view that the GEF Targeted Research policy could and should be used as a mechanism to facilitate the involvement of the wider scientific and technical community in GEF work. In view of the importance the Panel attaches to this issue, the Panel decided to continue its work on the identification of potential priorities for targeted research during the intersessional period, with the view of considering them at the sixth meeting of STAP to be convened in June 2000.

Agenda Item 6: Biodiversity Conservation in Production Forests: Elements which should be incorporated into the GEF Framework paper

23. A report was presented on the results of both the electronic-forum (SUSFOR-L) convened by STAP on "*Deploying Funds to Conserve Biodiversity*" with specific reference to forests and the STAP Brainstorming on Biodiversity Conservation in Production Forests convened in Mexico City, Mexico, October 15-16, 1999.
24. The main conclusion of the analysis is that conserving biodiversity in production forests is not substantially different to conserving it in a nature reserve. A major reason identified for the loss of biodiversity in the tropics is the absence of adequate policy and institutional frameworks under which sustainable management can be implemented. To facilitate consideration by the GEF on these issues, an overview of some of the policy and institutional constraints at the national, regional and international levels which mitigate against biodiversity conservation were highlighted. These included *inter alia*, community empowerment and the lack of organisation of local communities; land and resource tenure systems; unsuitable forest management and competition for land

resources; valuation of biological resources; market imperfections, international trade agreements and intellectual property rights.

25. Investment in adaptive management approaches was considered as an effective means of facilitating biodiversity conservation in production forests. In this regard, a number of concrete suggestions on how GEF funds could be used to mobilize a participatory, decentralised, adaptive management approach towards forests were highlighted. These included but not limited to:
- Learning from past experiences – the need to pull together existing experiences, and based on that formulate guidelines and identifying geographical areas where the chances of success are maximum;
 - Capacity building at various level directed towards strengthening community participation in biodiversity conservation;
 - The establishment of participatory monitoring systems for adaptive management.
26. A more detailed analysis of this subject can be found in the “STAP Report on Biodiversity Conservation in Production Forests” and in the electronic forum (SUSFOR-L) website at <http://gef-forum.unep.org:8080/~agrobio>.

Agenda Item 7: Agrobiodiversity: Elements to be Incorporated into the GEF Operational Programme

27. Reports were presented on the conclusion of the STAP Selected Review of the GEF Project “*Dynamic Farmer Based Approach to the Conservation of African Plant Genetic Resources*” undertaken as an integral part of the preparation of the GEF Operational Programme on Biodiversity and the STAP Brainstorming on Agrobiodiversity convened in Bridgetown, Barbados on February 20-21, 2000.¹ With respect to the former, the pioneering effort of the project and its focus on maintenance of crop genetic diversity on the farm supporting farmers and efforts at on-farm maintenance of local varieties of gene banks was recognised. It was concluded however, that it would be desirable to initiate attempts to re-define and broaden this focus, so as to assist in developing a greater understanding of a number of other relevant issues (i.e. incentives the use of local/traditional knowledge, etc); strengthening the sustainability of the programme and facilitate its replication.
28. In the review of the draft Operational Programme, and taking into consideration the conclusions of the Brainstorming Session, a number of areas were highlighted which should be considered for inclusion into the OP. These include issues such as the potential uses of wild relatives of and underutilised plants; genetic diversity in providing resilience, not only in terms of genetic diversity, but also diversity at the community and different social levels; the interaction between components of biodiversity (i.e. management techniques, cultural norms, multi cropping, species interaction); the role of pollinators and their relationship with communities; the role of soil and below ground diversity which is fundamental to how systems operate; pest and disease control mechanisms, and technology adaptation.
29. In addition, the socio-economic forces which impact on agro-systems, and the effects of climate variability and climate change on agro-systems were identified as important areas which should be addressed by the OP. It was also emphasised, that it is important for the OP to specifically address

¹ The Report on STAP Brainstorming on Agrobiodiversity is currently under preparation and will be presented to the GEF council at its November, 2000 meeting.

the interaction with other systems; it should therefore not only focus on diversity of the systems, but also the impact of agriculture on biodiversity.

30. It was agreed that STAP will continue to work closely with the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies in the preparation of the Operational Programme on Agrobiodiversity.

Agenda Item 8: Biomarkers: Implications for GEF Biodiversity Portfolio

31. The STAP Team Leader on this issue presented the major conclusions of the Brainstorming Session on Green Certifiers held in Mexico City, Mexico, October 13-14, 1999.
32. Generally, the idea of a “green certifier system” is considered as an important and indispensable way to deal with the reality of a constantly increasing trade of components of biological diversity and the need to preserve the ecosystems in which these species live. However, it was noted that there is no one universal method, instead a diversified range of techniques will need to be devised.
33. The establishment of a green certifier system was identified as a way to reward kinds of sustainable practices by identifying where biodiversity products come from as well as in helping to better define property rights on components of biodiversity. In addition, such a market could translate into an important source of encouraging legitimate revenue for indigenous communities, which would become the authenticated producers, thus encouraging them to participate in the preservation of the natural areas that make this valuable wildlife possible.
34. The Panel reiterated its view that the area of “green certifiers” should be given more consideration by the GEF, as an integral part of the broader consideration of sustainable use and benefit sharing.

Agenda Item 9: Selective Review: Biosafety

35. A progress report on the selective review of the Pilot Project on Bio-Safety was presented by the STAP Team Leader for this activity. The meeting was informed that the selective review will be completed during the inter-sessional period and submitted to the Panel for its consideration at its Sixth meeting to be convened in June 2000.

Agenda Item 10: Progress Report on Performance Indicators for Measuring the Impact of GEF Interventions

36. The STAP team leader for this issue presented an overview of STAP's ideas on approaches to the formulation of performance indicator for measuring the Impact of GEF Interventions in the biodiversity focal area. When compared to the most current work undertaken under the auspice of the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit on this, a considerable amount of overlap was identified. It was therefore agreed that the STAP Team Leader on this issue would liaise with the consultants in integrating STAP's views in the final report to the M & E Unit.

Agenda Item 11: East African Lake Review: Implications for GEF International Waters Portfolio

37. The STAP team leader for this activity presented the results of the East African Lakes (Victoria, Tanganyika and Malawi) Review Meeting which took place in Malawi, January 14-15, 2000. The review meeting provided for the first time, an opportunity for the riparian countries of the main East African Lakes to meet and exchange views, experience approaches on the management of the

lakes as well as to examine modalities and approaches for their future management. The meeting also provided a forum for interaction between a team of international scientists working under the framework of the International Decade for East African Lakes (IDEAL), scientists and African scientists working on the lakes and to explore opportunities for future collaboration and co-ordination of activities. This is necessary because of the current lack of co-ordinating mechanisms between the various activities in the East African Lakes.

38. The main conclusions which emerged from the meeting which were endorsed by the Panel are summarised as follows:

- A programmatic multi-lake basin approach for the East African Great Lakes is highly desirable given the commonality of issues being faced by the riparian states of the three lakes (i.e. watershed degradation; water hyacinth; blooms of potentially toxic algae; reduction of fisheries and fish kills; increasing sedimentation etc.); and the need to share and disseminate monitoring and research results information and experiences on management approaches; scientific information and technologies for addressing various issues. This would provide an overall framework within which interventions can be designed nationally, regionally or intra-regionally to ensure complementarity; facilitates a more co-ordinated approach to resource allocation by donor agencies; facilitates technology transfer and exchanges of experience between riparian countries and a framework not only for building regional scientific capacity but also ensuring scientific standards for investigations being undertaken on the lakes. Such an approach would also provide a more predictable framework for longer-term private sector involvement and investment.

39. In order to be meaningful, a 7-8 year time span was deemed desirable for a programmatic multi-lake basin approach for the East African Great Lakes as well as the establishment of monitorable indicators to measure success. This would entail:

- A co-ordinating mechanism, with clearly defined functions and responsibilities is central for supporting a programmatic multi-lake basin approach.
- Synthesis and analysis of available information/data including the results of the GEF projects for integration into policy decisions concerning the lake approach. Such an analysis will also facilitate priority setting, identification of gaps in knowledge and the linking of scientific information with national regional priorities.
- The provision of the necessary scientific and monitoring infrastructure should be put in place to support future interventions in the East African Great Lakes. This could be a multi-sector approach including Universities and research organisations in Eastern Africa; the international scientific community and institutions working in the East African Lakes; the private sector and governments.
- The establishment of incentive schemes (i.e. East African Lakes Foundation/Endowment Fund) as a means of providing incentives to African scientists to undertake investigation in the East African Lakes.

40. The Panel concluded that further consideration of the above ideas by the stakeholders is necessary as a marked paradigm shift in the management of the East African Lakes. Fundamentally, it calls

for management based on integrated data systems in which science has an important role to play. As a consequence, it is in the interest of the GEF to invest limited resources in facilitating further dialogue on the programmatic approach by the stakeholders in the East African Great Lakes. Such an activity could be considered with the context of the UNEP/GEF Strategic Partnership.

Agenda Item 12: Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs): Implications for the GEF

41. The STAP Team Leader for this activity presented the main conclusions of the STAP Brainstorming on POPs taking into consideration the request of the GEF Council for an assessment of implications for GEF activities of the ongoing negotiations on POPs.
42. A number of general conclusions and recommendation were made taking into account the range of problems that must be overcome in developing countries and countries with economies in transition before attaining the goals of reducing or eliminating persistent toxic chemicals. These are summarised as:
 - (i) should be put in place to assist countries in building capacity to negotiate POPs Mechanisms reduction and elimination and to implement management policies;
 - (ii) There is a need to establish monitoring activities to reduce data gaps, to produce time series data, evaluate environmental status and provide input data essential to chemical fate modelling;
 - (iii) The implementation of environmental assessments directed to obtain reliable data, and “clearing house “ practices are imperative to reduce data gaps;
 - (iv) The need for the establishment of training programmes and mechanisms to facilitate technology transfer to developing countries as tools to address the need for PTS exposure information;
 - (v) Incentives to the implementation of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) are imperative to reduce Potentially Toxic Substances (PTS) emission from agriculture sources;
 - (vi) Appropriate technologies must be made available to deal with old stocks in specific conditions, as for example, those existing in some African countries.
 - (vii) Implementation of BEP and BAT to reduce emissions as well as the establishment of incentives (or penalties) to improve industry maintenance and operational practices is needed to reduce industrial emissions;
 - (viii) Mechanisms are needed to fasten intervention in the management of stockpiles.
43. Information gaps and potential targeted research areas were also identified. These included *inter alia* gaps regarding monitoring and assessment; biological effects; stock piles; persistent toxic substance management; wildlife species sensitivity issues.
44. In terms of specific implications for GEF activities, a number of specific recommendations were made. These include:
 - That the UNEP’s Regionally Based Assessment on Persistent Toxic Substances should be used as a basis to selecting potential chemicals as candidates for GEF interventions. This implies the adoption of a more flexible definition of Persistent Toxic Substances (PTS) in which persistent and “mobile” may be substances that are less inherently persistent but that lead to continuous exposure because of their constant release in the environment and wide spread use (ubiquity); to consider exposure patterns in defining relevance; and to use chemical, ecotoxicological and human toxicological information.

- The GEF Operational Programme 10 “Contaminant-Based Programme”, as currently written does not allow for a GEF response on a country by country basis, though actions in context of POPs, will have to be taken at country level. In addition, water is taken as the single pathway of exposure while in the case of POPs other routes are of far greater importance, and effects on land biota are not at all considered. The restriction related to a country-based action, cited above, means as for today relying on replications, an approach that shall inhibit GEF performance when undertaking a problem that is characterised by a diversity of peculiarities (country based: modes of use and storage of old stocks, different exposure routes, cultural and political context, etc.) and environmental conditions (regional aspects but in some cases country based). Dealing with the requirements of the POPs convention under OP 10 may restrict GEF actions in other issues of water contamination which are at least as important in developing regions. Some examples are chemical and pathogenic contamination of waters derived from sewage releases.
- A revision of OP 10 is recommended in the direction of keeping the broad scope of GEF interventions in dealing with PTS other than the 12 POPs, and giving more emphasis to ephemeral contaminants (nutrient, etc) which are equally or even more damaging to the marine environment
- That a new OP be put in place to deal exclusively with the requirements emerging from the POPs Convention, in the event that GEF becomes the financial mechanism for the Convention. Such an OP should provide flexibility of action and a broad scope of interventions (addressing: human and environmental health issues, land and water ecosystems, technical and socio-economic aspects, actions on the ground for elimination or substitution).
- For an appropriate range of POPs/PTS issues to be addressed, the effects of this class of substances could not be limited to water pathways of exposure. For POPs/PTS to be dealt with holistically, all pathways of transport and exposure would need to be deemed relevant for GEF interventions.
- Though it was recognised that, for the purposes of the POPs Convention, such additional substances would be those accepted by the Parties to the Convention, it was not considered desirable that a specific persistent toxic substance be identified for the purposes of defining their eligibility for GEF intervention, but instead the broad definitions of criteria for substances to be considered as PTS would suffice. Broadly inclusive criteria such as, persistence (e.g. > 6 months in soils)*, bioaccumulation (e.g. $\log k_{ow} > 10^3$)* and promoting adverse effects in humans or animals, should be considered.

Agenda Item 13: Small Islands Developing States: Strategic Directions for the GEF

45. The STAP Team Leader for this issue presented the main conclusions of the “STPA Brainstorming on SIDS: Opportunities for GEF Interventions”² convened in Bridgetown, Barbados, February 17-18, 2000. A number of specific areas were highlighted which provide opportunities for GEF interventions in SIDS. These included, but not limited to, ocean management with an emphasis on

² The Report of the SIDS Brainstorming Session is currently under preparation and will be submitted to the GEF Council at its November, 2000 meeting.

integrated management systems and approaches; adaptation and vulnerability analysis; disaster management and preparedness; land management including watershed protections and use; coastal and marine protected areas; and a new energy agenda for SIDS, one based on energy efficiency and the renewable energy technologies *inter alia* Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion (OTEC); solar; wind; biomass, geothermal. The strengthening of regional and intra-regional mechanisms to facilitate management of the environmental resources in SIDS was identified as critical elements. In this regard, the mechanisms should be built in GEF project in SIDS to facilitate the exchange of experiences between SIDS from different regions. In addition, the consideration of the issues confronting SIDS underscored the merit of the programmatic approach now being evolved by the GEF.

Agenda Item 14: Dryland Biodiversity and the Proposed Action Plan for STAP's Work

46. In the consideration of this issue the Panel agreed that building upon STAP work on land degradation interlinkages and the deliberations of the Fifth Meeting of SBSTTA on the issue, the following approach and timetable should be considered, namely, to ensure that STAP work complements other initiatives, particularly the work of SBSTTA, the geographic cover so STAP work should include the following drylands: Mediterranean, arid and semi-arid grasslands and Savannah ecosystems; for each of the dryland types identified in (I), assess the various elements and components which constituted dryland biodiversity in those ecosystems; further develop criteria for assessing "globally significant" biodiversity in these ecosystems.
47. The STAP Team Leader for this activity was mandated to prepare a timetable for STAP's input on this issue for consideration by the Panel at its Sixth meeting in June, 2000.

Agenda Item 15: Power Sector Reform in the Energy Sector: Implications for GEF Climate Change Portfolio

48. Two substantive issues were considered under this agenda item, namely:
 - (a) **Brainstorming on Power Sector Reform:** It was agreed that a brainstorming session on Power Sector Reform be convened from June 26-27, 2000 immediately after the Sixth Meeting of STAP. Consideration be given to convening the brainstorming session with the Science and Technology Committee of the French GEF.

The purpose of the brainstorming session will be to assess the experiences gained from a range of GEF energy projects in Operational Programmes 5 and to distill lessons learnt and their implications for deregulation and privatisation as well as assess changes taking place in the energy sector in developing countries with the view of identifying impacts and opportunities for GEF interventions. The brainstorming session will focus on both renewables and energy efficiency as the restructuring of the market and new market mechanisms will impact on both sector.
 - (b) **Review of the Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion Technology:** At the request of the GEF Secretariat and the World Bank STAP was requested to review ocean thermal energy conversion technology, since this technology is not presently covered by Operational Programme 7. The main focus of the STAP review centred on the desirability and rationale for GEF support for the technology.

49. The conclusions of STAP's review are:

- The potential of OTEC is too promising to be ignored, particularly for small island developing states, and that the potential multi-purpose benefits of the technology deserve recognition;
- The main attractions are: (a) its multipurpose nature, and (b) the scope of innovation if combined with other technologies in the longer term, such as solar ponds to provide higher temperature heat input. The multipurpose possibilities include electricity production, desalination, marine-aquaculture using nutrient rich waters from the deep ocean, and district cooling, which include novel applications to increase the yields of high valued crops (through reducing evapotranspiration).
- Though the technology does not strictly meet the OP7 criterion of being “proven or demonstrated on a commercial scale” (OP7, paragraph 7.7), it meets – or is capable of being designed to meet all other criteria. These are that (OP7, paragraph 7.3):
 - The proposal is country driven (very high score on this count);
 - The technology can be made to be environmentally sound and sustainable (see recommendations);
 - A wider application is feasible;
 - Allowing for the benefits of the by-products, and the scope for innovation, it has the prospects of becoming one of several cost-effective, ‘climate friendly’ technologies;
 - There is significant interest from co-funders, private and public.
- STAP is proposing a development grant to explore and test the technology in a small island developing state.

Agenda Item 16: Enhancing the Role of the Scientific and Technical Communities in GEF Work: Implementation of GEF Strategic Partnership: Role of STAP

50. Three substantive issues were considered by the Panel under this agenda item, namely:

- (i) **GEF Strategic Partnership:** The Implementing Agencies presented an overview of the progress to-date on the development and/or implementation of the GEF's strategic partnership.

STAP's role in the development and/or implementation of the strategic partnership were identified as:

- Representation on the Steering Committees for the development and implementation of the strategic partnership. The STAP Chairman represents STAP on both the UNEP and UNDP partnerships.
- Participation in the execution of the Interactive Forum on Global Environmental Issues a sub-component of the UNEP Strategic Partnership.
- The linking of GEF resources to benchmarks. This is particularly relevant in the context of the World Bank Renewable Energy Partnership.

- (ii) **Country Dialogue Workshops** The draft STAP Module prepared by the STAP Secretariat in collaboration with COSTED was presented to the Panel for review, comment and adoption. The Panel reviewed the draft STAP module and entrusted the STAP Secretariat under the guidance of the STAP Chairman to finalise the draft before submission to UNDP.

With respect to the participation of STAP members in the dialogue workshops, it was agreed that UNDP would inform STAP when a specific request has been made by a country or group of countries (in the case of regional meeting) for the presentation of the STAP module, as this is an optional module.

- (iii) **Mobilization of the wider scientific and technical community in GEF work** the Panel expressed the concern that unless resources were allocated by the GEF to specifically facilitate the more active participation of various elements (i.e. engineers, social scientists etc) of the wider scientific and technical community in GEF work in a tangible manner, this potential stakeholder group could become disillusion with the GEF.

Agenda Item 17: Any Other Business

51. The main substantive issues considered by the Panel under this agenda item related to the STAP Work Programme FY2001 and STAP Draft Budget for FY2001. In consideration of the work programme and budget there was recognition by the Panel of the need to strengthen the STAP Secretariat. Since its establishment in 1994, the Secretariat has had no additional personnel while at the same time the work undertaken by the Panel has expanded considerably.

52. The STAP Work Programme as approved by the Panel is contained in Annex 1.

Agenda Item 18: Adoption of the Report

The meeting considered the draft conclusions and entrusted the STAP Secretariat to incorporate the comments made.

Agenda Item 19: Closing of the Meeting

53. The meeting was closed at 5.00 p.m. on Friday, February 25, 2000.

STAP Work Programme for FY2001

ACTIVITY	DATE	OUTPUT	TASK LEADER RESPONSIBLE
<p><u>STAP MEETINGS/BRAINSTORMING SESSION</u></p> <p>Seventh Meeting of STAP – Washington, D.C. Eighth Meeting of STAP – TBD Ninth Meeting of STAP – TBD</p>	<p>September, 2000 February, 2001 June 2001</p>	<p>Report Report Report</p>	<p>Chairman/STAP Secretariat</p>
<p>MANAGEMENT INCLUDING UPDATING OF THE STAP ROSTER OF EXPERTS AND OUTREACH TO THE ROSTER EXPERTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of gaps in the roster in consultation with the Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat • Technical inputs (updating of database to accommodate new requirements) • Editing and Printing • Distribution • Maintain and further develop STAP website, including the Roster related services • Management of the Roster of Experts including quality control • Annual Review of the Use of STAP Roster Expert • Publication and distribution of the STAP Roster newsletter and information package to STAP Roster of Experts 	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Consolidate Roster of Experts (Version I and II)</p> <p>Establishment of Website Annual Review for submission to GEF Council Minimum of 3 Newsletters circulated to STAP Roster Experts</p>	<p>STAP Panel/STAP Secretariat</p> <p>STAP Secretariat</p> <p>STAP Panel/STAP Secretariat</p> <p>STAP Panel/STAP Secretariat</p>
<p>SELECTIVE REVIEWS</p> <p>2-3 Selective Reviews on a project/thematic basis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International Waters • Climate Change – to be determined (Thematic) • Cross-cutting Issues 	<p>October/November, 2000</p> <p>TBD, 2000</p>	<p>Progress Reports to GEF Council on Selective Reviews</p>	<p>C. Padoch, M. Gadgil</p> <p>Z. Dadi, S. Karekezi S. Nishioka Paola Rossi</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in GEF Country Dialogue Workshops 	As determined by the Steering Committee	<i>papers</i> Presentation	STAP Members/STAP Secretariat
<p><i>MEETING TO BE ATTENDED BY STAP CHAIR/ MEMBERS -</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 GEF Council Meeting (Chairman and Vice-Chair) • 2 NGO Consultations • Project Implementation Review <p>Climate Change SBSTTA - Climate Change</p> <p>Biodiversity SBSTTA - Biodiversity</p> <p>Land Degradation CCD COP4/CCD</p> <p>Interlinkage Expert Group</p>	<p>Washington, D.C., May 2000 and October 2000</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>TBD</p>	<p><i>papers</i></p> <p>Report</p> <p>Expert Panels</p>	<p>M. Gadgil D. Anderson/C. Padoch</p> <p>S. Nishioka</p> <p>J. Sarukhan P. Bridgewater M. Gadgil</p> <p>P. Pisa</p> <p>P. Pisa</p>