



Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.14/Inf.11
November 4, 1999

GEF Council
December 8-10, 1999

REPORT OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL II (STAP II)

PARIS, FRANCE
JUNE 30-JULY 4, 1999

(Prepared by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel)

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

Paris, France, June 30 –July 4, 1999

INTRODUCTION

1. In accordance with the programme of work, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel II (STAP II) held its third meeting from June 30 – July 5, 1999 at The Division of Technology, Industry and Economics, UNEP, Paris, France.

SECTION 1: STAP BRAINSTORMING ON THE USE OF TAXONOMIC INFORMATION

2. The STAP Brainstorming on the Use of Taxonomic Information was held at The Division of Technology, Industry and Economics, UNEP on June 30, 1999. The meeting was chaired by Dr. Peter Bridgewater, STAP Team Leader on the Global Taxonomic Initiative (GTI). The purpose of the brainstorming session was to explore the key issues underpinning the use of taxonomic information as a key component in conservation, sustainable use, and equitable sharing of benefits of biodiversity.
3. The brainstorming brought together a small number of international experts to address this issue in light of the SBSTTA IV recommendations. Specific issues which were raised included (i) ways in which taxonomy can stimulate development and execution of country-driven proposals (ii) how the GEF Secretariat – Implementing Agencies Strategic Partnerships can help advance the Global Taxonomy Initiative and (iii) how taxonomy can help the Convention and the GEF address the issues conservation and sustainable use. The Report of the Brainstorming Session is presented in Annex 1.

SECTION II: THIRD MEETING OF STAP II

Agenda Item 2: Working Group Sessions

4. A number of working group sessions were convened, namely: climate change, biodiversity, international waters and the cross-cutting theme of land degradation, as a means of preparing inputs for the consideration of the substantive issues on the agenda and more particularly to review the consultants work on Performance Indicators for measuring GEF impact. The working group sessions were conducted in three segments, namely:
 - (i) A substantive review of the reports submitted by the GEF Consultants on Performance Indicators for Measuring GEF Impact. Presentations were provided by the consulting firms undertaking those studies: ITAD Ltd. in the case of biodiversity and Tellus Institute in the case of climate change;
 - (ii) Consideration of the other substantive issues on the STAP meeting agenda;
 - (iii) Teleconference as a means of facilitating the input of the focal area specialists from the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies not attending the STAP meeting. These sessions took the form of a GEF Task Force Meeting chaired by the GEF Secretariat.

Agenda Item 3: Opening of the Meeting

5. The opening plenary of the Third Meeting of STAP II commenced at 9.00 a.m. on June 30, 1999 at The Division of Industry and Environment, UNEP, Paris, France. The meeting was opened by Prof. Madhav Gadgil, Chairman of STAP. Mr. Jim Curlin, Officer-in-Charge, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics, welcomed the participants to Paris and in particular to UNEP's office.

Agenda Item 4: Adoption of the Draft Provisional Agenda and Organization of Work

A. Agenda and Organization of Work

6. The meeting adopted the draft provisional agenda and organization of work with minor modifications contained in documents UNEP/GEF/STAP II/3/4/Add.1 and UNEP/GEF/STAP II/3/4/Add.3.

B. Participation

7. The STAP members who attended the meeting were Prof. Madhav Gadgil, Dr. Christine Padoch, Dr. Peter Bridgewater, Prof. Jose Sarukhan, Dr. Paola Rossi Pisa, Dr. Michel Colombier, Dr. Zhou Dadi, Prof. Shuzo Nishioka, Prof. Eric Odada, Prof. Angela Wagener and Dr. Dennis Anderson.
8. Mr. Ndegwa Ndiangui represented the Convention to Combat Desertification.
9. The representatives from the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies who attended the meeting were Dr. Kenneth King, Assistant CEO; Dr. Allan Miller; Dr. Kanta Kumari and Dr. Walter Lusigi, Dr. Frank Rittner and Dr. Jarle Harstard (GEF Secretariat); Dr. Lars Vidæus and Dr. Kathy MacKinnon (World Bank); Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaif, Ms. Jacqueline Aloisi de Lardereil, Mr. Mark Radka and Mr. Jim Curlin (UNEP); Dr. Mark Griffith and Ms. Anne-Marie Verbeken (STAP Secretariat).
10. A number of special guests attended segments of the STAP meeting namely, David Nichols (Tellus Institute), consultant, Climate Change Performance Programme Indicators,; Dr. Doug Smith (ITAD), consultant, Biodiversity Performance Programme Indicators, Dr. Pierre-Edouard de Boigne, (FM0/WFE0) and members of the French STAP.

Agenda Item 5: Report by the GEF Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies and the Subsidiary Bodies of the Convention

11. The Assistant CEO of the GEF provided an overview of recent developments in the GEF and their implications for STAP. In this regard, he identified two main areas (i) priorities emerging from the thirteenth meeting of the GEF Council and (ii) strategic partnerships. With respect to the former, reference was made to the GEF initiative on country level co-ordination both at the Operational Focal Point and Constituency levels and the implications for STAP with respect to the mobilization of the scientific and technical community in recipient countries. Catalysing other institutions to absorb the agenda of the global environment through expanded opportunities for Regional Banks and the implications for STAP, particularly, as it relates to the use of the STAP Roster of Experts was also highlighted. The need for awareness visits to these institutions was emphasised.
12. In the case of the latter, an overview was presented on the strategic partnerships being developed between the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies. Specific reference was made to the UNEP Strategic Partnership on Mobilization of the Wider Scientific and Technical Community; UNDP's partnership on Capacity Building and the World Bank's partnership on Renewable Energy Technologies.
13. In the case of the UNEP Strategic Partnership, a number of ideas were highlighted which could form elements of this initiative. These included a focus on gaps in GEF operations such as sustainable use issues and global environment indicators; knowledge management including

clearing house facilities; facilitation of discussion on scientific and technical issues emerging from GEF operations through electronic fora; and support for the Global Environment Outlook with a specific focus in GEF focal areas. The importance of STAP participation in this partnership was emphasised.

14. Reference was also made to enhancing co-operation between GEF and complementary agencies such as the Convention Secretariats and bilateral agencies. In the case of bilateral agencies, it is anticipated that these agencies will replicate GEF projects through their regular bilateral programmes. The fee-based approach currently being implemented by the GEF was highlighted as a major instrument for ensuring greater transparency with respect to budgeting. Sustainable use was highlighted as a priority area which STAP should focus on.
15. The representative from the World Bank informed the meeting that FY99 was a good year for the Bank as it delivered 255m in GEF projects. For FY2000 a sustained growth in GEF work programme at a rate of 15% was anticipated. A trend which emerged in FY2000 will be a decrease in the average size of biodiversity projects as well as a shift of emphasis from protected areas to sustainable use.
16. Reference was also made to the formulation of strategic partnership and in particular the Renewable Energy Partnership. In this regard, it is anticipated that this approach will result in reduced transaction cost; increasing predictability of resources; and integration of GEF objectives in the World Bank country dialogue mechanism. Reference was also made to the Strategic Partnership on Land and Water for Africa.
17. The meeting was also informed of the World Bank's GEF decentralization efforts as well as the establishment of collaborative frameworks with Regional Development Bank and IFAD in the context of GEF policy on expanded opportunities for Executing Agencies.
18. The representative from UNEP gave a brief overview of the Action Plan on UNEP-GEF Complementarity adopted by the GEF Council at its last meeting and the progress achieved thus far in implementing the Action Plan. In this regard, specific reference was made to the UNEP document entitled "*Operationalizing the Action Plan on UNEP GEF Complementarity*". The elements of specific relevance to STAP were highlighted. These included the establishment of a STAP focal point in the Division of Assessment and Early Warning and more effective backstopping of STAP related activities.
19. Reference was also made to the UNEP-GEF Strategic Partnership on Mobilizing the Scientific and Technical Community. In this regard, the meeting was informed of ongoing discussion with the GEF Secretariat on this issue. The importance of STAP's active participation in the strategic partnership was emphasised.
20. The meeting was reminded of the need for STAP to undertake a Selective Review of the *Pilot Biosafety Enabling Activity Project* consistent with Council's directives.
21. The representative of the Secretariat of the Convention to Combat Desertification congratulated STAP for convening the Land Degradation Interlinkages Workshop in Bologna, Italy in June, 1999. He emphasised, however, the need for the results to be translated into concrete action. The meeting was also informed of the CCD Secretariat continuing efforts to work with other Environmental Conventions to explore the interlinkages and synergies between the various Conventions. Reference was also made to the CCD/GEF policy paper on land degradation interlinkages. This report will be presented at the next CCD/COP to be convened in Brazil in November, 1999.

Agenda Item 6: Report by the STAP Chairman, other Panel Members and the STAP Secretariat on Intersessional Activities

22. The STAP Chairman reported on the NGO Consultation and the Thirteenth Meeting of the GEF Council which were held from May 4-7, 1999. The issues which were highlighted by the STAP Chair on the basis of the discussion which took place at the Council Meeting are summarised as follows:

- Land degradation: the Council requested the Secretariat to prepare for the next Council Meeting in December a paper defining the linkages between land degradation and the GEF focal areas as well as a timetable for increasing GEF support for land degradation activities as they relate to the GEF focal areas;
- The decreasing number of climate change projects in the work programme;
- The mobilization of the scientific and technical community to help prepare projects on the sustainable use of biodiversity;
- Strategic partnerships with GEF Implementing Agencies.

23. Dr. Dennis Anderson reported on the Workshops on Solar-Thermal Electricity Generation Technologies and Grid-Connected Photo Voltaics convened by the World Bank on March 11 and 12, 1999. A number of recommendations were made which have implications for the GEF portfolio. These are summarised as follows:

- (i) Allow the current proposals for GEF projects using solar-thermal electricity generation technologies in Egypt and Mexico to move forward to develop their feasibility and tendering documents. Further projects may also be developed from India, China, Brazil and elsewhere.
- (ii) The GEF cannot and should not take sole responsibility for the future development of the technology. It is necessary to “achieve maximum learning benefits, minimise funding requirements from GEF, and maximise co-funding from non-GEF sources.” The GEF and its Implementing Agencies will need to foster partnerships between the clients and other financing agencies and with industry. And the commitment must be long-term. The sense is that such partnerships and co-financing arrangements would emerge as the projects are being prepared, appraised and implemented.
- (iii) The GEF programme must do more than provide new orders for the key solar equipment suppliers. It will need to cultivate IPP developers to lead the industry teams that will build, own and operate the new plants—an approach fully consistent with the current paradigm of liberalisation in the electricity industry in developing regions. Aside from learning from experience with the technologies so far, institutional, organisational technical learning will be better fostered if the programme of projects that the GEF supports are managed as a coherent programme. This will also help to avoid the dangers of a boom and bust cycle for orders of components when the industry is establishing itself. It was also suggested that the tendering process should require the submittal of a business plan which defined a path to cost-effectiveness.
- (iv) Monitoring and Evaluation. Cost reduction targets should be set and monitored at each stage of the programme. Also, the monitoring and indicators work of the Secretariat should include measures not only of costs and technical performance, but of

organizational, technical and financial co-operation achieved during the implementation of the programme.

24. Such a policy would help to develop a highly promising carbon-free option for electricity generation in developing regions, and minimise risks to all parties, including the GEF.
25. Anne-Marie Verbeken of the STAP Secretariat reported on her participation in the Round Table Discussion on WIDE in Recife, Brazil, April 8-9, 1999. STAP was invited to the Round Table discussion as a follow-up to the STAP Workshop on Mobilization of the Wider Scientific Community held in Chennai, India from January 5-7, 1999. Issues which were addressed at the roundtable session, included the content of the WIDE database; support mechanism(s) at the national level; collaboration with various entities holding relevant databases and international support and financing of WIDE. It was recommended that STAP, through the Roster of Experts explore collaboration with WIDE.
26. Dr. Zhou Dadi reported on his participation in the Tenth Session of the Subsidiary Body for SBSTA/Climate Change held in Bonn from May 31 – June 11, 1999. Major issues which were considered by SBSTA included the revision of the guidelines for national communication; transportation, technology transfer, Clean Development Mechanism and education, training and public awareness.
27. Dr. Peter Bridgewater reported on his participation in the Fourth Meeting of SBSTTA/Biodiversity convened in Montreal, Canada from June 21-25, 1999. The priority areas identified by SBSTTA which STAP should take note of included coral reefs; arid and semi-arid ecosystems, alien species, the Global Taxonomy Initiative, new plant technologies and sustainable tourism. In addition, the ecosystem approach and the possible establishment of a Global Biodiversity Outlook, an IPCC like process for biodiversity, were also highlighted as critical issues of relevance to STAP.

Agenda Item 7: Performance Indicators for Measuring the Impact of GEF Interventions

28. Brief presentations were made in the plenary session by the consultants co-ordinating the work of performance indicators in the climate change and biodiversity focal areas. Substantive discussion followed both presentations. Since the work on the climate change indicators was most advanced STAP was able to make more substantive inputs. A brief overview of some of the issues considered by STAP in the climate change focal area are contained in Annex II to this report.
29. It was agreed by STAP that the consultants findings will be the subject of continuous review. The next review session will take place at the fifth meeting of STAP to be convened in September 1999.

Agenda Item 8: Multiple Benefits of Integrated Ecosystem Management

30. The GEF Secretariat made a presentation on the proposed Operational Programme (OP) on *Multiple Benefits of Integrated Ecosystem Management: A Holistic Approach on Carbon Sequestration, Biodiversity, Soil and Water Conservation Benefits of Sustainable Ecosystem Use*.
31. The overall programme objectives of the proposed OP were outlined as:

- To assist GEF partners in their efforts to resolve problems preventing integrated ecosystem management and related global benefits;
 - To influence ecosystem management trends strategically with the view to achieve carbon sequestration, biodiversity, soil and water conservation and other global benefits.
32. It was explained that since carbon sequestration and other global benefits of integrated ecosystem management depend on complex biological, climatic and other natural factors and may vary significantly from site to site from time scale to time scale; the GEF interest is NOT the verification of short-term – on site impact, but instead, the strategic influence on ecosystem management trends (patterns) in a whole country or target region over the medium and larger term.
33. The issues identified which require further advice from STAP are:
- Identification of priority interventions areas (ecosystem types) and ecosystem management approaches that offer best potentials to achieve widespread global benefits;
 - Methodologies to characterise ecosystem management patterns with appropriate indicators and to assess mid-term changes in ecosystem use trends, including global benefits.

Agenda Item 9: Targeted Research

34. After much discussion on the current procedures with respect to the functioning of the Targeted Research Committee, the following revised procedure was agreed to by the Panel with the understanding that further discussion will be required with the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies on this matter.
35. The procedure as agreed is outlined as follows:
- IAs submit the targeted research concepts to the GEF Secretariat for eligibility determination. The concepts are also sent to the STAP Secretariat for distribution to STAP members to ensure their timely input on the concepts. In the review of the concepts a determination will be made by STAP of which projects should be reviewed by a STAP Roster Expert and/or an acknowledged authority in the relevant field;
 - Eligible concepts are distributed to the Research Committee for review, including the recommendation of STAP for external review. The review should be done at an early conceptual stage at which time the Committee may agree to delegate its authority to review the full proposed research methodology to a STAP Roster Expert and/or an authority in the field. The Chair will select the STAP Roster Expert and/or an authority in the field in consultation with the Members of the Research Committee. The IAs will however retain operational responsibility for contracting the expert and incorporating the comments into the proposal;
 - Projects presentation and review will be guided by a standardized format (Annex III) in identifying the criteria for targeted research projects based on the GEF Targeted Research policy paper and on the need for information on the research methodology to be used in the project;

- Proposals submitted to the Research Committee for review should have sufficient details to allow an evaluation of their potential contribution to GEF operational programmes as well as proposed methodology;
- Review of the submission will be done within 15 working days on the assumption that prior circulation to identify appropriate experts has been possible. At the discretion of the Chair, a further period of up to 15 working days may be necessary to facilitate a review by an external expert;
- Comments of Committee members may be exchanged by electronic communication and need not require a formal meeting or teleconference. However, requests for a meeting on a particular issue(s) or project(s) may be submitted to the Chair;
- The review by the Research Committee (including the designated expert(s), if any) will focus on issues of scientific and technical merit including questions and concerns about the proposed research methodology, assessing the adequacy of responses to earlier comments by the Committee. These comments and the IAs response should be included in the final project document;
- Meetings of the Targeted Research Committee will be convened a minimum of four times a year or when necessary. Project concepts will however be circulated on a rolling basis for review and comment. STAP meetings will be used to the maximum by STAP members to review project concepts;

Agenda Item 10: GEF Strategic Partnerships

36. UNEP and the World Bank made a brief presentation outlining their initial thoughts on the proposed strategic partnerships with the GEF Secretariat. The meeting was informed that by the next STAP meeting more detailed information of the elements of the proposed partnerships will be made available including STAP's role.

Agenda Item 11: Country Dialogue Workshop – STAP Input

37. The preparation of a STAP Module as part of the Country Dialogue Session was discussed. A proposal submitted by the Committee on Science and Technology in Developing Countries (COSTED) to assist STAP in this regard was considered. There was no objections to COSTED assisting STAP in the preparation of the STAP module. It was however emphasised that the necessary resources from the project should be made available to assist with preparation of the module.
38. Dr. Peter Bridgewater was selected as the STAP Team Leader in this issue.

Agenda Item 12: Annual Review of the STAP Roster of Experts

39. The STAP Secretariat reported on the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations contained in the Annual Review of the STAP Roster of Experts of FY99. The meeting was informed that the STAP Roster of Experts database has now been transformed into an interactive database allowing the experts to update the data contained in their CVs, while at the same time ensuring quality control. The database is user-friendly and offers a number of search options. As a consequence, performance evaluation of the roster experts by the IAs can be sent electronically to the STAP Secretariat for evaluation. This facility will greatly enhance the ability of STAP to review the performance evaluation of STAP Roster of Experts in a timely

manner. To increase the Roster of Experts knowledge of GEF operations, an information package has been developed; this includes focal area specific annotations to the Terms of Reference for the technical reviews.

40. The Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat were requested to review the annotations and provide their comments to the STAP Secretariat before the next STAP meeting in September, 1999.
41. The STAP Secretariat also outlined the timetable for the preparation of the Annual Review of FY2000, which includes an analysis of the use of the roster during the last three financial years. Implementing Agencies were requested to complete the performance evaluation of the Roster Reviewers by mid-August in order to allow the STAP Secretariat to compile the results.
42. Project proposals and the attached STAP roster reviews were distributed to STAP members in accordance with their area of expertise for review of the reviews to be submitted to the STAP Secretariat by mid-August.

Agenda Item 13: Integrating the Private Sector in GEF Work

43. An overview was presented by the GEF Secretariat on its work on the Private Sector. A number of observations were made by the STAP, namely, the definition of private sector, as presented in the paper, seem to suggest that the "private sector" is a homogenous group. In reality, this was not the case. It was suggested that the paper should clearly distinguish between small, medium and large enterprises as well as enterprises in developed and developing countries. It should also outline for each type of private sector group, their role in each phase of the GEF project cycle, as well as the tools which could be used in facilitating their participation in GEF activities.
44. The representative of the World Federation of Engineering Organisation (WFEO) also made a presentation under this agenda item. He expressed the wish of the WFEO to collaborate with STAP, particularly in the mobilisation of the scientific and technical community in GEF work and with the GEF in the formulation of private sector strategy. Areas which were highlighted where WFEO could make a contribution included sharing of experiences and use of WFEO/Com Tech a programme focusing on information exchange and knowledge transfer; water sector and mobilization of the engineering community in GEF work.
45. As a means of further strengthening the relationship between WFEO and STAP an invitation was extended to STAP to participate in the WFEO General Assembly to be convened in Madrid Spain from November 14-20, 1999 and the World Congress on Sustainable Development Engineering and Technical Challenges of the 21st Century to be held in Calcutta, India from January 20-23, 2000.

Agenda Item 14: Joint Meeting Between STAP and the Committee on Science and Technology of the French GEF

46. A joint substantive session between STAP and the Committee on Science and Technology (CST) of the French GEF commenced with a presentation by Jacqueline Aloisi de Lardere, Head of the UNEP's, Division of Technology, Industry and Environment on the aims, objectives and work programme of the Division. This was followed by substantive discussions between the two scientific bodies. Discussion focused on three broad themes, namely: the functioning of CST/French GEF and its similarities/differences with the GEF/STAP; substantive technical

discussion on carbon sequestration and energy efficiency and areas for further collaboration between the two bodies.

47. With respect to the latter theme, a number of ideas were floated such as participation by CST/French GEF in STAP brainstorming and workshop sessions; the convening of an annual joint substantive session between the two bodies and strengthening of ties between the secretariats servicing the two bodies with the view of benefiting from synergies which might be possible. It was agreed that STAP Secretariat will explore these ideas to keep the Panel informed.

Agenda Item 15: Thematic Issues which required Substantive Discussion

48. The Chairpersons of the ad-hoc Working Groups and/or Task Leaders presented reports on their respective work group and/or task teams assignments. These are summarised as:

Biodiversity

- (i) **STAP Workshop on Green Certifiers: 0 ctober 13-14, 1999, Mexico City:** The plans for the workshop were presented by Dr. Jose Sarukhan, Workshop Co-ordinator. The purpose of the workshop is to assess the possibility of implementing a worldwide "green certifier system" (which includes molecular markets such as isotope tracing, genetic finger printing, certificates of origin and microchips) to trace the source of live specimens and as products. Given that this system aims to reduce the illegal trade in wildlife, part of the underlying question is to examine how these certifiers could be used in a user-friendly, cheap, reliable and non-alternable way.
- (ii) **STAP Brainstorming on Sustainable Logging, 0 ctober 14-15, 1999, Mexico City:** The brainstorming will be co-ordinated by STAP in collaboration with CIFOR. The purpose of the brainstorming will be to analyse biodiversity – forestry issues, as a means of providing strategic advice to further guide the GEF to secure biodiversity conservation in logged forests.
- (iii) **Selective Reviews:** Two selective reviews will be undertaken in the biodiversity focal area during FY2000 (a) *Pilot Project on Bio-safety:* Consistent with the Council's recommendation, STAP will undertake a selective review of this project during November, 1999. Dr. Jose Sarukhan was selected as the Task Leader for the selected review (b) a thematic analysis of "agro-biodiversity"; aiming at a longer-term assessment of GEF involvement in and development of the field. On the basis of a number of projects submitted to STAP for an overall assessment of current trends in GEF portfolio in agro-biodiversity, two projects were selected for consideration, namely *Ethiopia: A Dynamic Farmer-Based Approach to the Conservation of African Plant Genetic Resources and Animals* and *Peru: In-situ Conservation of Nature Cultivators and their Wild Relatives*. It was agreed that the results of the agro-biodiversity selective reviews should feed directly into the preparation by the GEF Secretariat of a draft operational programme on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Agricultural Landscapes (Ecosystems). Dr. C. Padoch was appointed as Team Leader for the Selective Reviews.

International Waters

- (i) **Review of East African Lakes (Victoria, Tanganyika and Malawi), November 3-4, 1999.** It was agreed that STAP will convene a two-day meeting in Malawi to review the GEF Projects in East African Lakes (Victoria, Tanganyika and Malawi). The main purpose of the meeting will be to assess the status and operational problems emerging from the PIR of the

three projects. The other objective is to explore ways of integrating relevant scientific data and results into the design and implementation of the projects. The meeting will be attended by participants from the three IAs and particularly, the project/task managers, local administrators/policy-makers and scientists.

It was noted that this wealth of relevant information already achieved by African scientists within the framework of the IDEAL research on East African Lakes was not being utilized by on-going projects of GEF in East Africa (Victoria, Tanganyika and Malawi). The review meeting of the GEF Projects in East African Lakes will, thus, facilitate the establishment of links between local scientists and the GEF initiatives. It will also explore ways to integrate relevant scientific data and results into the design and implementation of the three projects. Prof. E. Odada was appointed as Team Leader for the East African Lake Review.

- (ii) **Persistent Organic Pollutants:** It was agreed that as part of the Fourth Meeting of STAP, a Brainstorming on POPs be convened on September 9-10, 1999. The proposed brainstorming will provide STAP with elements to advise GEF on how to proceed with interventions under the realm of POPs. The session will provide information on persistent chemicals, their use, fates and effects in the environment, including biodiversity and land degradation, the state of art of monitoring, prevention and remediation, existing options and socio-economic aspects.

The main themes which will be addressed by the brainstorming are:

- Monitoring through indicators: limitations, economic and technical advantages;
- Modeling and forecasting POPs environmental impact in developing countries;
- Overview on the global and regional significance of POPs: environmental and human health aspects;
- Policy and options for PTS use in agriculture and vector control;
- Policy and options for non-pesticide PTS

- (iii) **Workshop on Freshwater Resources in Sub-Saharan Africa, 25-30 October, 1999, Nairobi.** The meeting was informed of the progress being made on the Workshop on Freshwater Resources in Sub-Saharan Africa which is being organised by the European Union in collaboration with Pan African START and the special session which will be convened at the request of the GEF on the proposed "Land and Water Initiative for Africa".
- (iv) **Small Island Developing States:** The meeting recognised the urgency to address the priority issues from a GEF perspective in SIDS. It was agreed that as part of the Fifth Meeting of STAP to be held in Barbados, a brainstorming session on SIDS will be convened. The details of the brainstorming session will be the subject of further discussion during the Fourth Meeting of STAP.

Cross-cutting Theme of Land Degradation

- (i) **STAP Workshop on Land Degradation Interlinkages:** A report was presented on the Land Degradation Interlinkages Workshop which took place in Bologna from June 14-16, 1999. The main conclusions of the workshop were summarised as follows:

Timetable for the Integration of STAP's Work on Land Degradation Interlinkage into GEF Policy Work

To ensure that STAP's work is effectively integrated into GEF policy work, the following timetable for the delivery of STAP's output and involvement in GEF policy initiative was agreed as follows:

June 30 – July 4, 1999 – Review of the results of the Bologna Workshop.

End of July, 1999 – Submission of draft workshop report to the GEF Secretariat for input into the CCD/GEF policy paper.

August 1999 – Circulation of the First Draft of Joint CCD/GEF paper by GEF Secretariat for comments.

September 13-15, 1999 - Finalisation of STAP Land Degradation Interlinkages Study by STAP

September 16, 1999 - CCD/GEF joint meeting to finalize paper and plan November CCD/GEF joint Workshop in conjunction with STAP meetings in Washington

October 1999 – GEF Secretariat to finalize linkages paper

November 1999 – Joint workshop and presentation of paper to CCD/COP Recife, Brazil. STAP to participate in the workshop

December 1999 – Presentation of paper to GEF Council. Submission of STAP Land Degradation Interlinkages Study to the GEF Council.

- (ii) **Action Programme for Integrating Land and Water Management in Africa: A Global Initiative:** The meeting was informed of the proposed Land and Water Initiative for Africa. In this context, the conclusions of the informal brainstorming convened by the GEF Secretariat with African Experts attending the STAP Workshop on Land Degradation Inter-Linkages were presented.

Climate Change

The focus of the climate change focal area during this STAP meeting was on Performance Indicators. This is addressed under agenda item 7.

Agenda Item 16: Any Other Business

49. The Fourth Meeting of STAP was scheduled for September 13-15, 1999 to be preceded by a Brainstorming on POPs on September 9-10, 1999. To facilitate the participation of relevant STAP members, the GEF/CCD brainstorming on the policy paper on land degradation interlinkages will be held on September 16, 1999 and the Brainstorming on the Multiple Benefits of Integrated Ecosystem Management Operational Programme on September 17, 1999.
50. The Fifth Meeting of STAP will be convened in Barbados from February 23-25, 2000 to be preceded by a Brainstorming on SIDS.
51. The STAP Work Programme for FY2000 is attached at Annex IB.

Agenda Item 17: Executive Session of STAP

52. An Executive Session of the Panel was convened under the Chairmanship of the Vice-Chair, Dr. Christine Padoch, to review progress made during the first year of STAP II and to make adjustments to its working procedures so as to increase efficiency. As a context for STAP's work in FY2000, the STAP Secretariat presented an overview of the STAP budget for FY2000 as approved by the GEF Council.
53. As a consequence of the discussion, a major change will be made in the STAP working procedure at its Fourth Meeting. STAP meeting will now commence with STAP Session, to enable STAP members to come to grips with the key issues arising out of the various agenda items and its implications for STAP and the GEF. This was deemed necessary in order to maximise the synergies to be derived from Panel members with different expertise because of interlinkages between the issues.
54. In addition, a conclusion session will be held at the end of each STAP meeting.

Agenda Item 18: Adoption of the Report

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

Agenda Item 19: Closing of the Meeting

56. The meeting was closed at 2.00 p.m. on Sunday, July 4, 1999.

STAP Work Programme for FY2000

ACTIVITY	DATE	OUTPUT	TASK LEADER RESPONSIBLE
<p><u>STAP MEETINGS/BRAINSTORMING SESSION</u></p> <p>Fourth Meeting of STAP – Washington, D.C. Fifth Meeting of STAP – Barbados Sixth Meeting of STAP – Bangkok (UNEP)</p>	<p>September 8-10, 1999 February 23-25, 2000 June, 2000</p>	<p>Report Report Report</p>	<p>Chairman/STAP Secretariat</p>
<p><u>MANAGEMENT INCLUDING UPDATING OF THE STAP ROSTER OF EXPERTS AND OUTREACH TO THE ROSTER EXPERTS</u></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</p> <p>Annual Review for submission to GEF Council</p> <p>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><u>SELECTIVE REVIEWS</u></p> <p>3-4 Selective Reviews on a project/thematic basis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity – agrobiodiversity (Thematic) • Climate Change – to be determined (Thematic) • International Waters – to be determined (Thematic) • Biosafety (Project) 	<p>October/November, 1999</p> <p>Ongoing November, 1999</p>	<p>Progress Reports to GEF Council on Selective Reviews</p>	<p>M. Gadgil C. Padoch E. Odada</p> <p>Z. Dadi S. Karekezi S. Nishioka J. Sarukhan P. Bridgewater A. Wagener</p>
<p><u>STRATEGIC ADVICE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution to GEF Operational Programmes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Transport (b) Multiple Benefit • Technology Transfer across focal areas and private sector • Review of GEF Operational Programmes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Review of GEF projects (b) Cluster Review of Medium Size Projects (c) Strategic papers: • Operational Strategic Issues identified by GEF Council, the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies • Input into the Global International Waters 	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Input into Drafts</p>	<p>STAP Panel</p>

<p>Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalization of strategic advice on land degradation interlinkages 			
<u>WORKSHOPS/ROUNDTABLES/BRAINSTORMING</u>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop on Sustainable Use/Bio-Markers 	Mexico City	October 13-15, 1999	J. Sarukhan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brainstorming on POPs 	Washington, D.C.	September 9-10, 1999	A. Wagner/E. Odada
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brainstorming on Sustainable Forest Use 	Mexico City	October 15-16, 1999	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brainstorming on SIDS 	Barbados	February 21-22, 2000	STAP/CIFOR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic review East African Lakes 	Malawi	November, 1999	E. Odada
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop/Brainstorming on the Energy Sector 		June, 2000	M. Colom bier
<u>MONITORING AND EVALUATION</u>			
# Input into the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation exercise	ongoing	Reviews and technical papers	C. Padoch
<u>MEETING TO BE ATTENDED BY STAP CHAIR/ MEMBERS -</u>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 GEF Council Meeting (Chairman and Vice-Chair) 2 NGO Consultations Project Implementation Review 	Washington, D.C., May 1999 and October 1999		M. Gadgil D. Anderson C. Padoch
<p>Climate Change</p> <p>SBSTTA - Climate Change</p>	Argentina, November 1999	Report	S. Nishioka
<p>Biodiversity</p> <p>SBSTTA - Biodiversity</p>			J. Sarukhan P. Bridgewater M. Gadgil
<p>Land Degradation</p> <p>CCD COP3/CCD</p>	Recife, Brazil, November, 1999	Expert Panels	P. Pisa
TWAS General Conference	Dakar, Senegal November 25-26, 1999		
Annual Meeting of World Federation of Engineering Organization	Spain, November 15-20, 1999		

**STAP VIEWS ON ADVANCING THE GLOBAL TAXONOMY INITIATIVE:
KEY OUTCOMES & SUGGESTIONS FROM A CONSULTATIVE WORKSHOP, PARIS,
JUNE 30 1999.**

PREAMBLE

STAP, at its meeting in Paris, June/July 1999 reached some broad conclusions on how the GEF can help in the delivery of the GTI. These broad conclusions include:

- *Ways taxonomy can stimulate development and execution of country driven proposals;*
- *How the strategic partnerships with agencies can help advance the GTI;*
- *How taxonomy can help the Conventions, especially the Convention on Biological Diversity, and thus GEF, address the issues of conservation, management, benefit sharing and sustainable use of biodiversity.*

Implementing the GTI is more than theoretically feasible and there are numerous projects, current and completed that show how taxonomic capacity can be developed. These exemplars are often small in scale and the GEF family has a clear opportunity to assist in 'scaling up' this work.

It may be expected CBD CoP V will produce some different and stronger guidance to the financial mechanism on the issue of the GTI, once the SBSTTA IV recommendation has been considered. This document is intended to help the GEF Family plan in advance of CoP V.

INTRODUCTION

A key decision of the CBD CoP III in Buenos Aires, November 1996, was agreeing the development of a Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI). In the intervening time, meetings in 1998 (in Darwin and London) and the further deliberations of CoP IV in Bratislava, highlighted the need for fundamental taxonomic knowledge of biological diversity to underpin the key objectives of the CBD. Leaders from major systematic institutions, ecologists and conservation managers who attended the meetings agreed on the urgent need to accelerate the global taxonomic effort, through development, and, critically, implementation, of the GTI.

Our current taxonomic system is a long way from perfect, as we still don't know all the elements. Moreover, without an understanding of what the elements are, and how they depend on each other, we cannot truly adopt a proactive ecosystem approach to management, as the CBD is attempting to do. It is important to understand that the governments of the world who recognise the CBD have acknowledged the existence of a *taxonomic impediment* to sound management and conservation of biodiversity. In this vein it is worth re-stating some of the key reasons for the importance of taxonomy, which include an understanding of key organisms which enable:

1. development of food security,
2. the promotion of health,
3. identification and control of disease vectors,
4. identification and control of vectors of ecosystem dysfunction,
5. a scientific basis for conservation management and planning.

The GTI acknowledges that taxonomic efforts are labour intensive processes, due to the large number of organisms involved, and are usually undertaken by specialists. This problem is further amplified in developing countries, which are often species rich but resource, and sometimes

science, poor. While Governments have a strong role to play in advancing the GTI, non-government organisations, and co-financing from private philanthropy, will also play a key role. The Conference of the Parties to the CBD, meeting in Bratislava in May 1998, amplified the actions needed to implement the GTI.

The London meeting also suggested formalising the GTI as an Umbrella Project under the patronage of UN agencies. CBD-SBSTTA IV reiterated its view that the Executive Secretary of the CBD should be the key leader for the GTI, and so a key issue is how to link that leadership with the roles of UN agencies (especially UNEP, FAO, UNESCO). The developing partnerships (*inter alia* between UNEP and the GEF Secretariat) could play a decisive role here.

A facilitatory function to drive the science will complement the newly established co-ordination activities to be undertaken by the Programme Officer for Taxonomy in the CBD. Involvement of the GEF Family in accelerating taxonomic activity in the developing world can help prioritise the co-financing efforts. GTI activities must be linked with on-going interest and support through activities of scientific NGO's - *inter alia*, Association of Systematics Collections (ASC), *DIVERSITAS* and IUBS.

To achieve these actions the GTI must draw into partnership the world's largest and oldest natural history institutions with the developing world to provide the impetus to resolve the taxonomic impediment through several major areas of activity, each increasing in complexity; *viz*

- *Gathering of data – collection*; Enhancing the collections of specimens and the maintenance of reference collections.
- *Development of information – compilation*; Compilation and organisation of basic data from the collections into databases, regional checklists, key maps etc.
- *Development of knowledge – synthesis*; Synthesis of this data and information into monographs, floras, faunas, keys, input to management.

Each level of increasing complexity delivers information crucial to effective implementation of the CBD through the GTI. Major action in global biodiversity science can be assisted by moulding research and curatorial efforts towards the GTI with its aim of implementing – and educating about – higher levels of taxonomic activity, and translation of the results of that activity to practical, implementable solutions.

The taxonomic impediment will be partly resolved by: (i) an approach which fosters action to both stand-alone taxonomy projects; (ii) taxonomy as a component of a project. For category (i) a framework of action to stimulate country-driven action is needed, which includes criteria to guide 'needs-assessment' in countries (in relation to their existing state/status of taxonomy). These criteria would be based on existing models of practice (CONABIO, SABONET, INBIO, etc.). For (ii) major projects should be encouraged to include taxonomists in the design of the project, and where appropriate its implementation. That way the "value-add" from the taxonomic community can be maximised.

KEY THEMES CONSIDERED BY THE WORKSHOP

What has worked and what hasn't

Regional activities: SABONET and other networks help deliver results regionally, yet preserve the country-driven approach, and focus on building human and institutional capacity.

Data Management: A key way to help countries with a serious taxonomic handicap will be facilitating their investment in training technicians to manage taxonomic information in a GIS context, including building Mega-metadatabases, for which there is already some experience (eg CONABIO, IABIN, NABIN, *Index Kewensis* revision) and is a field that is advancing rapidly. This does not negate the need for taxonomic training in many countries, it simply puts the money and efforts in a much more efficient initial approach. As an important means of mobilising historical/old records a key need is repatriation, but not of physical specimens, rather repatriation of information and creation of databases as an alternative and less costly means of resolving this issue in developing countries.

Development and mobilisation of Parataxonomic support teams :

INBIO (Costa Rica) is an excellent example of this is in action, and the ability for parataxonomic activity to develop south-south support

UK Darwin Initiative: – many projects funded under the initiative are taxonomic in focus, but the initiative is primarily a bilateral approach, which while supporting country activity does not emphasise or necessarily develop the need for regional approaches

How to establish projects which remain country driven, but embrace regional, sub-regional or global aspects

Flora and Fauna projects: The CBD Articles request Parties to inventory their biodiversity. Such inventories are best achieved through the development of floras and faunas, which give wider access to the inventoried information. These efforts are often country-driven, but will usually repay a wider regional or sub-regional approach, as species distributions often are not congruous with national borders. There could be an interaction with global cataloguing programs such as Species 2000, and the GBIF proposed by OECD countries. Such efforts could provide a service of synonyms/names and hotlinks. Any activity under the proposed OECD GBIF needs to be linked to the GTI, and GEF activity. Here is an area where the Programme Officer from the CBD Secretariat should be linking with the GEF family and other key UN Agencies to work with the nascent GBIF Secretariat.

Promotion of the development of regional databases is a potential key role for GEF. Priority would be for groups of economic and/or conservation importance. This will also help efforts in promoting integration of traditional (see below) and more “western” scientific approaches. Such projects will yield information which will support the development of follow-up projects, including the building of identification keys and monitoring activities.

Develop mechanisms following the model of the UK Darwin Initiative, but expanding the effort to include a regional focus.

Encourage south-south linkages of effort, eg SABONET, the developing CONABIO-INBIO-Humbolt Institute linkage for Latin America. Such south-south partnerships may be of especial interest to the GEF.

Reinforce existing networks and develop new ones.

Convene regional workshops/seminars to determine country, sub-regional and regional needs & priorities.

Ensure projects dealing with protected area establishment link to taxonomic information, so the effectiveness of protection may be more effectively measured.

Data management of traditional, common or familiar names by which people refer to elements of biodiversity need to be connected with the formal systems of nomenclature and the accumulated body of taxonomic knowledge. Only then will all people be empowered (at least in principle, if they have access to information systems) to access scientific knowledge on the basis of the names they know and use. Names are the route of access to knowledge and for biodiversity they must be names that can be connected with scientific binomials (even if though there is often not a direct 1:1 correspondence between common and scientific parlance).

Develop some framework examples for the IA's to test

Electronic keys: The CBD depends on knowledge about species, and thus on ensuring accurate identification. Electronic keys to help *inter alia* identify pest insects, helpful insects, freshwater quality indicators, pollinators are a prime need. These can be developed by stand-alone projects, or which can be developed as part of other on-going projects. Projects which involve construction of electronic keys can easily produce benefits in the areas of training, Capacity building and access to taxonomic information. STAP, through its deliberations may be able to assist the GEF with selection of areas of support for this activity.

Identification keys for specific organisms and other taxonomy related products. Taxonomic efforts linked, for example, to the alien invasive species programme of work is impossible without a strong base of expertise able to identify species. The arrival and impact of alien invasive species can't easily be anticipated and the best early warning system is having taxonomic capacity. Before you can recognise and identify alien species you need the ability to recognise and identify native species, and part of the taxonomic impediment arises from the lack of such expertise in many countries.

Taxonomy for environmental monitoring. Pollution and other environmental issues such as outcomes from impact assessment, depend on selection and use of viable indicators. Such indicators can come from a well organised taxonomic system, but are less well accessed if the basic taxonomy is poorly developed.

Show how the GTI can integrate with other funding imperatives

Capacity building with UNDP and knowledge-based activities of UNEP –These could be developed under the embryonic partnership agreements.

Need to link GTI with agrobiodiversity efforts, including for Food Security
Also need to integrate taxonomic activities into stand-alone projects – perhaps each GEF project could be encouraged to explain how the taxonomic impediment will be reduced in their proposed outcomes?

Broad time-scales which can be expected in implementation needs

Need to focus on **short-term results**, and ensure projects are realistically timed.

Flora products need to be produced quickly, perhaps using capacity of existing projects, or broader projects to advance the work, noting that a good project, like the Nepal Plant Information Project (funded under the Darwin Initiative), will take two years to create basic information. Three year

projects are usually adequate for the mobilisation of much taxonomic knowledge, and while inadequate to complete the work, would make significant progress and, once completed, might suggest further phases with different outputs.

Whatsorts of capacity needs building and how to do it

UNDP in particular could be helpful through facilitating south-south co-operative efforts – including across regions, with strong biological relations, even if not geo-politically.

Realisation of the training needs, can these be integrated with actual project implementation

The GTI Programme Officer in the Secretariat should develop a kit on the GTI, what it is, how it can be implemented, how to link with GEF and other co-financing Funding possibilities etc. Such a kit can explore the setting of the GTI in the global scientific and geo-political realities. The development of a consortium approach (eg FAO/UNEP/UNESCO) to help advise the Executive Secretary of the Convention on how to implement the CoPs *desiderata* will be crucial in ensuring good training outcomes, as well as broader implementation of the GTI.

A strategy for linking the Mega-institutions of the developed world with the needs of developing countries

The willingness of such institutions to help is set out in the Darwin Declaration and, in many cases, for example in the UK through the Darwin Initiative, they are already active in this. Perhaps an initiative developing liaison officers from key countries to key institutions (Similar to those operating at RBG KEW) could be developed. Training placements and collaboration on joint projects are other workable approaches. A major barrier to progress at present is the lack of a straightforward route for developing countries to gain the resources needed to make this happen. Implementing Agencies, and the GEF Council itself, may wish to consider this issue as a key way to accelerate relief from the impediment.

Performance Indicators – Climate Change

The working group discussed the report on “Assessing the Performance of Climate Change Activities” prepared by the Tellus Institute.

It was suggested that the indicators for OP5, OP6 and OP7 need to be developed at four levels:

1. The country level

That GEF projects need to be “country driven” implied that this was the basic unit of analysis for assessing GEF’s contribution. At the level of the country, indicators were grouped under nine questions (*more details or illustrative examples are given for photovoltaic projects*).

- How much capacity has the country installed? What is the actual contribution to the total/sectoral needs?

(For PV in rural areas, production level may not be available, but a good indicator may be the % of installations in good working conditions – to be compared with indicators concerning support services, and consumers satisfaction . . .).

- What are the costs for the clients, and how do they compare with the costs of the alternatives?

(For PV, this will cover the cost of systems, at the consumer site)

- What are the supporting services?

(For off-grid PV, this will include namely “design, trading and installation”, “financing”, and “maintenance” services)

- What are the country policies (regulations, taxes, tariffs, etc) that may have a positive or a negative impact on the development of the projects?

(For off-grid PV, the country policy in the electric sector, in the rural services development – energy, water, health – and in the renewable sector will be relevant)

- What is the degree of consumer implication in the process?

(interest and awareness of potential new clients, satisfaction of the consumers already concerned, impact on the energy budget of household . . .)?

- What is the local manufacturing and assembling capacity (impact may be positive but sometimes negative – protectionism - depending on the technology and the size of the country/market)?

- How is the activity in this sector financed (relative shares of public funds/aid etc. and commercial investment)?

(For off-grid PV, part of the financing may come through bilateral or multi-lateral aid for the rural development, or national funds (redistribution within the electric sector), part may be on a commercial basis or rely on household equity).

- What is the environment impact of these activities (*for instance on land degradation/deforestation*)
- Other questions . . .

2. The international/global level

Global capacity installed in the world (levels and trends), broken down by OECD and developing countries; this will provide an indication of the extent to which there is a technology transfer. Another breakdown would be (a) commercial or “niche market” applications and (b) demonstration projects.

(For PV, off-grid rural electrification is clearly a niche market, another one to be confirmed – being on-grid applications in small hydro systems; on grid applications in large interconnected systems is still at the demonstration stage).

- Cost levels and trends (different components), “learning curve” aspect;
- Evidence on reliability, and of efforts to adapt the technology to specific conditions (country, population, application . . .);
- Public R&D efforts and incentives (levels and trends), international co-operation;
- Private sector interest, commercial investments.

3. The project level

GEF projects focus on some of the above questions in some countries (e.g. development of services and capacity), other questions in other countries (e.g. on policy), and most if not all in a few countries only. A parallel set of indicators can therefore be developed for these projects, drawing the “profile” of the GEF intervention.

We believe the information presented above would be valuable for both OP5, OP6 as well as OP7 projects.

But:

- OP5 and OP6 projects will clearly address some items of the “country level” set of indicators, “international” indicators being considered in this case as a “reference” context, giving basically the state of the art on the technology and the international experience on its development;
- For OP7 projects, indicators at the international level will be especially relevant as they are more in the focus of the GEF intervention, while this time the country level indicators will give a picture of the context in which the projects will be implemented, and help explain failure or success.

The program level is essentially a horizontal aggregation of (3).