



**Draft Minutes of the First (1st) Session of the Policy Innovation Systems for Clean Energy Security (PISCES) Consortium Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting
June 12th 2008, Bagamoyo, Tanzania**

PRESENT

Mr. Theophilous E. Mlaki (Chairing)
Mr. Olivier Dubois
Dr. Rainer Janssen
Mr. Oscar J. Kashaigili (representing Mr. Bashir Mrindiko)
Dr. Michael O'Brien (representing Dr. Chandarika Nath)
Mr. Peter O'Neill (representing DfID)
Ms. Sheila Oparaocha
Prof. Ralph Simms
Dr. Njeri Wamukonya
Mr. Harsha Wickramasinghe
Dr. H. Wickramatillake
Prof. Judi W. Wakhungu (Ex-Officio, Secretary, Taking Notes)

IN ATTENDANCE

Mr. Ron Ajengo (PISCES, Finance Manager)
Mr. Steven Hunt (PISCES, Project Manager)

Joining Second Half of Meeting

Prof. Jamidu Katima
Dr. Nambi
Ms. Tameezan wa Gathui
Ms. Ramani Nissanka
Ms. Joan Kariuki
Prof. Colin Pritchard

APOLOGIES

Ms. Sarah Adams
Prof. P.K. Aggarwal
Mr. Andrew Barnett
Mr. Loek Boonekamp
Mr. Ray Holland
Prof. Sir John Marsh
Ms. Michela Morese
Mr. Bashir Mrindiko (represented by Mr. Oscar J. Kashaigili)
Dr. Chandarika Nath (represented by Dr. Michael O'Brien)
Dr. Mariannne Osterkorn
Prof. M.S. Swaminathan



MIN 1:0 Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted with the following amendment. Members recommended that since this was the first CAG meeting it was best to start by appointing a Chair, and then deliberating on the CAG Terms of Reference (ToR).

MIN 2:0 Appointment of the Chair of the Meeting

Mr. Theophilous E. Mlaki was appointed as Chair of the Meeting. He accepted the position, to serve in his individual capacity, for the duration of the meeting but recommended that the ToR for CAG Members be discussed.

MIN 3:0 CAG Terms of Reference (ToR)

Important elements were raised about the *modus operandi* of the CAG. These included the terms of operation of both the Chair and the CAG, details of which Members agreed ought to remain flexible but would be discussed at the next meeting. For example, was the position of Chair rotational per annual meeting or was this a three-year term? Elements that were considered important to the GAG **ToR** were discussed as follows:-

- It was important to note that individually, the CAG's fields of expertise complements the PISCES goals,
- Specifically, the CAG role is to provide a wider perspective of expertise and knowledge into PISCES, thus serving as a window into the outside world,
- This knowledge is contextually current and is of relevance for the future direction of PISCES, and links to other partners
- Underscore the PISCES advocacy role.

MIN 4:0 Project Highlights

The Project Manager, Steven Hunt, presented the project highlights these included the *The Principles of PISCES, A Framework for Bioenergy, and Gaps in Knowledge*.

Members welcomed the Project Manager's report. The issue of terminology was discussed at length. There was concern that the terminology was not as precise as it ought to be. For example, the terms *bioenergy* and *biofuels* were being used interchangeably. PISCES was asked to improve its terminology and to regard this as part of the project's contribution to this field. The example of FAO was provided as that of a specific organization that has defined its terminology. PISCES was urged to follow this example.

Issues concerning how climate change and health are considered in this project were also raised. Members recommended that PISCES be clear on its contribution to the climate change debate – whether it was considering a two-way climate effect on bioenergy, or bioenergy effect on climate change.



The CAG was pleased to note that PISCES has already received wide media coverage, but recommended that this interaction continue and be pursued strategically. One way of doing this was to improve the website. Although Members applauded the fact that a website had been developed, they noted that it needed improvement, and should be made interactive for ease of communication. Concerning health, Members recommended that this issue be highlighted, especially the effects of pollution and particulates such as benzene, lead, indoor pollution, and so on.

The CAG queried how the specific PISCES country -level activities would have meaning to, and impact the international bioenergy debate, such as trade and the MDGs. The CAG stated that the livelihoods aspect of this work would influence both national and international debates, and that the livelihoods aspect of this project would be highlighted.

Finally, while Members did not question the research merits of this work, they were interested in knowing how PISCES would engage in advocacy, and how PISCES would influence policy.

MIN 5:0 Review of PISCES Annual Report

The CAG welcomed the Annual Report, but noted that it was short on outputs primarily because the project was at the nascent stage. The notion of each country having a specific theme was also mentioned as a potential weakness and needed to be evaluated in future. The CAG acknowledged that PISCES partners visit and learn from each other. But it was recommended that the role of each country be harmonized in order to promote clarity. However, good progress had been made and the CAG proposed that the PISCES focus on the following:- land and bioenergy by identifying strategic partners on this issue; the issue of land and industrial waste; exploring more strategically how land can be dealt with more systematically in the *Access & Delivery* theme; contribute to the FAO land and biofuels analysis; inform the IAEA, & IPCC of the PISCES and progress; explore options for the private sector role; explore options of how to best influence policy and governments through the PISCES Policy Working Group (PWG); and learning from RiPPLE, COMPETE, GVEP etc.

Members advised that incorporating perspectives from different stakeholders, especially women's groups, and many grassroots experts was important to influencing the overarching policies. PISCES was urged, through the cross-cutting themes work, to be cognizant of the fact that notions of equity are much broader than gender considerations.

MIN 6:0 Financial Report



The PISCES Finance Manager, Ron Ajengo, presented the Financial Report. The CAG welcomed the Report and made the following comments: - they wanted to know why there was a difference in overhead charges per institution, and why the lead institution has a lower overhead than other partners; they queried why relatively speaking, the personnel component was high; they wanted to see a clear breakdown among the personnel costs, scholarships, and capacity building activities; and they wanted to know why the Project Manager was not housed in the lead institution.

It was explained that PISCES partners have different overhead policies, and that these policies are governed by their respective Boards. Concerning the personnel component, it was reported that many personnel are working full-time on PISCES while others charge the project part of their time. A breakdown of the personnel costs would be presented in the next CAG meeting. In addition, the CAG requested that a more detailed financial report be presented at the next meeting, and that accounting procedures be spelled out clearly.

It was reported that the Project Manager was not housed in the lead institution because previously, this position was not designed in the original plan. However, after an inter-rim meeting with the DfID representatives, PISCES was urged to appoint a Project Manager. Steven Hunt was appointed for a period of six months with the understanding that he would also serve as a Mentor to his successor, ideally, appointed from the lead institution.

MIN 7:0 Future Plans & Reporting to the PISCES Partners

The CAG advised that, in future, PISCES ought to incorporate the following:-

- To strive consistently to develop a niche for its work because the topic was broad
- Devise a Communication Strategy (CS)
- Use the Communication Strategy and Policy Working Group (PWG) to work with parliamentary committees especially those concerned with energy, and the environment to ensure that bioenergy is integrated into overall energy policy; and to conduct stakeholder consultations; and to ensure that the PWG work influences policy in all participating countries, to forge close links with governments, and to adjust the budget as needed in order to accomplish this
- Develop a strategy on how to address equity – including land and access issues; include an expert on gender issues, and to help enhance the pro-poor aspects
- To synchronize activities, especially training, among PISCES partners, and to continue to promote mutual learning
- To seek options of working strategically with other consortia such as COMPETE
- PISCES to take advantage of the CAG individual expertise to further the goals of the project e.g. exploring options of working with FAO to expand the PISCES livelihood dimension in Latin America and Francophone Africa
- To seek participation in and promote the PISCES goals at the major forums e.g. UNCSD in April 2009, and in FAO, UNDP, UNEP etc.



MIN 8:0 Decisions

8.1

Peter O'Neill mentioned that it would be useful at this nascent stage of the project to have a Chair even though issues such as ToR were evolving. Dr. H. Wicramatillake proposed that Mr. Mlaki continue to serve as Chair. The proposal was seconded by Prof. R. Simms.

Mr. Mlaki accepted the overture, saying that he would serve as a liaison between the Secretariat and the CAG.

8.2

It was agreed that, at the next meeting, time would be allotted to discussing the ToR for the Chair, the CAG, and how the meetings should be conducted.

8.3

It was agreed that at the next meeting more time would be allocated for roundtable discussions between PISCES and the CAG.

MIN 9:0 Date of the Next Meeting

It was agreed that the **NEXT MEETING** be held **June 17 – 19, 2009 in Edinburgh.**

There being no other business the Chair closed the meeting at 5:30PM.

Signed: _____
Chair

Date: _____

Signed: _____
Secretary

Date: _____