

# Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility  
(Version 5)

## STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: May 08, 2017  
Screener: Virginia Gorsevski  
Panel member validation by: Brian Child  
Consultant(s):

### I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9385
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Rwanda
PROJECT TITLE:	Forest Landscape Restoration in the Mayaga Region
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	REMA (Rwanda Environmental Management Authority), Gisagara, Ruhango, Nyanza and Kamonyi Districts
GEF FOCAL AREA:	Multi Focal Area

### II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):  
**Minor issues to be considered during project design**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP believes that the basic logic of the project "Forest Landscape Restoration in the Mayaga region" is good. It focuses on four districts in Rwanda. Knowledge is brought together and informs interventions by improving the capacity of an extension service. Land use and land consolidation plans are developed in four districts, and are monitored and enforced. New energy efficient technologies are adopted – household cook stoves and energy, charcoal, NTFPs.

However, STAP feels that the PIF under-estimates the 'on-the-ground' challenges of designing and implementing a wide range of interventions. Further, these interventions are described only in aspirational and generic terms. Before this PIF is approved, STAP recommends that a generic description of each activity is replaced by a scientific and technical description of exactly what this is, and an assessment of the technical, social and economic feasibility and cost/benefit of the large number of proposed interventions (see below). The project should consider prioritizing a few key interventions so that it is feasible and is able to accomplish its intended objectives within the budget, time frame and technical capacity. Outputs such as implementing district land use plans, forest restoration, improving the capacity of an extension service, implementing household energy technology, and sustainable charcoal production are all major efforts that could almost be projects on their own.

The match between \$USD 1.776 m of Biodiversity funding and the global environmental impact in terms of 354 ha of forest and 1,000 ha of natural forest planted needs to be assessed and justified, as do the implications of 10,000 ha of (exotic?) fast growing species.

STAP recommends that for each intervention proposed in the text, the PIF (a) provide a technical description of the intervention (b) assess the technical feasibility, (c) assess the social impacts and trade-offs and, (d) analyze the costs/benefits:

- What exactly are decision-support tools, and what/where is the knowledge to support them?
- What are the synergies between reforestation efforts and local community livelihood opportunities?
- How will the project restore degraded forests and ecosystem services?
- How will communities be empowered to develop increased agricultural productivity/ sustainability?

Where is the technical model and evidence that this can be done?

- What are the interventions to prevent erosion? Are they technically and socially feasible and how much do they cost?
- What "best practice" plantation practices will be applied?
- What climate smart production techniques will be applied?
- What sustainable land management practices will increase food production?
- Which practices will restore watersheds, increase tree cover, improve crop yields, protect river banks and enhance climate resilience?
- Which energy efficient technologies will reduce wood fuel demand by 30%?
- What agro-forestry practices are referred to? What are their technical and social feasibility, cost/benefit, and tradeoffs?
- What are the yield and biodiversity implications of 10,000 ha of planted fast-growing tree species?

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.</p> <p>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>