

# 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: March 14, 2016  
Screener: Sarah Lebel  
Panel member validation by: Annette Cowie  
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9285
PROJECT DURATION:	6
COUNTRIES:	Afghanistan
PROJECT TITLE:	Community-based Sustainable Land and Forest Management in Afghanistan
GEF AGENCIES:	FAO
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock, NEPA
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):  
**Concur**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the FAO proposal "Community-based sustainable land and forest management in Afghanistan". The project proposes to build on a number of existing projects and initiatives to address unsustainable land management in Afghanistan, with a particular focus on forests and rangelands. STAP considers the PIF is very well-developed both scientifically and technically. STAP welcomes the thorough analysis of the issue and its drivers, the detailed plans for interventions, and the strong focus on participatory processes.

In order to strengthen the project, STAP makes the following recommendations:

1. The PPG should help clarify the way forest and rangeland management are linked and can be integrated on the ground in the context of this project. This could entail, for example, targeting geographical units such as watersheds to plan interventions at landscape scale that integrate both forestry and grazing.
2. The knowledge management strategy includes a national resource centre with an online platform to be used as a repository. It is however unclear whether this centre will be a staffed physical entity, and provide other KM services, such as distribution of printed materials, or training.
3. The proposal recognizes the need to build resilience to climate change. The project developers may be interested to consult the Resilience, Adaptation Pathways and Transformation Assessment (RAPTA) Framework at [www.stapgef.org](http://www.stapgef.org) for guidance on assessing and enhancing resilience, evaluating intervention options and devising adaptive implementation pathways.

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
<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

	<p>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.</p>
<p><b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<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.  (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>
<p><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<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>