

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 10, 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:	9417
PROJECT DURATION:	3
COUNTRIES:	Chad
PROJECT TITLE:	Restoring Ecological Corridors in Western Chad for Multiple Land and Forests Benefits - RECONNECT
GEF AGENCIES:	IUCN
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of the Environment, Republic of Chad
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 IUCN proposal "Restoring ecological corridors in Western Chad for multiple land and forests benefits - RECONNECT". The project sets to restore and protect ecological functions of forested areas in Chad, while mitigating CO2 emissions. STAP recognizes that the PIF is very well-developed scientifically and technically, and clearly presented.

Specifically, STAP welcomes the focus on local communities and vulnerable groups, and the recognition of various socio-cultural barriers to the project implementation (e.g. language requirements for training documentation). The project is moreover grounded in a strong baseline, building on previous work having created local bodies designed to ensure sustainable natural resources management. In addition, the PIF does not shy away from addressing real risks to the project such as political instability and terrorism.

In developing the project further STAP suggests it will be important to develop criteria to prioritize effort between implementing sustainable land management practices on partially degraded land, to reduce further degradation, and applying more intensive restoration or rehabilitation practices to severely degraded land. In most situations it is more beneficial to focus on avoiding and minimizing degradation.

STAP suggests that the Resilience Adaptation Pathways and Transformation Assessment Framework (RAPTA) would be useful in project development. It provides guidance on assessing and building resilience to climate change and other stresses and shocks, and provides guidance on implementing adaptation pathways. It also assists in managing complex multi-stakeholder interactions, which are a particular challenge for this project. RAPTA encourages a focus on identifying the controlling variables in the system, and the most vulnerable aspects, which should then be the target of interventions and monitoring. It therefore assists in identifying the most effective interventions, and how to implement them. The RAPTA guidelines and further information are available at: <http://www.stapgef.org/the-resilience-adaptation-and-transformation-assessment-framework/>

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	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.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<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>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<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>