

# 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 09, 2012

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking  
Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT MULTI TRUST FUNDS**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4952

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Rwanda

**PROJECT TITLE:** Landscape Approach to Forest Restoration and Conservation (LAFREC)

**GEF AGENCIES:** World Bank

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA)

**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 revision required**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP acknowledges this important project to "restore and maintain critical landscapes in Rwanda that provide global environmental benefits and contribute to enhanced resilient economic development and livelihoods." It appreciates the focus on GEBs in the objective statement, the mention of economic development and the inclusion of Outcome Indicators, including those for capacity development based on the Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI) baseline for environmental mainstreaming.

STAP raises a number of scientific and technical issues that will require consideration as the project preparation proceeds to a full proposal:

1. The GEF places important emphasis on the choice and use of impact indicators to track the progress of a project especially in its delivery of global environmental benefits (GEBs), over and above the baseline position. While indicators of delivery of some Outcomes are given in the Project Framework, there are no indicators for Expected Outputs. It would be appropriate to include these in the Framework as well as the text (especially in Column 3 of the incremental analysis on pa.14 which claims to include GEBs but only very indirectly covers those recognised by the GEF), and to base choice of impact indicator on either or both of the UNCCD national reporting indicators and the GEF-5 focal area strategy indicators. Change in land cover would be a good indicator to choose in Output 1.1.3, for example, which would also integrate impacts across BD, LD and SFM. Changes in total system carbon would be another good indicator. STAP urges some careful analysis of relevant indicators of impact that would enable the tracking of GEBs.

2. In a multi-focal project such as this, experience suggests that collaboration between sectoral agencies will be critical and that coordinating structures will be required with sufficient power to enforce cooperation. However, in acknowledging the risk of failure to collaborate across agencies, the incremental analysis (p.14) provides only for the alternative to "review and identify mechanisms to address institutional barriers." The risk analysis at Section B4 mentions only that "linkages" will be set up. STAP advises that lessons on achieving institutional collaboration should be drawn from other forest programs. For example, in Zambia, FAO has analyzed the needs to enhance collaboration between the National Forest Programme and poverty alleviation "an objective shared with the current project in Rwanda: see <http://www.fao.org/forestry/16691-03ba2778aae177b4cb70fbf5970df3bc9.pdf>. One point pertinent to the current project is that establishing joint forest management is the prime means to alleviate poverty in forest-dependent communities. This is an aspect only briefly touched upon for the Rwandan project; e.g. "community-driven management" is mentioned, which could be quite different to joint forest management. There is mention in Section B3 that gender-sensitive approaches will be adopted. However, the proposal needs a far clearer focus on aspects such as

local participation and how gender issues will be accommodated. Again, these are issues well-established in the UNDP-UNEP PEI mentioned earlier in the proposal which need to be explicitly referred to in order to ensure that project managers take the lessons on board. .

3. Payments for Environmental (or Ecosystem) Services are mentioned three times in the proposal, but only in passing. In the context of this project, PES will be complex to initiate and continue sustainably without reference to key principles and good practice from elsewhere. The World Bank, of course, has undertaken extensive analysis of PES as an implementing framework in contexts such as described in this project. In addition, project proponents may wish to refer to STAP's advisory document on the subject:

<http://www.unep.org/stap/Publications/STAPsAdvisoryProducts/PaymentsforEnvironmentalServices/tabid/4742/Default.aspx>

4. Monitoring mechanisms are mentioned at two places in the Project Framework (1.1.3 and 2.2.3). STAP believes that these will be extremely important to establish, not only to evaluate the delivery of GEBs but also to guide project decisions and priorities on an on-going basis. The proposal currently lacks information on who will undertake this monitoring, what methods will be employed, what indicators will be used (cf. point 1 above) and how the results will feed-back to project management. STAP suggests, for example, that the outputs of the GEF-financed Carbon Benefits Project could be used for total system carbon. Access to institutions with experience in remote sensing would be good to monitor changes in land cover.

5. The economics and financial rationality of the practices to be promoted for SLM (Outputs 2.2.1 & 2), SFM (Output 3.2.2) and water/marshland management (Outputs 3.2.3 & 4) do not feature in the proposal. Yet, the acceptance of introduced " or even traditional " practices depends fundamentally on how far these practices support current livelihoods. There is no mention in the proposal as to how practices will be chosen and what criteria will be adopted. STAP strongly urges the proponents to build into project design the intention and the capacity to assess all approaches and practices to economic scrutiny, possibly using some of the available database facilities of WOCAT that enables the simultaneous assessment of technical, economic and social relevance of land and water management techniques. STAP notes that some economic aspects have already been researched in Rwanda (e.g. Byiringiro, F. and Reardon, T. 1996. Farm productivity in Rwanda: effects of farm size, erosion, and soil conservation investments. *Agricultural Economics* 15:127-136) and a thorough literature search should be undertaken.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review</li> </ul> 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.
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement. 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.