IAA STUDY GROUP

« Space to Promote Peace, with focus on the reconstruction of Afghanistan »

Response to the Peer Review Comments/Suggestions

1. The IAA Study group on "Space to Promote Peace" was established in July, 2002 under the Commission-V of the IAA. The Study Group submitted its report (Version 3.1) to the IAA. The IAA Board of Trustees considered the report and noted that wide consultation and working group meetings had been held on the subject at Houston, Paris and Bremen. The IAA Board of Trustees approved the Space for Peace Study Report, conditional on satisfactory completion of the Peer Review. The BOT requested that the Peer Review Report be placed on the website along with the final version of the Study Report, and that they be notified when this was done. It was agreed that the BOT would then have two weeks to examine these two documents.

2. The IAA Commission-V sent out the Version 3.1 of the Study Group report to Peer reviewers in April, 2004. The Peer review Comments have been received in June, 2004.

3. The Study Group is grateful to the eminent reviewers A, B and C for their careful reading of the manuscript and for their interesting and stimulating comments. The Study Group is also thankful to Commission-V, especially its Chair, and the IAA Board of Trustees for their encouragement and support in the conduct of this study and also in its review process.

4. The Study group has carefully considered all the comments and has made a detailed response to the comments. The Study Group is gratified to note that several of the comments of the reviewers are statements of agreement with the report or supports its conclusions and recommendations.

5. **TABLE-1** addresses the comments of the Reviewers and the Explanation/Response of the Study Group.

6. **Based on these responses, a new version of the Study Group report has been prepared (Version 4.0) and is made available to IAA.**

7. With this, the Study Group requests the IAA to formally accept the report and formally release it.

TABLE – 1: RESPONSE AND STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE TO PEER REVIEW COMMENTS
(IAA STUDY GROUP ON "SPACE TO PROMOTE PEACE")

Question to Review team	Revie wer	Comments of the Reviewers	Response/Explanation of the Study Group	Actions & Suggested Corrections on the report
Does the Study Group Report meet the original IAA Study Group criteria: (a) Be international	A	Yes	Thank the Reviewer.	No Action.
	B	Yes	Thank the Reviewer	No Action
	C	• International representation in the Study Group is heavily weighted toward European and North American countries. The prominent role of the IAA Co-chair from India is a welcome feature because it provides a South-Central Asia presence. The same European and North America bias is repeated in the distribution of the invitees to the Bremen Workshop though, importantly, three more Afghans were brought into the discussions at that point. It is not apparent that there was any representation from other post-conflict situations where space-based technology has been adopted to provide for lateral input (perhaps no such country has adopted space-based technology for reconstruction?). • The content reflects the first-world, cosmopolitan composition of the Study Group. • It is not much informed by lateral examples from post-conflict situations,	• The IAA had taken great care to identify a wide cross-section of experts from different nations to the Study Group - it is true that a larger number represented Europe and N America. As pointed out by the Reviewer, India was involved and so were the Afghan representatives. The fact that the study was Chaired by a leading expert from India and Europe brought about the right mix of technological judgment and application realities. In addition, the Study Group itself has been careful to use a process that brings about a more harmonious assimilation of inputs from a larger cross-section of the space community and also from the ground personalities in Afghanistan. The involvement of Afghan experts and the Afghan Embassy in Paris was a very successful mechanism of bringing focus to ground-requirements and also for them to be sensitized to space technology applications and solutions. • The Study Group has been very careful to ensure that a "developed world perspective" does not bias the	The Study Group notes the observations on the composition. Based on the explanations made on the content, the Study Group is convinced that the process adopted by the Study Group has been methodical and has sufficiently ensured that the local requirements and needs of Afghanistan, as assessed, drive the study. No modifications to the report are seen necessary.

Question to Review team	Reviewer	Comments of the Reviewers	Response/Explanation of the Study Group	Actions & Suggested Corrections on the report
		from very poor countries, or by grassroots concerns.	recommendations and were convinced that the involvement of the Afghans was important to let the Afghan colleagues assess the needs of Afghanistan and the priorities for reconstruction. These needs have been discussed during a series of meeting organized by Dr. N. Chafii in Afghanistan during one week in June, 2004 at the request of the Study Group. These meetings prepared the Bremen workshop where they have been confirmed and were used to define the priorities.

• Further the involvement of 2 experts from Afghanistan (one an Afghan and another UN rep from Kabul) to the Bremen Workshop helped bring local focus and also tune the recommendations to what the local-requirements are. It should be noted that the needs and the resulting priorities have been validated and approved by the Afghan colleagues during the workshop. The Ambassador of Afghanistan at Paris and the Ambassador of Afghanistan to UNESCO confirmed them during a meeting at UNESCO in November, 2004.

• The study group has been very careful to recommend particular uses of Space technologies that have been validated by previous experiment, including Afghanistan as this can be seen in the tables of chapter 4 and in chapter 5 | |

Question to Review team	Reviewer	Comments of the Reviewers	Response/Explanation of the Study Group	Actions & Suggested Corrections on the report
Does the Study Group Report meet the original IAA Study Group criteria of being interdisciplinary in scope	A	Yes with regard to different space applications. Legal aspects (data/telecom/export regulations; international/national Afghan law) are not very thoroughly reflected.	The Study Group agrees that the focus of the study has been on developmental aspects and the issues related to legal aspects of space technology has not been sufficiently and thoroughly reflected. The Study Group is not clear whether national Afghan Law or Policies on such technology issues are in position. However, the Study Group values this observation and proposes to add reference to the legal aspects in the Executive Summary and also in the implementation plan.	A paragraph has been added in the Executive Summary as new para number 8. A short sentence has been added in chapter 4 after table 4.1 A highlighted new section referring to the legal aspects has been added in Chapter 7 as Section 7.5 and referred to in § 123 .
	B&C	Agree that it is interdisciplinary.	Thank the Reviewers	No Action
Does the Study Group Report meet the original IAA Study Group criteria of a clear target user	A	Yes, UNESCO. But at some points it is not clear whether the study is addressed to UNESCO or/and to other funding sources.	The Study Group notes that the comments of the 3 Reviewers are all correct and would like to reiterate the philosophy identified in Figure-7.1 of the report : • The study was taken up under IAA at the request of UNESCO. The Study Group recognizes the following elements : • The beneficiaries of the study would be the users in Afghanistan and its Society. • The implementation of the study requires	No Action
	B	The clear target user is Afghanistan.		
	C	The breadth of this Study involves multiple possibilities for projects that have multiple possible users including the ATA, NGOs, and various UN bodies.		

Question to Review team	Reviewer	Comments of the Reviewers	Response/Explanation of the Study Group	Actions & Suggested Corrections on the report
			an anchoring by an UN agency which will own and implement the studies. The Study Group identifies this anchoring the UN agency as UNESCO. • The implementation of the study will require the involvement of various agencies – UN agencies involves in the reconstruction of Afghanistan, the space agencies, funding agencies and the local Afghan administration.	
Does the Study Group Report meet the original IAA Study Group criteria of leading progress and be completed within three years	A&B	Yes	The study group agrees with the comments of the 3 Reviewers	No Action
	C	Ideas are creative and contribute to social and scientific progress in Afghanistan, But ambitious	The Study Group feels that the reviewer has correctly got the point of the societal impact that the implementation can make in Afghanistan and elsewhere. Based on the experience of countries like India (where such developmental support of space has been operational), the Study Group feels that 3 years is not too long a time for implementation of the recommendation. In fact, they can be done much in time. However, the major aspect will be mobilizing at the ground level the necessary wherewithal for the implementation.	
Is the objective clearly described in the report? Are all objectives met?	A	Yes, but the title is misleading, The Study does not deal - as it might be expected- with security issues. It is a study on "Space for achieving development, which might have an effect on internal peace of a war-ravaged society".	The Study Group is pleased to note that reviewer C agrees with its views that the report should not deal with security issues, as it has been advised also by many space agencies. Reviewer C points out quite appropriately that the report focus rather on	No action.

Question to Review team	Revie wer	Comments of the Reviewers	Response/Explanation of the Study Group	Actions & Suggested Corrections on the report
			the reconstruction aspects of development of Afghanistan – because as has been outlined in Chapter 1, development is a key core element of a peace process.	
			Is the title misleading? The study group looked carefully at this question and feels that the title is not "misleading" though it may not reflect fully on PEACE issues (say security and defense issues) but is focusing on reconstruction issues of development. The study group feels that one major aspect of Peace is development and a satisfied society would mainly be peaceful. Thus, Peace and Development are linked and thus this title was chosen right in the beginning. At this stage, the group is not comfortable to change the title of the study and report as it has already gone through a series of discussions and meetings of the group members and the workshop. However, the context of the study is clearly defined and set out in the Introduction.	
	B&C	Objective is clearly defined and fairly clear steps are laid out for achieving those objectives.	Thank the reviewers.	No Action.
Is the report organized in a clear, concise manner? Is the report readable and understandable to non-experts?	A	It would be more clear if the structure would have reflected the four issue areas/projects (as four visible chapters or subchapters) more closely. The report itself is very readable.	The Study Group had considered this approach for the structuring of the report considering the Pedagogical approach given in Section 1.5 of the report. It was felt essential to highlight some details of Afghanistan to provide a perspective of its resources, bring in a need assessment of the	In order to make matters clear, a new section 6.5 has been added in Chapter 6 which brings out the fact that the initiatives have gone through a process of

Question to Review team	Reviewer	Comments of the Reviewers	Response/Explanation of the Study Group	Actions & Suggested Corrections on the report
			reconstruction goals of Afghanistan and then match it with space capabilities for identifying possible initiatives. From this possible list the 4 areas have been culled out as priority space based initiatives. The Study Group would like to maintain this structure but recognizes that there could be different focus provided by different approaches and structuring (many such structuring could be possible).	analysis and selection. The title of chapter 7 has been modified accordingly
	B	The report is well and clearly organised, from the objectives to the solutions, but it is not concise enough and it presents some redundancy, mainly on the introduction part of each chapter. It is clearly readable and understandable to non-experts; technical aspects, space tools and space systems are presented and explained in a very simple and comprehensible way to the general public.	There might some redundancies in the report as has been pointed out by the reviewer but the fact that it is readable and understandable we would not want to make any major changes at this point of time. In fact the redundancies could be viewed as reiterating the points and thus as an emphasis.	No major changes. Minor changes have been made in the introductory part of Chapter 3 (which does remove some of the redundancy).
	C	The report appears to be still a work-in-progress. It would benefit from a stronger and clearer set of objectives that are presented in a working model rather than as laundry lists. Some decisions should be made as to how to trim and streamline the entire report to remove repetition. The report also needs final line-by-line editing to clarify the language. With trimming and editing, the report will be understandable and readable.	The report is not a work in progress but aims to identify what the space community could consider as potential projects for reconstruction activities in Afghanistan. The reviewer seems to have missed the concept of how the study was evolved and taken up. Unlike other hands-on projects, this is more a conceptualization of what can be done and to bring focus to the needs of Afghanistan. The Study Group has not prepared a "laundry list" but has been systematic and analytical in its approach to identify its initiatives. The Study Group would like to pass this	No action to be taken.

Question to Review team	Reviewer	Comments of the Reviewers	Response/Explanation of the Study Group	Actions & Suggested Corrections on the report
			comment of the reviewer – which seems to be of a general nature as it does not point to specific redundancies and requirements of trimming and stream-lining.	
Is the report fair? Is its tone impartial and non-judgmental?	**A**	Yes, but the tone is sometimes a little bit emotional and missionary.	No comment	No action
	B	Concerning the overview of Afghanistan and need assessment for reconstruction the tone is impartial and non-judgmental, but the solutions which are studied are all space-oriented and they are not compared with others (ground capacities).	The Study Group feels that it was its mandate to propose space based initiatives and solutions. Comparing them with ground capacities and ground based solutions was not intended in the objectives. Further, such an analysis would require a benefit ratio assessment and would be a topic of study by itself. The Study Group feels that with the intention of looking at how space can help in Afghanistan, the assessment given in section 4.2 has been in tune with what was intended.

However, in our assessment, we have been rationale enough to identify goals which can be met by space. In fact, in Table-4.1 and 4.2, many of the needs have been left out because space cannot play a role there (Here may be other technologies – including those based on ground techniques could be useful). | In order to make explicit what is implicit in chapter 4, a small modification has been made in § 78 |
| | **C** | The obvious intent to promote space-based technology over other kinds of reconstruction initiatives could be considered a "bias" I suppose. The lack of significant Afghan input could also be seen as a bias and perhaps unfair as well. The tone is impartial and non- | The Study Group disagrees with this comment as the whole study has been constructed on Afghan inputs – which have been obtained by questioning the Afghan authorities in Afghanistan, by letting the Afghani defining the needs and the priorities for their countries. These needs and priorities have been | No Action. |

Question to Review team	Revie wer	Comments of the Reviewers	Response/Explanation of the Study Group	Actions & Suggested Corrections on the report
		judgmental.	validated by official Afghan authorities.	
Does the report reflect international and interdisciplinary considerations?	A	Yes, but legal considerations are not fully developed.	The Study Group agrees but has already provided response to this aspect earlier.	No new Action. See above actions already made regarding this issue
	B	Reflects international and inter-disciplinary considerations.	Thanks the Reviewer.	No Action.
	C	The missing international aspect is from experts on post-conflict reconstruction, and especially experts who can speak to the role of space-based technology in reconstruction.

Only three of the nine examples that are provided to demonstrate the usefulness of space-based technology (Appendix 3 Case Studies) are from developing countries; of these, two are from India and one from El Salvador. It would be far more convincing to have cases from post conflict situations (again, perhaps, Afghanistan is to be the pioneer in this area—if that is the case, then perhaps it is best to say so up front). | Again, the Study Group disagree with this comment of the reviewer as UN agencies involved in post conflict reconstruction (UNESCO, UNOSAT and the Afghan representatives have been involved in the study and the workshop. Space experts have been the key members of the Study Group. The report has adapted case studies from different parts of the world but the focus has never been only on developing countries – which seem to be made out by the reviewer. However, the group feels that the case studies highlighted in the report are to be seen as examples of the type of which can be applied in Afghanistan – to that extent the case studies are very much relevant.

Space inputs might have been used in many other post conflict situations (in specific manner for specific requirements of UN and other agencies) but the group feels that this is the first time that a focused assessment of how space, in an integrated manner (remote | Clarification on the relevance of the case studies has been made now in Chapter 6 and beginning of Annexure 3. |

Question to Review team	Revie wer	Comments of the Reviewers	Response/Explanation of the Study Group	Actions & Suggested Corrections on the report
			sensing, satellite communications, etc), can help in post conflict reconstruction has been made. The group does not claim that this study for Afghanistan is a "pioneer" as it has referred to many UN reports related to Afghanistan and has acknowledged this in the references section.	
Does it contain input and analysis from a comprehensive set of sources?	A	Yes, but a reflection on the UNISPACE III recommendations would have added to the acceptability.	The Study Group agrees	A paragraph has been added Executive Summary and in the Introduction to refer to UNISPACE III.
	B	Diverse but well referenced sources.	No comment	No Action.
	C	Most of the sources are international donor reports about Afghanistan or scientific studies about space-based technology. The former provide basic information about the usual set of "needs" while the latter verifies the scientific credentials of the Study Group. The gap between the two bodies of literature includes literature on post-conflict reconstruction elsewhere and particularities of the Afghan social and political context. Attention to these two missing bodies of knowledge would have allowed the authors to link their objectives much more concretely to the realities of Afghanistan. For an example of a more contextualized approach to reconstruction in Afghanistan, see Mohammed Haneef Atmar and Jonathan Goodhand, "Afghanistan: The Challenge of 'Winning the Peace'" in	From the study of the various comments made by the reviewer, it looks that he is looking for a more comprehensive assessment of reconstruction goals – which include economic, political, sociological, cultural, anthropological, besides the technological aspects. This aspect seems to be stemming out from his concern that the report "is not comprehensive" but "promotes space technology". The group feels that the type of assessment mentioned by the reviewer has not been on its agenda. The Study Group has considered the specific reference quoted by the reviewer and finds that the paper highlights conflict dynamics and suggests a 3 pronged strategy for making peace in Afghanistan. This paper, according	No Action.

Question to Review team	Reviewer	Comments of the Reviewers	Response/Explanation of the Study Group	Actions & Suggested Corrections on the report
		Monique Mekenkamp, Paul van Tongeren and Hans van de Veen, eds., Searching for Peace in Central and South Asia (Lynne Reiner Publishers, 2002, pp 109-140).

The report is more non-disciplinary than interdisciplinary. Particularly missing are distinct voices from economics, political science and sociology/cultural anthropology. The study's core mission of promoting the use of space-based technology for information and communication could be more linked to projected economic benefits for the nation and for individuals, to political benefits (the mention of e-governance, for example, is quite peripheral) and to social welfare and cultural appreciation. | to the group, is of a different type focusing on the international-regional-local dynamics of the Afghan conflicts, how conflict can be managed, the need for multi track diplomacy of aid, involving NGO and improving civil society; and recommends principles for peace building and short and long term challenges in the context of Afghanistan.

The group feels that the referred paper is more on the tract of conflict management and renewing diplomatic engagement. While these principles are very relevant and valid in the global context, these are out of the scope of the present IAA study. | |
| Are the data and analyses handled competently? Are references given where appropriate? | B | Difficult to evaluate the references. | No comment | No Action |
| | C | Data analysis not critical to this study. | No comment | No Action |
| Are the findings, conclusions and recommendations adequately supported by evidence, analysis and rationale? | C | The recommendation to move forward with four demonstration projects seems premature in that full participation by the Afghan counterparts has not yet been achieved (see, for example, several references in the report to places where Afghan review and input are still needed).

It is, furthermore, not clear that the projects have been selected according to the set of criteria presented on page 9. As is the case | It should be noted that the four demonstration projects have been fully endorsed by the Afghan authorities in France (the Ambassador of Afghanistan in Paris and the Ambassador of Afghanistan of Afghanistan to UNESCO).

The Study Group is surprised by this remark. The pilot projects are actually based on needs expressed in Table-3.1 and expanded in | No specific action.

The specific statements in the report on the need for reviewing with Afghan colleagues was an error (as it has already been done) and needed to be removed. This has been done now. |

Question to Review team	Reviewer	Comments of the Reviewers	Response/Explanation of the Study Group	Actions & Suggested Corrections on the report
		with so many proposals, Afghanistan's major needs (as presented many times in the report) are in fact not being addressed by the four demonstration projects. Instead, the projects contribute in other directions, all valuable in their own right, but clearly more defined by the capabilities and interests of the international space community than, say, farmers facing water shortage, malnourished women refugees, or children at risk of encountering land mines.	Table-4.1. From these tables and assessments, it is clear that the 4 initiatives address some of the listed requirements – though not all have been recommended. It can be seen from these tables that restoring food security, infrastructure repair requires remote sensing and GIS; expanding education could be done by space based distant education systems; health services improvement can be done by tele-medicine and so on. The group agrees that some of the points mentioned by the reviewer related to human refugees, children at risk, etc., have not been covered in the report – as the focus has been on what space can do and for these areas space technology does not play a role.	
Does the executive summary concisely and accurately describe the key findings and recommendations? Is it consistent with other sections of the report?	B	The executive summary is concise and gives the main issues (the four pilots projects) consistent with the other sections of the report, but recommendations are missing.	In fact the implementation of four projects is the main recommendations of the study. Considering the comment, the section in the Executive Summary is re-titled.	Changing the title and restructuring of Para 9 (former 7) in Executive Summary to highlight the recommendations.
	C	The Executive Summary would be much more consistent with the rest of the report if the authors undertake bold trimming of the latter and focus more directly on their four proposed projects and why and how they are important to Afghanistan's future.	The Study Group considers that such a general statement of "more consistent.... and bold trimming" is very difficult to implement. May be the reviewer, as has been pointed out by us earlier does not consider text on space and other aspects so relevant. On the other hand, these are very important for the Study Group which is focusing on space initiatives. Going by the general observations by the	No Action.

Question to Review team	Reviewer	Comments of the Reviewers	Response/Explanation of the Study Group	Actions & Suggested Corrections on the report
			reviewers that the report reads well, the group does not propose any further reduction or cutting of the text in the Executive Summary.	
Are any sensitive policy issues treated with proper care? For example, if a recommendation requires involvement or approval from a particular organization or agency, are any challenges appropriately addressed?	A	Have all possible funding sources named in the report been contacted in advance?	No. The intention of the Study Group is not to contact funding sources as it expects the UN system to do so with UNESCO as the anchor agency. However, in the interest of involvement of some of the UN and funding agencies, they have been invited to the discussions and encouraging responses received from some of them.	No Action.
	B	The implementation of the four initiatives mentioned requires the participation of Afghan authorities or agencies, others UN or space agencies and in addition the aid from other countries; the list of these organizations is complete but the implementation plan is too undefined, and a plan of actions to take is missing.	It is true that the Implementation Plan is not exhaustive and defined in detail. The plan now, is more oriented to give a direction, and it is for the anchor agency to develop an actual detailed implementation plan with the local authorities. As has been rightly pointed out by the reviewer, the implementation will call for involvement of UN agencies, Afghan authorities, space agencies and aid agencies – the implementation plan will have to consider all of this. Detailed implementation plans cannot be proposed without the shared responsibility of the Afghan government. This is why it is expected that for each pilot project a detailed implementation plan be developed with the responsible Afghan authority, according to the time line presented in Table-7-1.4.	A clarification of this point has been made in reorganizing § 133 and 136, and § 144 of the conclusion has been modified accordingly.
Are appendices relevant to the report content?	B	Appendices provide good and additional information.	No comment.	No Action.

Question to Review team	Revie wer	Comments of the Reviewers	Response/Explanation of the Study Group	Actions & Suggested Corrections on the report
	C	Appendix 2 seems excessively long and "generic" for this proposal. Nearly 30 pages in length, very little applies specifically to Afghanistan. I would suggest dropping it completely as its massive presence seems to underline the emphasis of the study on promoting space-based technology rather than, primarily, helping the people of Afghanistan. (The report's tilt toward "using Afghanistan" to demonstrate the value of space-based technology is evident throughout the report, but see especially the first line on page 5. Isn't it more appropriate to see Afghanistan "using" space-based technology….?) Appendix 3 would be much more convincing if presented as a table of case studies with brief information points on the issue, the technological intervention, and the social/economic/political impact. More developing countries cases are needed as are examples from post-conflict situations.	This report is aimed at being read by non-specialists in space. Therefore a pedagogical presentation of the potentials of space-based tools is thought to be appropriate at this place. The readers who are not interested in a detailed description of the space-based tools will be satisfied by the short introduction of chapter 4 and will skip the reading of this appendix. Further, if the report is to be circulated in countries like Afghanistan, this Appendix will provide such readers an overview of space applications for Peace and also of how other countries have used them. From the groups point of view, these appendices are important to make the report complete and readable for a larger cross section of professionals. If it is true that the aim of this report is to demonstrate the value of space-based tools for promoting peace, the study group has been very careful to make recommendations that will facilitate the use these technologies by Afghanistan for the benefit of its people, as it is explained in chapters 4 to 7 This point has been discussed in answer to question 5	No Action.
Is the expected role of IAA clearly identified?	**A&B**	Role of IAA to be more clearly defined.	Although it is stated that that this report is made at the request of UNESCO in • the fifth paragraph of the preface	Text has been added in the introduction to clearly define the role of IAA.

Question to Review team	Revie wer	Comments of the Reviewers	Response/Explanation of the Study Group	Actions & Suggested Corrections on the report
			• § 2 of the Executive Summary, • §140 of the conclusion the Study Group agrees that this should be made as clear in the introduction.	
		I believe the role of the IAA is mainly catalytic in terms of providing ideas and perhaps helping secure funding for the pilots. If that is not the case, then perhaps some greater clarification is needed.	The reviewer is correct on the role of IAA. The role of IAA is to produce the report and publicize its results.	No Action.
What other significant improvements, if any, might be made in the report?	C	The major needs are streamlining and getting to the four pilots much more directly and quickly. I would suggest more forthrightness about value of the four pilot projects to particular issues rather than (vainly) attempting to connect them to world peace and peace in Afghanistan. They are in fact more convincing as valuable if presented as targeted at particular, focused niches of need and not as grassroots initiative. As described, both the tele-medicine and tele-education projects are quite elitist, involving links between specialty hospitals in the first instance, and specialized training in the latter. The project concerning disaster preparedness is the most socially equitable of the four. In other words, by being more accurate and realistic about the value of the four projects, I believe the case for their support will actually be more compelling	What is suggested by reviewer C is an important change in the spirit and goals of the study. In the spirit of the work of the study group (see § 132), this last suggestion is more of the responsibility of those who will actually implement the pilot projects. It is expected that this report will be followed by four detailed implementation plans that will address the issues mentioned by reviewer C. These plans are suggested in § 132 and in each of the 4 tables 7.1-4. In fact the implementation of these projects has been carefully discussed with our Afghan colleagues who think that they have the infrastructure to implement them efficiently. Furthermore, as said in the report, the tele-education project meets a fundamental recommendation made by a working group of experts on education held at Kabul	In order to make this philosophy more clear, text has been added in Chapter 7 regarding the need for detailed implementation plan for each initiative, including schedule of activities and budget.

Question to Review team	Revie wer	Comments of the Reviewers	Response/Explanation of the Study Group	Actions & Suggested Corrections on the report
		and interesting to potential donors.		