STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	**Response**	
GEF ID	10369	
Project Title	Strengthening the Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Management of Forest Landscapes in Turkey's Kazdağlari Region	
Date of Screening		
STAP member screener	Saleem H. Ali	
STAP secretariat screener	Guadalupe Duron	
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	**Minor issues to be considered during project design** STAP acknowledges FAO's project "Strengthening the Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Management of Forest Landscapes in Turkey's Kazdağlari Region". This project considers the integrative management of forestry and biodiversity in a valuable ecosystem which has potential for World Heritage listing. The project builds on earlier work in this region of Turkey undertaken by FAO but integrates areas of implementation through a joint management approach. Climate change is likely to impact such ecosystems and the project should build in some further climate risk screening. Here are two sources the project team may wish to consider during the project design: Tutkun, N., & Oezel, G. (2016). Assessing the influence of climate change characteristics on the rainfall duration of Turkey. Natural Hazards, 84(3), 2265–2277. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-016-2539-y Atmiss, E., & Gunsen, H. B. (2018). Comparative Analysis of forestry policy and implementation during the AK Party Period in Turkey. International Forestry Review, 20(4), 405–419. https://doi.org/10.1505/146554818825240692	

	Below, STAP provides further information about its guidance.	
Part I: Project Information **B. Indicative Project Description Summary**	**What STAP looks for**	**Response**
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes – the objectives are clearly stated
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Noted in nested outcomes quite well
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	There is a note that the diagram is in the annex but it was not included in PDF. Secretariat should check this document.
1. Project description. Briefly describe: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes –.
	For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-	Yes

	defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?	
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes – The Natura 2000 project work and related work is presented as baseline
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes
	For multiple focal area projects:	
	are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	Yes – noted for both agroforestry / farming and water balance
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	National Biodiversity Monitoring Project is noted as well as earlier work in region by other donors and government itself.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	Linked forest management to biodiversity assessments
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	The project notes a theory of change in the Annex but this was not provided in the PDF.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund,	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Adequate

LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing		
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?	These are missing in clear form and need to be articulated as part of the minor revision assessment.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Not yet
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	See above
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The PIF suggests that climate risk screening indicates low risk and further work will be done in program development. STAP guidelines should be followed for this and some and a region specific article worth noting are attached in document folder and noted below Tutkun, N., & Oezel, G. (2016). Assessing the influence of climate change characteristics on the rainfall duration of Turkey. Natural Hazards, 84(3), 2265–2277. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-016-2539-y
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	The innovation noted is simply a combination of biodiversity and forestry management.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Not in detail

	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Possibly but further research is needed.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Included
2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Yes – broad range of stakeholders included
	What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?	
3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Yes – there a long description of various regulations in Turkey on gender equity and this region is noted as being more egalitarian. However, project specific indicators should be developed as well. In the benefits section it is noted that out of 1500 beneficiaries of project 50% will be women

project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/ tbd. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd		but not clear whether this is simply by population default or deliberate hiring.
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	No
5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design	Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control? Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project? For climate risk, and climate resilience measures: • How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately? • Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? • Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?	There is a comprehensive risk assessment noted though the climate risk screening could be improved. STAP guidelines should be followed to augment this section up to 2050 timeline as stated.

	• What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?	
6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives	Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?	Yes – FAO/GEF project on "Sustainable Land Management and Climate Friendly Agriculture" in Konya (Turkey) which aims to rehabilitate degraded dry lands and mainstream biodiversity conservation into production landscapes, and the FAO/GEF project (under preparation) on "Conservation and Sustainable Management of Turkey's Steppe Ecosystems"
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	Yes
	Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?	Yes
8. Knowledge management. Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	There is a detailed description of linkages with other landuse data management efforts in country.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	FAO has noted that they will hire a communications specialist for this project. However, specific details of the communication strategy have not been provided.

Notes

STAP advisory response	**Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed**
1. Concur	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. 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.
	* In cases where the STAP acknowledges the project has merit on scientific and technical grounds, the STAP will recognize this in the screen by stating that ***"STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design."***
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	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:
	(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.
	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.

3. Major issues to be considered during project design	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:
	(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. 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.