

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: @@@@ @@, @@@@

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Nijavalli H. Ravindranath
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4468

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Belarus

PROJECT TITLE: Landscape Approach to Management of Peatlands Aiming at Multiple Ecological Benefits

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, Belmeliovodkhoz (entreprise under the Ministry of Agriculture), National Academy of Aciences, Ministry of Forestry

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): **Consent**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the opportunity to review the project "Landscape approach to management of peatlands aiming at multiple ecological benefits" in Belarus. STAP commends the multiple benefits approach adopted by this project, as well as the explicit outcomes/outputs, baselines, and incremental cost reasoning. STAP also is pleased to see the National Academy of Science as one of the key stakeholders involved in the development of criteria for peatland use, development of the inventory on peatland use, and the development of the measurement, reporting and verification framework for agricultural and forestry peatlands. Furthermore, STAP is encouraged the project will develop peatland restoration methods for agriculture and forestry based on previous experience from the UNDP-GEF medium sized proposal on peatland restoration.

STAP's advisory response is consent, and suggests that UNDP considers the following points in the development of the proposal:

1. The project could consider the IPCC 2006 methods for the inventory of greenhouse gas emissions from peatlands to monitor the carbon stocks and emissions in forests and agricultural peatlands. The project also could consider the carbon estimation and monitoring methods being developed under the GEF's "Carbon Benefit Project".
2. STAP suggests to estimate the greenhouse gas emissions under the current scenario using the IPCC guidelines.
3. On barrier analysis and drivers of degradation of peatlands, the proposal appears to present as barriers, only, the lack of a long term vision and the knowledge gaps of carbon management of peatlands. However, there also is a need to conduct studies and understand the drivers of degradation of peatlands to enable the development of targeted interventions to halt degradation. Thus, STAP suggests to detail more explicitly the drivers of peatland degradation in Belarus.
4. The limitations of the eddy covariance method for the practical application of carbon stock, or CO₂ emissions/removal estimation, are well documented in the scientific literature. Thus, the project proponents may wish to review the existing literature and weigh the benefits of applying the eddy covariance method.
5. The proposal focuses mainly on monitoring carbon benefits. However, the proposal also could address how it intends to monitor the expected multiple global environmental benefits.

6. On outcome 2.1, the proposal states that "most of the degraded agricultural peatland areas within the Poozeri landscape will be subject to restoration by rewetting." STAP encourages the proponents to specify what basis was used to identify the areas that qualified for restoration when they develop the full project document.

7. On outcome 2.3, further details are needed in the full project document on what training land users will receive to implement new land uses, and to measure, monitor and report on soil and vegetation management and carbon fluxes. Good training and sustained knowledge will be important once the project ends, as well as for tracking and calculating the multiple global environment benefits the project seeks to achieve.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	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.
2. Minor revision required.	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"> (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (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 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 revision required	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.