



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4469		
Country/Region:	Turkey		
Project Title:	Integrated Approach to Management of Forests in Turkey, with Demonstration in High Conservation Value Forests in the Mediterranean Region		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4434 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; CCM-5; CCM-3; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$7,120,000
Co-financing:	\$21,180,000	Total Project Cost:	\$28,300,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Linda Heath	Agency Contact Person:	Adriana Dinu

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	CC/Feb2811: Yes. FCCC entered into force in Turkey in 2004; Kyoto Protocol 2009.	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	there is no non-grant instrument in the GEF funded portion of the project.	
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	CC/Feb2811: Endorsement letter dated Feb 16th, signed by Prof Dr Akca, the Operational Focal Point. Because the monetary amounts are listed by focal area, and because these may likely need to change due to project management costs (see response to Q27), a revised letter may be needed. CC/Mar2411: Addressed.	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 9-8-2010

Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	CC/Feb2811: the UN-REDD programme is a collaboration between UNDP, FAO, and UNEP focused on the most part on tropical countries. Please further describe, or clarify, the comparative advantage that UNDP has on monitoring (as mentioned in the second sentence in Section C as compared to FAO and UNEP), for implementing this project. CC/Mar2411: Yes, clarified.	
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	CC/Feb2811: Co-financing by the agency is a grant of \$640,000, about 3% of the total project cost. A priority UNDP project might have a higher level of funding. One would expect in-kind support also if agency program and staff capacity in the country were to work on this. CC/Mar2411: Addressed.	
	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	CC/Feb2811: The project appears to fit in the staff capacity in the country (Five members will be assigned to this project), although no in-kind amount from these staff shows up in the co-financing from UNDP. The description of how the project fits into the agency's program in this country specific is not well described in section C2. The explanation seems more global rather than focused on this country. Please clarify. CC/Mar2411: Yes, thank you for the specific information.	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	CC/Feb2811: Yes, it is within the total STAR allocation of \$27.07	
	• the focal area allocation?	CC/Feb2811: Yes. The CC focal area allocation is 18.03, so this project is about a quarter of the CC allocation. No other PIFs have yet been entered into PMIS for GEF5 for Turkey.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	not applicable	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	not applicable	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	<p>02/28/11 IG: SMF/REDD+ Indicative Grant Amount should be no greater than 3:1. See Q27. 03/28/11 IG: Addressed</p>	
Project Consistency	<p>8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?</p>	<p>CC/Feb2811: There is some confusion in the way the project is presented. For instance, under section B2 and B3, we are told the project will develop a mechanism for sharing revenues from the sale of forest credits from future carbon markets with local communities and that this project will help the government market its project on better access to solar energy will be provided through a wide-scale micro-crediting mechanism. But these do not show up in the project framework Table B. Solar energy projects belong under CC-3, and microfinance may be in different SFM outcomes/outputs. Thus, it appears the project is not aligned appropriately to the results framework. Please be more clear where the crediting and solar energy funding is coming from. CC/Mar2411: Yes, thank you for the clarifications.</p>	
	<p>9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?</p>	<p>CC/Feb2811: See response to Q8. Because some parts of the project are described differently in different parts of the PIF, the project is unclear, so it is unclear if the relevant GEF5 objectives are identified, especially in regards to components that may fit better under CC-3 and other outcomes/outputs of SFM. CC/Apr0111: Thank you for the clarifications. The only thing remaining that is needed is a letter of endorsement from the government of Turkey for the policy work is being requested. Please send the letter as soon as possible. This is clarified in response to Question 34. CC/Apr 511: Letter of endorsement has been received. Addressed.</p>	
	<p>10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports</p>	<p>CC/Feb2811: Turkey's National Climate Change Action Plan was to be completed by Sept 2010. Please briefly describe</p>	

	<p>and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?</p>	<p>how this proposed project fits with that plan. Or is that action plan the NAMA for the forestry sector? The focus of this project should be mitigation, rather than adaptation.</p> <p>Turkey has a special status in the FCCC. "Turkey's special conditions have been recognized with the 26/CP.7 article at the 7th Conference of Parties in Marakech. Turkey will only be able to benefit from NAMAs or similiar mitigation mechanisms if it is able to convince the international parties of the UNFCCC of its special conditions and become recognized as a developing country in the post-2012 climate regime." Please be clear if Turkey has stated what their plans are in the post-2012 climate regime. If there is still uncertainty, how will the proposed project be affected.</p> <p>Also, please in Section A2 be clear about which is "this" policy and which is "the" project, for example in the sentence "The project will establish the know how...needed to implement this policy..." Thank you.</p> <p>CC/Mar2411: Addressed clearly, thank you.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>CC/Feb2811: no, the proposal says there is potential but does not concisely articulate specifically how the capacities developed will contribute to institutional sustainability. Some brief statements of how much mediterranean forests are different or similar to forests of other regions, and how well the MRV systems/management practices developed for the project region are generally expected to apply to the other regions would be useful (also see response to Q17).</p> <p>CC/Mar2411: Yes, this is clear.</p>	

Project Design

<p>12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>CC/Feb2811: The four baseline projects listed in section B1 are useful, but it is unclear how much of these are part of the project that UNDP is proposing as the GEF project which seems to be described in B2. Perhaps all of them are, and a clear statement saying so would be very useful. It is not clear how the solar energy access comes from and where the micro-crediting program fits in. Thinning listed in the table in section B2 does not always provide carbon benefits, in fact it may reduce carbon benefits but this very much depends on circumstances. Also in the table, why does reforestation focus on areas with crown cover 10-15% rather than nonstocked areas (lower than 10% cover)? Also see response to Q13. CC/Mar2411: Yes, thank you for the useful response and changes.</p>	
<p>13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>CC/Feb2811: The main problems seem to be addressed although more work on specifics is needed. The current status of a forest inventory and monitoring system in Turkey is not described. Given the reporting to FAO, and the real time GIS for forests and fires and pest control, one would think there is quite a basic forest inventory system that would fit very well into an MRV system for carbon and biodiversity. Please briefly describe the status.</p> <p>The footnotes in this section (B1) are a bit confusing because the numbers are repeated, but just to say: the footnote about the Government's definition of forests running contrary to FAO's is appreciated but that there is a difference isn't that surprising. Forests can have less than ten percent cover as long as they have not been converted to another land use. It appears FAO may want to call these "other wooded land" but it is common to continue to call this kind of area forest.</p>	

		<p>Some of the data and assumptions may not be sound. For example, the CO2e emissions related to illegal logging, including the amount for fuel needs, seems very low by at least a factor of 3. Did the 2000 forest fires really "destroy" 15,000 ha of forest or are the areas just burned to some degree? The fire statistics seem to include more than just the Mediterranean forest area. Are these areas of forest fires truly forest? Sometimes wildfire statistics are reported as forest fires and wildfire estimates may include shrubland and grassland. How much carbon was emitted as a result of the forests being affected by insects? The actual effect may not be that great, depending on the insect and level of infestation. Please reconcile how many hectares of forest land are considered to be in the Mediterranean region of Turkey. Baseline project #1 lists 10.5 million ha, whereas first sentence of B1 says 7 million. This is not meant to be a comprehensive list, please recheck estimates. Your initial effort is appreciated, improvement is needed.</p> <p>02/28/11 IG: Please clarify the estimates of illegal logging. B1 estimates 71,100 m3/yr illegally logged c.f. B2 Project Scenario of 747 ha avoided illegal logging. 03/28/11 IG: Addressed</p> <p>CC/Mar2411: yes, much clearer.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>CC/Feb2811: it is unclear. As the PIF documents available for download on the GEF website state, in Table B grant types should not be mixed (that is TA and Investments are not to be mixed as they are in component 3). The expected outputs in Table B do not seem to line up with Table A. In component 1, what does MRV for Med. Forests developed mean?</p>	

		<p>Is this an MRV system with protocols that results in carbon estimates for accounting? How does the MRV in component 1 related to the MMR in component 2. Some of these items seem national level and directed at more than just "high conservation value forests in the Med." as the title and project objective in Table B states. Please reconsider the title--or one, just saying "the Mediteranean" instead of "the mediterranean region of Turkey" sounds very clearly like you are managing forests in the Mediterranean Sea, rather than on land. (this is a problem in other places in the document) In component 3, it is stated that the carbon benefits will be calculated at the preparatory stage. Actually the PIF is a preparatory stage. However, my main concern is that there also be more precise carbon estimates at mid-term and at final project. That is, I am expecting the MRV or MMR or whatever system to provide carbon benefit estimates, or improved carbon benefit estimates for the protected areas. Please revise in light of these and other comments in this review, as well as any other issues you may notice.</p> <p>In terms of soundness, the project is missing an important, relevant opportunity to demonstrate how a payment scheme (such as the micro-credit scheme where it can only be inferred that logging will be reduced, or the activity mentioned in B3 about mechanism for sharing revenues from carbon markets) benefits forest carbon.</p> <p>02/28/11 IG: Illegal logging is identified in B1 as a key threat but does not feature prominently in the project framework. 03/28/11 IG: Addressed</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>CC/Mar2411: yes, thank you for the clarifications. It wasn't necessary to be quite so detailed in some places, such as in revised output 1.3; I was only looking for simply whether the MRV in component 1 was more policy development or a development of the actual system. However, the details about the micro-credit scheme are very important. Please note that "Finance for baseline activities is included [as cofinancing only] when such activities are essential for achieving the GEF objectives and are managed as an integral part of the same project, which would be described in the project document;" (GEF/C.20/6, Cofinancing, para. 14a). If the micro-credit activity does not meet this definition, then it should not be used as co-financing. Please be clear about this at time of CEO endorsement. Addressed.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?</p>	<p>CC/Feb2811: It isn't clear if the additional activities are complementary to address the problems. please be clear how the activities listed in B2 differ from or are related to those listed in B1. For instance, B1 indicates the government has pest control program and a forest fire fighting system with a fairly nice budget for the area of forest, and yet B2 indicates two pest warning systems in forests of this region; just how many pests systems are warranted by the expected pest problems? The amount of CO2 lost from fire and illegal logging outweighs the pest component. Cost-effectiveness may show that a pest system isn't that cost-effective in terms of CO2. A US\$28million dollar project can do quite a bit in terms of MRV/REDD+/LULUCF system and demonstration in a country of 21 million ha of forest. Would there be a chance that natural fire risk would grow if families stopped collecting fuelwood? If the chance is large, please address.</p>	

		<p>In terms of complementary activities, the project is missing an important, relevant opportunity to demonstrate how a payment scheme (such as the micro-credit scheme where it can only be inferred that logging will be reduced, or the activity mentioned in B3 about mechanism for sharing revenues from carbon markets) could work, and how it would benefit forest carbon.</p> <p>CC/Mar2411: The many appreciated modifications to the text contribute to helping evaluate this question. In terms of the cost-effectiveness for pest centers, the information on dollars/tCO_{2e} is appreciated. It is clear further consideration of relative cost-effectiveness and benefits is needed, which would logically take place during the PPG stage. Also STAP may have comments. By CEO endorsement, please refine the information about cost-effectiveness and benefits of the pest centers. On a related topic, the GEF is developing a policy on safeguards, which many implementing agencies have, and the safeguards will likely include pest management safeguards. Information about the safeguards to be used is also expected at CEO endorsement. Thank you for the additional information, this is addressed.</p>	
	<p>16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>CC/Feb2811: The general approach to the current carbon benefits at this stage is generally acceptable. However, some of the estimates seem way off, for example, the CO_{2e} emissions related to illegal logging, including the amount for fuel needs, seems very low by at least a factor of 3. The CO₂ amount emitted specifically due to logging for fuelwood seems too low in the table in B2. Please check this again. However, because this project is about MRV or MMR</p>	

		<p>development, a more precise more landscape specific approach is expected to be used for carbon benefits reported later in the project.</p> <p>CC/Mar2411: For SFM projects, activities are to show carbon benefits. For CEO endorsement, all carbon benefits should be recorded in the tracking tool including for component 3, and methods documented. Benefits currently listed as avoided emissions 123,591tCO₂/yr, and increased sequestration of 7,340 tC/yr. Over 10 years, this is 1.3 million tCO₂.</p>	
	<p>17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>	<p>CC/Feb2811: Thank you for the cost-effectiveness calculations in A1. Until the carbon benefit estimates have any sort of precision though, these are just guides. More importantly, the cost-effectiveness is about this project approach. Looking at FCPF estimates for REDD-readiness, and considering the program that Turkey already seems to have (based on what is presented about fire, GIS system, and pests), one would think \$28 million should be able to deliver a MRV protocols for carbon and areas (for land use change which speaks to both carbon and biodiversity) for all forests, and provide demonstrations regionally too, as well as the biodiversity areas. Considering that \$3million is already spent on pest control, and there is so little CO₂ emission relatively speaking associated with that, are 2 pest centers justified just in the Mediteranean area alone? The fire fighting system already has a budget of what US\$2 per ha which is really quite notable funding already. Since the forests are mostly people-caused, the cost-effectiveness would be in getting people to stop lighting wildfires and less would be needed to fight the fires. Please explain how this particular project is cost effective given that parts of it seem very expensive compared to other programs and given the benefits.</p>	

		<p>In terms of cost-effective, it appears that the project could in a cost-effective way demonstrate how a payment scheme (such as the micro-credit scheme where it can only be inferred that logging will be reduced, or the activity mentioned in B3 about mechanism for sharing revenues from carbon markets) could work and how it would benefit forest carbon.</p> <p>CC/Mar2411: Thank you for the clarification. Some of the discussion on cost-effectiveness has ended up in Q15. There is still some uncertainty about the cost-effectiveness of the pest centers relative to cost-effectiveness of dealing with other problems. However, perhaps STAP will address this issue, and as stated in Q15, this topic should be reconsidered at time of CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?</p>	<p>CC/Feb2811: If the description is clear, there is not much in the way of socio-economic benefits being delivered to these communities which "are amongst the poorest in Turkey". A solar energy device per family from a US \$28million project doesn't seem like much. If fires are often set by people, can the numbers of fires be reduced by improving socioeconomic benefits? Roughly, how much sharing of revenues from future carbon markets with local communities will be needed to make a meaningful difference in terms of final impacts on global environmental benefits? Will families have to move when the protected areas and corridors are established? Please clarify.</p> <p>CC/Mar2411: As noted, additional details are expected at time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>02/28/11 IG: Please clarify whether local community livelihoods will be impacted by restrictions on land use e.g. grazing, NTFP</p>	

		<p>collection and if any actions are planned to provide alternatives. 03/28/11 IG: Addressed</p>	
	<p>19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?</p>	<p>CC/Feb2811: Considering the women are described as increasingly acting as household heads in forest villages, which are among the poorest, please consider specific activities targeted at gender issues The proposed project seems no better than the business as usual scenario.</p> <p>"UNDP Turkey Country Programme Document (CPD) recognizes gender as a cross cutting issue that should be mainstreamed in all programmatic areas of interventions. As a result of UNDP's work towards the promotion of gender equality in Turkey UNDP's contributions have been recognized by the Turkish Government, NGOs, academia, and beneficiaries. As the main activities undertaken in 2008 we can highlight the continuous support for the promotion of women's entrepreneurship in the GAP Region as well as the advocacy for the promotion of women's participation in politics and decision making in Turkey, the awareness building activities and the capacity development activities for women candidates for local elections and local media in 14 provinces, including the network promotion among women's movement through the creation of platforms for women politicians regardless party lines. On the field of women's economic empowerment UNDP works with men and women for gender equality"</p> <p>"...Despite the numerous advancements, particularly in the constitution, the Criminal Code, the Civil Code and the Labour Act, the implementation and de facto realization of these rights, is still a</p>	

challenge [in Turkey], which is also reflected in the basic development indicators for women, that are far behind to comparable MICs and much further behind the EU member states.

An important progress in advancing women's empowerment and gender equality in 2008 was the National Action Plan on Gender Equality covering the period of 2008-2013 and prepared in the framework of the Twinning Project "Promoting Gender Equality implemented by the General Directorate on the Status of Women. The Action Plan specifies targets for ministries and other national agencies for promoting gender equality. Among the main challenges we can highlight the low participation in politics (both national and local) and in decision making in general, high and increasing unemployment among young women (with consequent loss of confidence and vision as well as decreasing models for encouraging young women's advancement); and high (albeit lowering) acceptance towards violence against women... Other challenging data on women's lack of advancement and empowerment according to the General Directorate on the Status of Women in Turkey include:

- 57.2 % of women work in the agriculture sector and 50 % of the women in agriculture sector are part of family work force without pay;
- One out of every three women is a victim of violence;
- 63 % of women between the ages of 15 and 19 approve violence against women."

Given the problems, there should clearly be opportunities for socioeconomic benefits for women especially in forest villages.

In terms of indigenous people, if there are

		<p>none, then please state that. CC/Mar2411: Yes, this is more clear given the additional information, with more details expected at CEO endorsement. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>20. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>CC/Feb2811: --Although there may be difficulties in launching the micro-credit scheme, it isn't clear this is part of the project, and it doesn't seem to be that major of a risk. The amount of illegal logging in general was about 4 times that of illegal fuelwood collecting; one would think the failure to reduce illegal logging is closer to a major risk. --I would think a major risk would be that the Kyoto Protocol would not be continued after 2012. What would that mean to this project? Is a mitigation plan needed for that possibility? --There seems to be uncertainty about Turkey's plans and in the post-2012 climate regime. (see response to Q 10). What does that uncertainty mean to this project, and what are your initial thoughts in mitigating that risk? CC/Mar2411: Yes, thank you. One item to include at time of CEO endorsement is the effect that ecotourism may have on increasing GHG emissions due to travel related emissions, and what will be done to mitigate those emissions. Cleared.</p> <p>02/28/11 IG: Is no risk attached to the project being unable to influence change in land management practices by local communities and the private sector e.g. burning grazing land. 03/28/11 IG: Addressed</p>	
	<p>21. Is the provided documentation consistent?</p>	<p>CC/Feb2811: There appear to be some inconsistencies in the documentation, such as the solar energy access in one place and not the other, and area of forests in the Mediterranean region. This is not a comprehensive list. CC/Mar2411: Yes, addressed.</p>	

	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?	C/Feb2811: Government roles are clearly identified. Please provide information on the role of CSO and local communities in particular describing how existing land-users will be involved in determining the mechanism for sharing revenues from sale of future carbon credits and how they may be involved in an MRV or "MMR" scheme. CC/Mar2411: Okay. More details about the process being used to involve existing landowners and local inhabitants expected at CEO endorsement.	
	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	CC/Feb2811: Several initiatives and projects are mentioned, thank you. However, some of the linkages are unclear, such as to the work being done on a financial mechanism for sharing carbon credit revenue, the solar energy access work, how specifically this project links with the \$US54 million fire program and US\$3million program for pest infestation, etc, as well as any connections to the UNDP program on mainstreaming gender. CC/Mar2411: The text modified in response to this and other comments have made this clear. Addressed.	
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	CC/Feb2811: It is unclear if the arrangement is adequate. The involvement of CSOs, and local communities especially in terms of gender considerations lacks detail. CC/Mar2411: Clear at this stage. More details are expected at time of CEO endorsement.	
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding	CC/Feb2811: project management costs	

Project Financing	level for project management cost appropriate?	are actual, and yet all project management costs are assigned to the climate change focal area. Please assign actual estimated management costs to the focal area as appropriate. Although not required at the PIF stage, a plan (and budget) for M&E for the GEF project will be expected before CEO endorsement. CC/Mar2411: Yes, this is now clear. Addressed.	
	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle?	CC/Feb2811: see responses to Q15 and Q17. Also, the collective amount for component 1 seems high, depending on what "MRV for Med. forest developed" means. If this is a monitoring system, it may belong under Investment. CC/Mar2411: Yes, this is now clear, thank you.	
	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.	CC/Feb2811: Please do not mix grants and in-kind, if at all possible. Co-financing: Gov grant: US\$13.3 m Govt In-kind: 6m Agency grant: 0.64m CSO grant: 0.11m CSO inkind:0.25m Others mixed: 0.6m TOTAL US\$21,000,000 GEF cofinance ratio = 1:2.94 Turkey received a US\$700 million loan from World Bank in 2010. It includes supporting Turkey's National Climate Change Strategy following the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol in February 2009. CC/Mar2411: Thank you for the clarification. Addressed.	
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	CC/Feb2811: see responses to Q28. In Component 2, US\$17.5 million would go a long way towards national REDD readiness and demonstrations on the total 21 million hectares of forest and other wooded land that Turkey has, especially given the existing GIS system, fire protection system, and pest control	

		<p>program they are described as having. How does this relate to the "MRV for Med. forests developed" in component 1? Please explain why the total costs for component 2 are so high. If it costs \$17.5m for about 0.45 million ha, at that rate it will take \$820million for all the forests in Turkey.</p> <p>CC/Mar2411: Yes, thank you, the revisions contribute to making it easier to evaluate this question. Addressed.</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	<p>CC/Feb2811: Tracking tool for CC has not been included. Although not required at the PIF stage, a plan (and budget) for M&E for the GEF project will be expected before CEO endorsement (see Q32). CC/Mar2411: Addressed, the appropriate tracking tools will be included at CEO endorsement.</p>	
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>CC/Mar0411: In summary, the general concept of an integrated approach for generating multiple environmental benefits is of interest, but please respond to the issues listed in the review sheet.</p> <p>To mention main issues again: The concept appears to have a rigorous technical MRV and policy basis for REDD+ and LULUCF. However, the concept is currently missing the opportunity to demonstrate how a carbon payment scheme would reduce illegal</p>	

		<p>logging, degradation, forest emissions, etc. Such a demonstration fits well in the SFM incentive. Forest-edge communities are described as the poorest in Turkey, and women as a group are described as especially affected. Targeting such a demonstration to improve the socio-economic well-being of forest villages and especially women and showing the impact in terms of CO2 emission reduction would be a notable activity.</p> <p>Also, clarity or more consideration is needed, especially in terms of 1) the role of key stakeholders, in particular the role of CSOs and local communities, 2) cost-effectiveness, and 3) project framework.</p> <p>CC/April111: GEFSEC requests a letter of endorsement from the government of Turkey for the policy work listed in Component 1, in particular output 1.2 "set of policies and standards for NAMAs..." Please send this letter as soon as possible.</p> <p>Other comments have for the most part been addressed. A list of items to consider at CEO endorsement is listed in #35.</p> <p>CC/Apr 511: Letter of endorsement has been received. Approval is recommended.</p> <p>A list of items to consider at CEO endorsement is listed in #35.</p>	
	<p>35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>At time of CEO endorsement, among other items please ensure the following is discussed appropriately: 1) pest management safeguards, 2) involvement of landowners and local inhabitants, 3) opportunities for women, 4) the use of the micro-crediting scheme as cofinancing, 5) the effect that proposed ecotourism is expected to have on greenhouse gas benefits due to tourism-related emissions, and how these will be mitigated, and 6) document methodology at this stage and</p>	

		include all carbon benefits. SFM projects are expected to have carbon benefits so include carbon from all activities including the biodiversity activities. As the project proceeds the MRV activities should result in more precise carbon benefits for the project.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 28, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 01, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 05, 2011	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.