

# 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:** 4469

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Turkey

**PROJECT TITLE:** Integrated Approach to Management of Forests in Turkey, with Demonstration in High Conservation Value Forests in the Mediterranean Region

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** General Directorate of Forestry; Ministry of Environment and 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 UNDP's proposal "Integrated approach to management of forests in Turkey, with demonstration in high conservation value forests in the Mediterranean region". STAP is supportive of this initiative, and provides suggestions on how UNDP can further strengthen project development.

1. Literature and methodologies exist for measurement and monitoring carbon stocks in forests (For example - IPCC guidelines for LULUCF(2003) and AFOLU (2006), GOF-C-GOLD, Ravindranath and Ostwald (2008), and others.). Therefore, it is not clear why a specific methodology is required for Turkey, while the global and scientifically accepted methodologies are applicable to different countries and forests types.
2. The GEF funded a project to develop methods, guidelines and toolkits for estimation and monitoring of carbon stock changes or CO2 emissions/removals (Carbon Benefits Project). The methods are being pilot tested, and the results may be available for use in this project. STAP, therefore, strongly encourages UNDP to inquire further about the Carbon Benefits Project with the GEF Secretariat.
3. The component on improved tree species management is a long term research objective, requiring decades of monitoring. UNDP may wish to consider the feasibility of such a component.
4. What baseline methodology will be used to enable Turkey's readiness in future carbon markets, and to assist Turkey develop a series of forest based mitigation projects? Currently, the CDM afforestation and reforestation methodologies are available, and could be considered for the proposed mitigation projects in Turkey. However, it is relevant to note there are no globally accepted methodologies for developing baselines for REDD+ projects. Turkey could adopt these methods when they become available.
5. It is commendable that the project has considered the potential impacts of climate change on the forests. Even though climate change may not impact forests during the period of the project, it is desirable to adopt dynamic global vegetation models to assess the impacts of climate change in the short and medium term.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. <b>Consent</b>	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing 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>	<p>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:</p> <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> <p>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.</p>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>