

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: April 25, 2012

Screeners: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4583

PROJECT DURATION :

COUNTRIES : Turkey

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Land Management and Climate Friendly Agriculture

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MOEF)

Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA)

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): **Minor revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the FAO's proposal "Sustainable land management and climate-friendly agriculture" in Turkey. The proposal is scientifically justified on the basis of its draft project framework (including objective and components), the problem statement, the narrative description of the baseline, and the expected global environmental benefits. However, STAP believes the proposal could be strengthened further in the following ways “

1. In general, the project framework is defined clearly. Nonetheless, STAP recommends reviewing carefully the outcomes and outputs, since these appear to be transposed in many instances (example “ 2.3 appears to be an outcome and not an output.). STAP would expect to see quantified outputs of the project in the Expected Outputs column; and rather broader changes to which the Outputs will contribute in the Expected Outcomes column. Also, STAP recommends adding output indicators to the project framework.

2. STAP welcomes and appreciates the global environmental benefits defined explicitly in the proposal. Undoubtedly, the table under incremental reasoning is very useful as it demonstrates clearly the intended multiple benefits the project intends to achieve through each intervention. However, STAP recommends strongly identifying indicators for each global benefit during the project development, as well as specifying how the indicators will be measured and monitored during the project implementation. For carbon benefits, FAO's EX-ACT is mentioned briefly in the project framework, but it is not raised further in the proposal “ for example, under the incremental reasoning. Therefore, STAP encourages the project developers to specify further the carbon measuring tool(s) that will be used under incremental reasoning, as well as other methods that will serve to track the delivery of the intended biodiversity, land use, and climate benefits.

3. Soil salinity is only very briefly touched upon in the proposal (e.g. one mention in Table on p. 11) and does not appear in either the baseline description or barrier analysis. Yet, problems caused by increasing salinity and salt crusts are commonly reported for the KCB and they require very specific management techniques “ see Driessen, P.M. and Schoorl, R (2006). Mineralogy and Morphology of Salt Efflorescence on Saline Soils in the Great Konya Basin, Turkey. J. Soil Science 24(4): 436-442. Salinity is an aspect that has also been noticed to have increased in conjunction with increased abstraction of groundwater and with increasing aridity (climate change) in this already-dry area. STAP suggests that this omission be addressed, especially as it relates closely to climate change..

4. Component 1 will be a major challenge, involving substantial changes in land use, crops, water use and livelihoods of local communities. The description of this component is one short paragraph in the PIF. STAP has concerns that the

complexities involved in rehabilitation of degraded land are under-estimated. For example, rehabilitation is far more costly financially than protection of productive land from becoming degraded, Who will bear these costs; will they be sustainable; how are the innovative technologies to be chosen and evaluated; what impact will there be on local land users; have gender issues been considered? Simply trying to implement a number of innovative technologies will not generate rehabilitated land “ as many studies have shown from other dryland areas. Choosing the most degraded areas “ such as saline-alkaline sites “ will likely be a failure because of intractable soil chemistry.

5. In component 1, STAP recommends referring to its advisory document on "Environmental Certification and the Global Environment Facility" for its activity on certification of restored forests and rangeland landscapes. STAP's advisory document contains several key messages that it recommends including in the project design in order to minimize the threats of certification effectiveness. The document also summarizes the evidence base for the effectiveness of certification programs to generate global and local environmental benefits. Once more, STAP suggests accounting for this evidence in the project design. STAP's advisory document can be found at “ www.unep.org/stap

6. Also, STAP recommends specifying further the improved pasture management activities in component 1, or component 2. Currently, this activity is only briefly listed in the project framework (under component 1), and in the table under incremental reasoning. This gap leads the proposal to be unclear how livestock will be integrated within a conservation agriculture system. For example, STAP suggests addressing how the potential competing demands will be addressed for crop residues “ that is, the need for sufficient biomass to protect and feed the soil, as well as serve as livestock feed.

7. The proposal indicates climate change as a significant threat to sustainable land management and its contribution to delivering multiple global benefits in the Konya Closed Basin. A study by Ramazan Topak and Bilal Acar of Selcuk University, Agricultural Faculty, Konya, reports on the unsustainable conjunction of increasing water demand, limited groundwater reserves and climate change. To support further this reasoning, STAP suggests adding climate change projections, or trends, in the proposal. For this data, as well as adaptation measures that could be mainstreamed across the various interventions, the project developers may wish to consult the World Bank Climate Change Knowledge Portal- <http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm>

<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.