



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2021 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

| | |
|--|---|
| Region: | Europe and Central Asia |
| Country (ies): | Turkey |
| Project Title: | Conservation and Sustainable Management of Turkey's Steppe Ecosystem |
| FAO Project Symbol | GCP/TUR/061/GFF |
| GEF ID: | 5657 |
| GEF Focal Area (s): | Biodiversity |
| Project Executing Partners: | Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry(MAF); General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks; General Directorate of Plant Production |
| Project Duration: | Four (4) years |
| Project coordinates: (Ctrl+Click here) | <i>This section should be completed by:</i> -Projects with 1st PIR -Projects could re-submit the coordinates if they have changed, or if the PMU now has more updated coordinates |

Milestone Dates:

| | |
|--|---|
| GEF CEO Endorsement Date: | 28 April 2016 |
| Project Implementation Start Date/EOD : | 15 January 2017 |
| Proposed Project Implementation End Date /NTE¹: | 15 January 2021 |
| Revised project implementation end date (if applicable)² | 30 June 2022 (<u>MTR recommendation:</u> one-year no-cost extension to the project to provide more time to successfully deliver outputs and maximize progress towards outputs and outcomes (<u>Annex II- OED Management Response</u>). <u>Project Steering Committee Decision:</u> 1.5 year extension of the project (until June 2022) as per the MTR recommendation and the impact of COVID-19 (<u>Annex III- 17 April 2020 4th Project Steering Committee MoM</u>). <u>Steering Committee Decision:</u> additional 3 months extension of the project (until September 2022) as per the impact of COVID-19 (<u>Annex IV- 25 May 2021 5th Project Steering Committee Decision</u>) |

¹ As per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Actual Implementation End Date³: | N/A |
|--|-----|

Funding

| | |
|---|------------|
| GEF Grant Amount (USD): | 2 328 676 |
| Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc:⁴ | 9 510 000 |
| Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2021 (USD m): | 1 873 173 |
| Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2021⁵ | 14 306 347 |

Review and Evaluation

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee Meeting: | 25 May 2021 |
| Expected Mid-term Review date:⁶ | - |
| Actual Mid-term review date: | N/A (November 2019) |
| Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022):⁷ | N/A |
| Expected Terminal Evaluation Date: | - |
| Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022): | No |
| Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁸ | Yes – GEF Tracking Tool |

³ Actual date at which project implementation ends - only for projects that have ended.

⁴ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

⁵ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁶ The MTR should take place about halfway between EOD and NTE – this is the expected date.

⁷ Please note that the FAO GEF Coordination Unit should be contacted six months prior to the expected MTR date.

⁸ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium-Sized projects = < USD 2M at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programmes approved on or after 1 July 2018. Also projects and programmes approved from 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion.

Ratings

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative): | MS |
| Overall implementation progress rating: | MS |
| Overall risk rating: | M |

Status

| | |
|--|---------|
| Implementation Status <i>(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i> | 4th PIR |
|--|---------|

Project Contacts

| Contact | Name, Title, Division/Institution | E-mail |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Project Manager/Coordinator | Nihan Yenilmez Arpa, NPC (FETUR) | Nihan.YenilmezArpa@fao.org |
| Lead Technical Officer | Peter Pechacek, Forestry Officer (FAOSEC) | Peter.Pechacek@fao.org |
| Budget Holder | Viorel Gutu, SEC-SRC and FAO Representative in Turkey (FAOSEC) | Viorel.Gutu@fao.org |
| GEF Funding Liaison Officer | Hernan M. Gonzalez, Technical Officer (OCBD) Chris Dirkmaat, Executive Officer (TCIAD) | Hernan.Gonzalez@fao.org Chris.Dirkmaat@fao.org |

2. Progress Towards Achieving Project Objectives and Outcome (DO)

(All inputs in this section should be cumulative from project start, not annual)

| Project objective and Outcomes (as indicated at CEO Endorsement) | Description of indicator(s) ⁹ | Baseline level | Mid-term target ¹⁰ | End-of-project target | Level at 30 June 2021 | Progress rating ¹¹ |
|---|---|--|-------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| Project objective: Improve the conservation of Turkey's steppe ecosystems through effective protected area management and mainstreaming steppe biodiversity conservation into production landscapes. | | | | | | |
| Outcome 1: Effectiveness of the protected area system to conserve steppe biodiversity increased | Management effectiveness of protected areas increased according to the total score of the GEF5-BD monitoring effectiveness tracking tool (METT) Objective One | METT score TekTek: 20 Kizilkuyu: 32 Karacadag: 11 | Not specified | METT score TekTek: 40 Kizilkuyu: 64 Karacadag: 22 | METT score TekTek: 28 Kizilkuyu: 51 Karacadag: 13 | MS ¹² |
| | Established a monitoring programme for three pilot sites | TekTek: 0 Kizilkuyu: 0 Karacadag: 0 | Not specified | TekTek: 1 Kizilkuyu: 1 Karacadag: 1 | TekTek: 0 Kizilkuyu: 0 Karacadag: 0 | MU |
| | Total hectares of steppe area contained within the core protected areas of Şanlıurfa Province | Total hectares: 40 000 ha TekTek: 20 000 Kizilkuyu: 20 000 Karacadag: 0 | Not specified | Total hectares: 50 000 ha TekTek: 20 000 Kizilkuyu: 20 000 Karacadag: 10 000 | Total hectares: 35 337 ha TekTek: 20 000 Kizilkuyu: 15 337 Karacadag: 0 | MU ¹³ |

⁹ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

¹⁰ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework); therefore, this column should only be filled when relevant.

¹¹ Use the GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Marginally Satisfactory** (MS), **Marginally Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU).

¹² METT was scored during the MTR period. It will be rescored at the end of the project.

¹³ The border for the Kizilkuyu WDA was revised in 2020 and the total area changed to 15 337 ha due to conflict between local administrations and PA management.

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---------------|---|--|------------------|
| | Total hectares of steppe area conserved within the protected area buffer zones of Şanlıurfa Province | Total hectares: 0 ha TekTek: 0 Kizilkuyu: 0 Karacadag: 0 | Not specified | Total hectares: 60 000 ha TekTek: 5 000 Kizilkuyu: 5 000 Karacadag: 50 000 | Total hectares: 19 396 TekTek: 13 732 Kizilkuyu: 5 664 Karacadag: 0 | U |
| Outcome 2: Steppe biodiversity conservation mainstreamed into production landscapes | Total hectares managed according to the improved sustainable grazing management programme | Total hectares with sustainable grazing management programme: 0 ha TekTek: 0 Kizilkuyu: 0 Karacadag: 0 | Not specified | Total hectares under the sustainable grazing management programme: 110 000 ha TekTek: 25 000 Kizilkuyu: 25 000 Karacadag: 60 000 | Total hectares under the sustainable grazing management programme: 0 TekTek: 0 Kizilkuyu: 0 Karacadag: 0 | U ¹⁴ |
| | Number of pastoralists with enhanced steppe conservation knowledge participating in sustainable grazing management programmes | Total pastoralists with enhanced steppe conservation capacity: 0 TekTek: 0 Kizilkuyu: 0 Karacadag: 0 | Not specified | Total pastoralists with enhanced steppe conservation capacity: 500 TekTek: 200 Kizilkuyu: 100 Karacadag: 200 | Total pastoralists with enhanced steppe conservation capacity: 250 TekTek: 100 Kizilkuyu: 50 Karacadag: 100 | MS ¹⁵ |
| | Total number of free-ranging gazelle in Şanlıurfa Province | Total free-roaming gazelle: 200 individuals | Not specified | Total free-roaming gazelle: 300 individuals | A total of 375 <i>Gazella marica</i> were recorded by the end of May 2021 in Kizilkuyu WDA. | HS |

¹⁴ The sustainable grazing management programme was begun in March 2021 under the “Development of Grazing Management Plans and Management Plans for the Kizilkuyu Wildlife Development Area, TekTek Mountains National Park and (Sanliurfa part of) Karacadag”. A total of 118 732 ha is planned to support sustainable grazing for the project sites (TekTek Mountains NP: 37 732 (20 000 ha core +13 732 ha buffer), Kizilkuyu: 21 000 ha (15 337 ha core+ 5 664 ha buffer), Karacadag: 60 000 (12 835.53 ha core, 24 366.75 ha buffer zone and 22 797.72 ha sustainable use zones)

¹⁵ Several publications were drafted and produced in 2020 and training programmes for pastoralists were elaborated to increase capacity for pastoralists through development and implementation of the project. “Training Manual and Resource Materials under the Model Steppe Conservation Training Programme for Pastoralists”. Implementation of the programmes will be completed by the end-July 2021.

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---------------|--|---|------------------|
| | Number of hectares within and proximate to protected areas that are less severely overgrazed. | Number of overgrazed hectares: TekTek: 17 000 Kizilkuyu: 15 000 Karacadag: 60 000 | Not specified | Number of overgrazed hectares: TekTek: 5 000 Kizilkuyu: 5 000 Karacadag: 20 000 | TekTek: This figure is unknown, because the monitoring is not yet operational. Estimated size is therefore as in the 3rd PIR. Kizilkuyu: This figure is unknown, because the monitoring is not yet operational. Estimated size is therefore as for the 3 rd PIR. Karacadag: This figure is unknown, because the monitoring is not yet operational. Estimated size is therefore as for the 3 rd PIR. | MU ¹⁶ |
|--|---|--|---------------|--|---|------------------|

¹⁶ Grazing management planning started in March 2021 under the “Development of Grazing Management Plans and Management Plans for the Kizilkuyu Wildlife Development Area, TekTek Mountains National Park and (the Şanlıurfa part of) Karacadag”. A total of 118 732 ha will be allocated to support sustainable grazing for the project sites (TekTek Mountains NP: 37 732 (20 000 ha. core +13 732 ha buffer zone), Kizilkuyu: 21 000 ha (15 33 ha core+ 5 664 ha buffer), Karacadag: 60 000 (12 835.53 ha core, 24 366.75 buffer zone and 22 797.72 ha sustainable use zones) at the end of March 2022. Preparation of a grazing and livestock monitoring programme is now in the final stage. The monitoring programme will then be implemented to monitor and evaluate the results.

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------|---|---|------------------|
| Outcome 3: Enabling environment established for the effective conservation of steppe biodiversity across large landscapes | Total government annual investment in steppe area conservation | Total government annual investment in steppe conservation: Şanlıurfa Province: USD 100 000* National: MFAL: USD 1 million* MFWA: USD 250 000* *Total investment is determined by the Division Directorate of National Parks and the Provincial Directorate of Food, Agriculture and Livestock. | Not specified | Total government annual investment in steppe conservation: Şanlıurfa Province: USD 250 000 National: MAF-GDPP: USD 1.5 million MAF-GDNCNP: USD 500 000 | Total government annual investment in steppe conservation: Total co-financing: USD 14.306.347 | HS |
| | Total number of hectares of steppe ecosystems outside of protected areas conserved from future agricultural and urban expansion as indicated within the GAP strategy | Total hectares planned for cultivation within SE Anatolia: 3.3 million ha* | | Total hectares planned for cultivation within SE Anatolia: 3.7 million ha | Total hectares to be protected from cultivation and agricultural expansion in SE Anatolia (outside of PAs): 3.4 million (FAO-MoAF, 2020. Şanlıurfa Steppe Conservation Strategy and Action Plan). | MS ¹⁷ |

¹⁷ The total meadow-pasture area in the GAP Region (including six provinces) covers 2.2 million ha, while the area covered by steppe forest and brush is 1.5 million ha. The total area of the province of Şanlıurfa covers 1.5 million hectares, 756 000 ha of which is steppe pasture. The Şanlıurfa Steppe Conservation Strategy and Action Plan has been completed and implementation has been initiated in close cooperation with the Şanlıurfa Governorship and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. A protocol to strengthen governance and collaboration which forms the basis for joint action with relevant stakeholders was signed on 25 May 2021. Some 756 000 ha of steppe pastures will be managed strategically in accordance with this protocol. The strategy will be finalized at the end of June 2021 and delivered to all provinces in Turkey together with the GAP Region Agriculture Master Plan.

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|------------------|
| | | *According to the Gap Region Agriculture Master Plan | | | | |
| | Number of government policies fully integrating steppe conservation principles and practices | <p>Government policies integrating improved steppe conservation: GDNCNP National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan: 0</p> <p>National MAF Annual Strategic Performance Document: 0</p> <p>Şanlıurfa Governor's five-year development plan: 0</p> | | <p>Government policies integrating improved steppe conservation: GDNCNP National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan: 1</p> <p>National MAF Annual Strategic Performance Document: 1</p> <p>Sanliurfa Governor's five-year development plan: 1</p> | <p>GDNCNP National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan: 1 (MAF, 2019. National Biodiversity Action Plan 2018-2028)</p> <p>National MAF Annual Strategic Performance Document: 1 (MoAF, 2019. Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry 2019-2023 Strategic Plan)</p> <p>Şanlıurfa Governor's five-year development plan: 1 (2020. Sanliurfa Vision 2023 Feasibility Report)</p> | HS ¹⁸ |

¹⁸ The Şanlıurfa Steppe Conservation Strategy and Action Plan was completed and implementation has been initiated in close cooperation with the Şanlıurfa Governorship and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. A protocol signed between the Şanlıurfa Governorship and extension offices of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry on 25 May 2021 incorporated the strategy into the Şanlıurfa Governorship's five-year development plan.

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings

| Outcome | Action(s) to be taken | By whom? | By when? |
|---|---|--|---|
| Outcome 1: Effectiveness of protected area system to conserve steppe biodiversity increased 1. Management effectiveness of protected areas increased according to the total score of the GEF5-BD monitoring effectiveness tracking tool (METT) 2. Established a monitoring programme for three pilot sites 3. Total hectares of the steppe area contained within the core protected areas of Şanlıurfa Province 4. Total hectares of steppe area conserved within the protected area buffer zones of Şanlıurfa Province | 1. Finalize Guidelines for Assessing the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Protected Areas (PA) including all training related to PA (especially on METT). This will include changing the implementation modality to transfer finalization of the Guidelines from a national consultant to an LoA with an existing partner (Doga Koruma Merkezi, DKM) 2.1. Deliver all tasks related to monitoring under the existing LoA with DKM on time 2.2. Deliver remaining tasks related to monitoring, which are not under the existing LoA with DKM through conclusion of a new service contract 3. Propose the establishment of the Karacadag PA within the limitations agreed at the 2020 SC meeting 4. Adopt the management plans for pilot sites including consideration of buffer zones (finalization of the planning process by the service provider is in progress) by MAF. | 1. Project team and DKM (existing LoA partner for whom a planned service contract will be made) 2.1. DKM (LoA partner) 2.2. DKM 3. National consultant or service contract/LoA (modality TBD, preferably service contract/LoA) 4. ANCEO (contract partner) and MAF | 1. November 2021 2.1. July 2021 2.2. February 2022 3. December 2021 4. March 2022 |
| Outcome 2: Steppe biodiversity conservation mainstreamed into production landscapes 1. Total hectares managed according to | 1. Preparation of the Grazing Management Plans for pilot sites for sustainable grazing management including consideration of buffer zones (finalization of the planning process by the service provider (ANCEO) is in progress) by MAF. | 1. Project team and ANCEO (for development of the plans) and MAF 2. ANCEO and PGlobal (Service providers) in close cooperation with MAF | 1. March 2022 2. March 2022 and September 2021 3. February 2022 |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--------------------------|
| <p>an improved sustainable grazing management programme</p> <p>2. Number of pastoralists with enhanced steppe conservation knowledge participating in sustainable grazing management programmes</p> <p>3. Number of hectares within and proximate to protected areas that are less severely overgrazed</p> | <p>2. Provision of all capacity-building activities to pastoralists listed under the contract for development of the above grazing management plans drafted by ANCEO and PGLOBAL and conducted under the "Training Manual and Resource Materials under the Model Steppe Conservation Training Program For Pastoralist" programme.</p> <p>3. Set the monitoring programme in place</p> | <p>3. Project team and DKM (existing LoA partner - DKM - will be contracted after LoA finalization)</p> | |
| <p>Outcome 3: Enabling environment established for the effective conservation of steppe biodiversity across large landscapes</p> <p>1. Total number of hectares of steppe ecosystems outside of protected areas conserved from future agricultural and urban expansion as indicated within the GAP strategy</p> | <p>1. Review of the GAP region strategy and proposal to integrate the prevention of future agricultural/urban development using a realistic amount of land outside of PAs</p> | <p>1. MAF in close cooperation with the project team</p> | <p>1. September 2021</p> |

3. Progress in Generating Project Outputs (Implementation Progress, IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as planned in the Annual Work Plan)

| Outputs ¹⁹ | Expected completion date ²⁰ | Achievements at each PIR ²¹ | | | | | Implement. status (cumulative) | Comments Describe any variance ²² or challenges in delivering outputs |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|---------|--------------------------------|--|
| | | 1st PIR | 2nd PIR | 3rd PIR | 4th PIR | 5th PIR | | |
| Output 1.1 New steppe protected area formally proposed for establishment and ready to be operationalized. | Y4 | Initiating surveys and assessment of biodiversity in Karacadag, TekTek Mountains NP and Kizilkuyu WDA. Preparing Protected Area Establishment Guidelines. Drafting Management Effectiveness and Stakeholder Engagement Guidelines. | Finalizing surveys and assessment of biodiversity in Karacadag, TekTek Mountains NP and Kizilkuyu WDA. Preparing management effectiveness and stakeholder engagement guidelines. Preparation of nomination dossier. | Undertaking communication activities, raising public awareness, and publishing information materials, strategies, guidelines and other field survey results. Undertaking a series of activities (training, workshops, etc.). | Completing the editing, internal clearance and design of three sets of guidelines: (i) Guidelines for the Establishment of new protected areas; (ii) Guidelines for Assessing the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Protected Areas (iii) Guidelines for Engaging Stakeholders in Managing Protected Areas. | N/A | 55% | <p>The OCCP clearance process is ongoing for the following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Guidelines on the Establishment of Protected Areas ○ Guidelines for Assessing the Effectiveness of Protected Areas ○ Guidelines for Engaging Stakeholders in Managing Protected Areas <p>The International Day of Biodiversity on 22 May (25 May 2021), within the scope of communication activities was organized on 25 May 2021 in Sanliurfa.</p> <p>The output was changed as indicated below in accordance with the MTR recommendation and the 2nd PSC suggestion, taking into consideration this uncertainty and the fact that the legal designation falls outside the control of the project.</p> |

¹⁹ Outputs are described in the project logframe or in updated project revisions. In the event of project revisions resulting from a mid-term review, please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells blank and add the new outputs in the table, explaining the variance in the comments section.

²⁰ As per latest the work plan (latest project revision); for example, Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3).

²¹ Please use the same unity of measures for the project indicators to the extent possible. Please be extremely brief (max. one or two short sentence with main achievements).

²² Variance refers to the difference between expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>Organizing two events at project sites to raise public awareness on the occasion of the International Day of Biodiversity on 22 May (25 May 2021), within the scope of communication activities, efforts to raise public awareness, and the publication of information materials, strategies, guidelines and other field survey results.</p> | | | <p>Previous version: "New steppe protected area established and operational"</p> <p>Modified version: "New steppe protected area proposal submitted for establishment".</p> <p>The modality for preparation of the nomination dossier was changed during 2021, and instead of consultancy, a decision was taken to extend the scope of the existing LoA or sign a new LoA with DKM to prepare the nomination dossier. Due to the proposed new modality, the deadline for finalization of the protected area proposal dossier for Karacadag was extended to the end of 2021.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|-----|-----|---|
| Output 1.2. Effective management plans for three steppe protected areas created and implemented | | <p>Preparing the Guidelines for Protected Area Management Planning.</p> <p>Completing the draft management plan for Kizilkuyu, which revises the existing management plan.</p> | <p>Finalizing and ratifying all three management plans based on the Kizilkuyu management planning experience, and adapting the plans to different formats and needs.</p> <p>Developing specific “Species Action Plans” for managing and conserving important (flag) species.</p> <p>Using the management planning process for capacity building at all levels, by developing guidelines, ensuring the active participation</p> | <p>Finalizing the “Species Action Plans” for managing and conserving important (flag) species.</p> <p>Listing, designing and providing key investments in infrastructure required to operationalize management planning (creating signage, demarcating borders, etc.).</p> <p>Using the management planning process for capacity building at all levels, by developing guidelines, ensuring the active participation of key staff and implementing other capacity-</p> | Completing the editing, internal clearance and design of the Guidelines for Protected Area Management Planning. | N/A | 30% | <p>The guidelines for management planning have been completed and the planning process together with specific “Species Action Plans” for managing and conserving important (flag) species have been initiated (March 2021).</p> <p>As many activities are linked directly to the management planning process, there has been a cumulative delay and the expected achievements have not yet been realized.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|-----|-----|---|

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|-----|---|
| | | | of key staff and implementing other capacity-building activities. | building activities. | | | | |
| Output 1.3. Rigorous monitoring programme for three steppe protected areas established | | Generating and publishing a simple Monitoring Handbook (BD Monitoring Guidelines). | Generating and publishing simple Monitoring Guidelines. Catalysing the establishment of a monitoring group to advise and support protected area managers with the | Catalysing the establishment of a monitoring group to advise and support protected area managers in the design and implementation of a rigorous biodiversity monitoring programme. Preparing a monitoring programme for | Catalysing the establishment of a monitoring group to advise and support protected area managers in the design and implementation of a rigorous biodiversity monitoring programme. Preparing a monitoring programme for | N/A | 50% | <p>The guidelines for BD monitoring have been completed.</p> <p>The current LoA with the DKM was amended and signed on 10 June 2020. The Monitoring Programme was drafted by the LoA partner in close cooperation with FAO and the Ministry team. It was reviewed by the partners at the end of December 2020. Immediately afterwards, the final of the draft Monitoring Programme was developed and finalized by the end of April 2021 according to the LoA (which was granted a no-cost extension).</p> |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|-----|-----|---|
| | | | <p>design and implementation of a rigorous biodiversity monitoring programme.</p> <p>Preparing a monitoring programme for three project sites in accordance with the Monitoring Guidelines and setting in place a monitoring programme for all three protected areas.</p> | <p>three project sites in accordance with the Monitoring Guidelines, and setting in place a monitoring programme for all three protected areas.</p> <p>Providing equipment and tools required to initiate the monitoring programme.</p> | <p>three project sites in accordance with the Monitoring Guidelines is in progress.</p> | | | <p>Establishment of the monitoring programme for the three project sites is under review by the Ministry.</p> <p>A monitoring group to advise and support protected area managers in the design and implementation of a rigorous biodiversity monitoring programme has been listed in the drafted monitoring programme.</p> <p>The equipment and tools required to initiate the monitoring programme have been listed, and technical specifications for purchasing of these equipment have been identified.</p> <p>After finalization of the review process by MAF, direct procurement will be initiated with the DKM in order to commence works on set up of the monitoring programme in accordance with the Monitoring Guidelines and programme.</p> <p>The necessary monitoring equipment will be purchased.</p> |
| Output 2.1 Sustainable grazing management programme operational across three steppe protected areas and | | <p>Preparing the Guidelines on Grazing Planning and Management</p> <p>Analysing ongoing grazing activities and conducting</p> | <p>Guidelines on Grazing Planning and Management.</p> <p>Analysing ongoing grazing activities and conducting baseline</p> | <p>Preparing land use management plans for three sites.</p> <p>Establishing and implementing an effective coordination system between</p> | <p>Guidelines on Grazing Planning and Management</p> <p>Identifying the best grazing management models for each site and preparing</p> | N/A | 35% | <p>Preparation of the Guidelines on Grazing Planning and Management has been completed.</p> <p>Preparation of the Grazing Management Plan and the Land Use Management Plan has recently started.</p> <p>The remaining activities which are ongoing are linked to grazing management demonstrations. This has</p> |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| associated buffer zones | | baseline surveys in each of the protected areas and associated buffer zones concerned with grazing. | surveys in each of the protected areas and associated buffer zones concerned with grazing. Preparing land use management plans for three sites. Establishing and implementing an effective coordination system between government agencies and livestock producers Establishing the Grazing Working Group to ensure that lessons learned are captured and disseminated. | government agencies and livestock producers. Establishing the Grazing Working Group to ensure that lessons learned are captured and disseminated. Developing and implementing a grazing management demonstration programme. Supporting the implementation of the Grazing Management Plan through the necessary equipment and tools. | grazing plans for the three sites. | | | caused a cumulative delay. Therefore, the expected achievements have not yet been realized. |
|----------------------------|--|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----|--|---|--|-----|-----|---|
| Output 2.2 Sustainable grazing management programme impacts monitored at three steppe protected areas | | N/A | <p>Developing a grazing monitoring system and linked BD monitoring programme (Ecosystem monitoring-impact Monitoring, socio-economic and land use applications, and livestock monitoring with linked BD monitoring programme).</p> <p>Developing a Livestock Monitoring Programme and incorporating it into the Grazing Monitoring System.</p> <p>Creating a livestock sales programme linked to “steppe friendly”</p> | <p>Implementing monitoring protocols.</p> <p>Supporting impact monitoring of the sustainable grazing management programme through the necessary equipment and material.</p> | <p>Developing the Livestock Monitoring Programme and incorporating it into the Grazing Monitoring System.</p> <p>Completing livestock monitoring protocols and a baseline analysis with ecological, herd production and social indicators.</p> | N/A | 30% | <p>Preparation of the Guidelines for Grazing and Livestock Monitoring has been completed.</p> <p>The livestock monitoring programme is being developed and a monitoring programme is being produced and put in place for the three project pilot sites under the guidance of the BD Monitoring Guidelines.</p> <p>Development of a grazing monitoring programme for the three project sites will be finalized shortly by the LoA partner after the revision by the Ministry.</p> <p>After finalizing the reviewing process, the implementation stage will be initiated by the modality of direct procurement with the DKM to set up the monitoring program in place according to Monitoring Guideline and Monitoring Programme. The necessary monitoring equipment will be purchased.</p> |
|--|--|-----|--|---|--|-----|-----|---|

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----|--|--|--|-----|-----|--|
| | | | <p>production methods (specified in the Grazing Plan).</p> <p>Developing alternative income-generation opportunities for the three project sites.</p> <p>Completing livestock monitoring protocols and a baseline analysis with ecological, herd production and social indicators.</p> | | | | | |
| Output 2.3 Model steppe conservation training programme for pastoralists emplaced | | N/A | <p>Creating a project training strategy and training programme on steppe management and monitoring.</p> <p>Developing a training</p> | Implementing the training programme in line with demonstrations. | <p>Developing a Training Manual and resource materials for training.</p> <p>Implementing the training programme in line with demonstrations.</p> | N/A | 90% | <p>Although the activities started on time following signature of the contract, implementation of the training programmes has been delayed due to restrictions imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic and have not made the expected progress.</p> <p>A training manual and resource materials for training sessions have been completed. All the planned training programmes are being implemented in line with demonstration, with the</p> |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----|---|--|--|-----|------|---|
| | | | <p>manual and resource materials for training.</p> <p>Developing a training manual and resource materials for training.</p> | | Integrating the training programme into government operations. | | | <p>exception of integration of the training programme into government.</p> <p>An international study visit was the only aspect of the training programme that could not be implemented during this period due to COVID-19 pandemic restrictions.</p> |
| Output 3.1 Şanlıurfa Province steppe conservation strategy and associated enabling environment improvements implemented | | N/A | Establishing the Şanlıurfa Steppe Conservation Technical Working Group under the Pasture Commission. | <p>Designing and developing a Model Steppe Conservation Strategy for the province level (workshops and meetings will be held during the preparation process).</p> <p>Identifying alternative income-generation activities as part of the Steppe Conservation Strategy.</p> | Mainstreaming strategy objectives and priorities into operational budgets, human resources and the policies of local and regional organizations. | N/A | 100% | The Şanlıurfa Steppe Conservation Strategy and Action Plan was completed and implementation has been initiated in close cooperation with the Şanlıurfa Governorship and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. A protocol to strengthen governance and collaboration and form a basis for joint action with the relevant stakeholders was signed on 25 May 2021. |
| Output 3.2 National steppe conservation strategy and associated enabling | | | Establishing a Steppe Conservation Working Group as a joint initiative of the General | Establishing a Steppe Conservation Working Group as a joint initiative of the General | Establishing a Steppe Conservation Working Group as a joint initiative of | N/A | 90% | The strategy has been drafted and approved by the ministry. The only pending action is the mainstreaming of the strategy into national policy and strategy documents, annual plans, etc. This decision must come from the Ministry. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|-----|-----|--|
| environment improvements established | | | Directorates of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF). | Directorates of MAF. Preparing the National Steppe Conservation Strategy for the national level (workshops and meetings will be held during the preparation process). | MFAL and MFWA. Preparing the National Steppe Conservation Strategy for the national level (workshops and meetings will be held during the preparation process). | | | |
| Output 3.3 National steppe conservation training and awareness programme for decision-makers and resource managers | | | Designing and implementing the Steppe Conservation and Management Training Programme for agriculture and national parks extension officers. Organizing annual steppe conservation seminars/ workshops. Preparing and distributing the Model Steppe | Designing and implementing the Steppe Conservation and Management Training Programme for agriculture and national parks extension officers. Organizing an annual steppe conservation seminars/ workshops. Preparing and distributing the Model Steppe Conservation Recommendation | Designing and implementing the Steppe Conservation and Management Training Programme for agriculture and national parks extension officers. Organizing an annual steppe conservation seminars/ workshops. Preparing and distributing the Model Steppe Conservation Recommendation | N/A | 90% | The training programme has been initiated but delays occurred due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Steppe conservation awareness-raising activities including wall painting, the creation of nature/environment corners in schools, kite festivals, and poem and drawing competitions commenced in ten schools within the scope of the LoA. In addition, the 2nd Annual Steppe Conservation Workshop was held in December 2020. Currently, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, certified training for ministry staff and a study visit for decision-makers have been postponed and are pending finalization. Completion of all training programmes is foreseen for the end of July 2021 with the exception of the study visit for decision-makers. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>Conservation Recommendations and Instructions to increase awareness among the 81 Pasture Commissions in Turkey.</p> <p>Generating and publishing training materials.</p> | <p>ns and Instructions to increase awareness among the 81 Pasture Commissions in Turkey.</p> <p>Generating and publishing training materials.</p> | <p>ns and Instructions to increase awareness among the 81 Pasture Commissions in Turkey.</p> <p>Generating and publishing training materials.</p> | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|

4. Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on Project Implementation

Please briefly summarize the main progress in achieving outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):

The preparation of management plans for the pilot sites and the development of species conservation plans are underway. The preparation of grazing management plans is included in the same contract and is being undertaken in parallel.

Due to continuing spread of COVID-19, implementation of the training programs had to be postponed, and, therefore, no planned activities regarding the training programmes were fulfilled in 2020. In order to compensate these unexpected turnouts, no-cost extension amendment was carried out, and, in turn, all foreseen training activities were moved from 2020 to 2021. Even if, the preparation process for guidelines had started in the second year of the project, completion of the guidelines took longer than expected. However, the process has been completed during this period, and final steps are being taken to upload to the system.

The establishment of a monitoring programme for the pilot sites has been drafted under a LOA contract. Drafted monitoring programmes are under revision by the project partners.

Development of a model steppe conservation training programme for pastoralists is underway. The Training Manual and resource materials for training have been drafted. A training curriculum and programmes are being conducted.

The Sanliurfa Steppe Conservation Strategy has been finalized and the Ministry guaranteed its implementation with a signed protocol on 25 May 2021.

The National Steppe Conservation Strategy has been finalized. The only pending action is the mainstreaming of the strategy into national policy which will be prepared by the ministries regarding to the nature conservation and management. Within the current strategies which have been drafted between the years of 2019-2020 were covered partially conservation of the steppe biodiversity conservation. However, full integration will be taken time therefore, it is beyond the project life. ,

Steppe conservation awareness-raising activities such as murals and the creation of nature/environment corners in schools, kite festivals, and inter-school competitions have been undertaken in ten schools. In addition, the 2nd Annual Steppe Conservation Workshop has been held. All expected publications have been drafted and published. International BD Day was celebrated with the participation of the Deputy Minister from MAF in May 2021.

All activities were carried out in close cooperation with the Ministry and key stakeholders through a participatory approach.

What major challenges has the project experienced during this reporting period?

The preparation of LoAs and Technical Specifications for activities (including their amendments) are taking longer than expected due to the time required for preparation, approval and clearance processes. Actions and activities related to recruitment and tendering are also taking longer than expected.

Significant delays in finalizing the reports also occurred due to the time needed for the implementing agency, service provider (SP), and executing partners to make technical revisions.

Due to the unexpected impact of COVID-19 restrictions, a contingency plan has been drafted. Some project activities, including several workshops and meetings, study visits, field excursions, demonstration activities with journalists, education activities, field visits and studies, have been postponed to future dates due to COVID-19 measures.

Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence, and progress should be reported in Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

| | FY2021 Development Objective rating²³ | FY2021 Implementation Progress rating²⁴ | Comments/reasons²⁵ justifying the ratings for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period |
|---|---|---|--|
| Project Manager/ Coordinator | MS | MS | All planned activities including the finalization of National and Sanliurfa steppe conservation strategies, the preparation of training and awareness materials, and the designing and editing of guidelines, were completed. Management and grazing planning which constituted the main activities of the project have been initiated and are underway. Many participatory events and follow-up activities were organized despite COVID-19 restrictions, some activities were postponed due to direct or indirect links with the pandemic. Overall, the project is operational and has managed to conduct several activities that were well received by the project partners. Finally the NPC, the project team and ministry partners are continuing to work in close cooperation in order to speed up project delivery. |

²³ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating:** Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. For more information on rating definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

²⁴ **Implementation Progress Rating:** Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on rating definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

²⁵ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence.

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|--|
| Budget Holder | MS | MS | Due to the COVID 19 pandemic and imposed periodic restrictions in 2020 and 2021, many planned activities had to be postponed on FAO side as well as from LoA partners to carry out certain planned tasks. The project had to be extended twice to complete the activities by September 2022. Despite that delay, the project achieved important objectives, especially finalized a set of guidelines to be implemented by the stakeholders in the coming months. In order to achieve the global targets, the project team should put more efforts in intensifying the activities and strengthen the coordination with the stakeholders and the partners. |
| GEF Operational Focal Point | MS | MS | The project has made notable progress in raising awareness and creating strategies. Recognizing the COVID 19 restricted effects on the field; it is expected that the main activities related to the management, grazing planning, and monitoring will make progress by planning the remaining time effectively. |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|----|---|
| Lead Technical Officer ²⁶ | MU | MU | <p>Delays in project implementation continue to persist with significant new additions gained during the reporting period. Reasons (and consequences) for the delays were already reported in the previous 3rd PIR (and are also subject of the current PIR as documented throughout the body of the text). The project NTE is set by extending of another 3 months at Sep 2022. However, the remaining project time will most likely not allow for delivery of those results, which are deemed technically of major relevance since they are part of the GEB. Adopted MTR response required to address this deficiency by developing an Action plan to deliver on GEB. As of now, the first draft was submitted to the LTO and is since 20 July 2020 in progress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original promise of the Project document to expand effective steppe conservation was weakened by the decision to abolish consideration of the corridors in the Management plans for PAs. Resulting effect is that the PA will be kept isolated from each, which was supposed to change through the project contribution. • Adoption of the National steppe conservation strategy, which was developed by the project is lacking, hence not allowing to effectively mainstream it into the production landscapes. • Works to complement monitoring program for periodical assessment of the pilot sites are in progress. Works relevant to determination of the governing monitoring protocol followed by the setting of the monitoring program in place were not yet started. They can be in full hardly accomplished within the NTE due to the time amount needed. Hence, some of the required information demanded by the Project document (e.g. reporting on area size, which became less severely overgrazed) may not be available by the project end. • Works to deliver nomination dossier for Karadacag PA were not yet initiated. Delivery of the dossier to the responsible authorities in Turkey was approved by the SC in 2020 following the MTR recommendation in order to compensate for originally planned establishment of a new PA. Establishment of a new PA was one of the pillars of the GEB described in the Project document. However, it turned out that a PA establishment is not realistic due to underlying long legal process. The time is increasingly tight to accomplish the dossier delivery within the NTE due to the complexity of works. • Contracts to deliver Management plans for PAs and associated Grazing management plans were signed late and gained since then already a 3 months delay. It will be difficult to get the Plans adopted by the NTE (in lieu of their |
|--------------------------------------|----|----|---|

| | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| | | | <p>originally promised implementation, which became due to the delays unrealistic).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The status of most other GEBs listed in the Project document seems to remain largely unchanged since finalization of the MTR two years ago (1 out of 15). <p>Other critical points documented in the approved response to the MTR were not yet initiated including the requests to update Communication strategy and to prepare Strategy and action plan to guide the mainstreaming of Social and environmental safeguards across project outputs.</p> <p>Additional technical concern is related to the demonstration program to showcase practices for alternative grazing management. Since it did not yet commence, it will likely miss the current vegetation period. Resulting need for contract extension by including an alternative season of 2022 will be hardly doable due to the approaching NTE.</p> |
| FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer | MS | MS | <p>The project has made significant contributions from a perspective of integrating steppe conservation principles into national policy. This has resulted in significant government investment for steppe conservation as well as raising awareness to protect buffer zones from agricultural and urban expansion. Work is needed regarding sustainable grazing and working with local pastoralists to enhance their conservation capacity, but the COVID pandemic has made field work very difficult. As vaccination rates increase and field work becomes feasible once again, we expect work with local stakeholders to be strengthened.</p> |

²⁶ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical units.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved ESM plan, where appropriate. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015, should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Please add recommendations to improve the implementation of the ESM plan, when needed.

| Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement | Expected mitigation measures | Actions taken during this FY | Remaining measures to be taken | Responsibility |
|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| ESS 1: Natural Resource Management | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ESS 7: Decent Work | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ESS 8: Gender Equality | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage | | | | |
| | | | | |
| New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY | | | | |
| | | | | |

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate if the initial Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.

| Overall project risk classification (at project submission) | Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid. ²⁷ If not, please provide the new classification and an explanation. |
|---|--|
| Project is low risk | Still valid, no new constraints noticed |

Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.

²⁷ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

6. Risks

Risk ratings

| RISK TABLE |
|--|
| <i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. Please make sure that the table also includes the Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and Social Management Risk Mitigations plans. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant.</i> |

| | Risk | Risk rating ²⁸ | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions ²⁹ | Notes from the Project Task Force |
|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| 1 | Challenging project coordination | High | Close and collaborative cooperation between many institutional stakeholders (particularly the MFWA and the MFAL) will be essential for the project to achieve its stated goal and objectives. This is mitigated through the coordinating structure of the National Project Implementation Unit and by the already existing collaboration with the project management team at FAO. As all relevant departments are represented in the Project Steering Committee, it will be the main task of this body to mitigate any challenges to project coordination. | As the project has several different partners and changes in the teams are inevitable, it is likely that the members of the steering committee will also change. However, there is a strong network and relationship with Ministry partners and NPC. NPC is working in close cooperation with the project and Ministry teams to strengthen collaboration and cooperation. In addition, formal and informal meetings and events between high-level decision-makers are being organized to strengthen collaboration and support continued information flow. | The composition of the Project Management Team according to the ProDoc (page 64) is well detailed. The team is composed of a full-time National Technical Coordinator (NTC), an Operations Specialist, a Procurement Associate, a Communication Specialist and a Project Assistant based in the FAO SEC Office. All the team members have responsibilities to follow the project activities in line with the ProDoc requirements and according to the AWP. With effective coordination internally and with the stakeholders, the team will be able to deliver the outputs timely. ii) The NPC will be actively coordinating in timely delivery of the outputs and monitor the progress In consultation with the MoAF, the project management structure will be developed |

²⁸ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High

²⁹ If a risk mitigation plan has been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in a previous PIR, please report here on progress made or the results of implementation. For moderate and high-risk projects, please include a description of ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period.

| | Risk | Risk rating ²⁸ | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions ²⁹ | Notes from the Project Task Force |
|---|---|---------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| 2 | Low capacity of local and national institutions | Medium | National institutions capacity and technical expertise in MFWA/MFAL staff at various levels are weak. To mitigate this risk, the National Project Implementation Unit will support the institutional framework and technical capacity development at national and local levels, through a capacity building program and training at central and local levels. | The project foresees significant capacity-building activities and implementation of a communication plan. | |
| 3 | Climate change | Low | Climatic changes will require evolving research on the proposed approaches and new best practices. MFAL and MFWA, with their own unique research institutions and with the contribution of FAO's technical expertise, are in a good position to steer research and adopt forthcoming results in the field. This will be the responsibility of the National Project Implementation Unit. On the other hand, climatic changes can also increase political support for the project. | The project is not directly affected by climate change. Best practices considered for all contractual works | |

| | Risk | Risk rating ²⁸ | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions ²⁹ | Notes from the Project Task Force |
|---|---|---------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| 4 | Low ownership and lack of sustainability of new technologies and techniques | Low | Lack of ownership and subsequent lack of sustainability of new technologies promoted under the project could cause difficulties in achieving desired adoption levels. This will be mitigated through the above mentioned capacity building program and through an awareness campaign targeted at project beneficiaries. This capacity building program will involve tools, such as economic models and plans, economic analysis that clearly show that there is an economic and social benefit to the adoption of these technologies (win-win). This will be the responsibility of the project's Field Office. | The project is progressing by integrating significant capacity-building activities | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--------|--|--|--|
| 5 | Incentives for local stakeholders are not adequate to generate engagement | Medium | <p>The project is designed to engage fully with local stakeholders. This will make certain that stakeholder desires, including local resource users both women and men, have the opportunity to help define how best to conserve steppe resources. A major part of this effort will involve working directly with pastoralists to assist them to measure how various steppe conservation activities result in economic benefits. For instance, the project will provide pastoralists with the technical support required to measure how improved management of steppe delivers both enhanced ecosystem services as well as improvements to livestock production and value. This will serve as a major incentive for local project support. Both, the National Project Implementation Unit and the Field Office will be responsible to generate engagement.</p> | <p>Several working groups have been established to encourage intensive participation by local stakeholders. An independent expert group and a local stakeholder group have been established to strengthen stakeholder participation throughout the implementation process. Field-level focal groups including teachers, mukhtars and academics have been established, with associated WhatsApp groups set up.</p> <p>Outdoor trainings for pastoralists to introduce them the methods for sustainable grazing management and conservation of biodiversity in rangelands have been arranged and almost 250 pastoralist participated to the training programs. Several publications and promotional materials have been produced and almost 500 items of these materials have been</p> | |
|---|---|--------|--|--|--|

| | Risk | Risk rating ²⁸ | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions ²⁹ | Notes from the Project Task Force |
|---|---|---------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>delivered to the local based stakeholders.</p> <p>Under the service provider contract, many incentives such as travel, materials, accommodation for free to attend trainings have been provided and the participation of the participants have been encouraged.</p> | |
| 6 | Regional political conflict may stimulate security measures limiting implementation | Medium | Since the PIF was approved, the political conflicts in the region have escalated. The project's pilot sites are located in areas relatively far from current conflict and outside of places of security risk. FAO/Turkey and Government are certain that the project sites will continue to be considered safe zones throughout the implementation. However, this will be monitored by National Project Implementation Unit during the project period. | Special travel arrangements are conduction for the project team during the field mission period. 4X4 full equipped vehicles are used and strict security rules are implemented during the missions. | |

| | Risk | Risk rating ²⁸ | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions ²⁹ | Notes from the Project Task Force |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| 7 | COVID-19 pandemic (NOT FORESEEN IN PRODOC, ad hoc addition here, see detailed report under section 13 Possible impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the project) | High | <p>The current pandemic will have a significant impact on the implementation of field-based activities. In order to avoid negative impacts on project implementation, meetings and events should be conducted online via video-conference tools, whenever possible.</p> <p>Any field-based activities that cannot be implemented through IT-based tools, such as field surveys and investigations, may be carried out in small groups with the maximum precautions taken.</p> <p>Contingency plans should be drafted and alternate tools and approach used such as IT-based forms of implementation (Zoom, Skype business, etc.)</p> | <p>The majority of activities were conducted via Zoom, accompanied by small face-to-face meetings and field studies.</p> <p>IT-based applications were the principal means of interaction and several WhatsApp groups were established.</p> <p>Due to travel restrictions, many of the field works, face to face meetings and trainings and study tours could not be conducted in this period.</p> | |

Project overall risk rating (Low, Moderate, Substantial or High):

| FY2020 rating | FY2021 rating | Comments/reason for the rating in FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) since the previous reporting period |
|---------------|---------------|---|
| M | M | |

7. Adjustments to Project Strategy – Only for projects that had the Mid-term review (or supervision mission)

If the project had a MTR review or a supervision mission, please report on how the MTR recommendations were implemented as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

| MTR or supervision mission recommendations | Actions to be taken | Measures implemented |
|--|---|--|
| Recommendation 6.1: Raise the anomaly of the omission of 'steppe' from the NSCD Action Plan with those responsible for Turkey's National Strategy to Combat Desertification and also with the Pastures and Steppe Thematic Working Group. At the same time, explore synergies and potential opportunities for mainstreaming the National Steppe Conservation Strategy through the Action Plan for the National Strategy to Combat Desertification. | National Steppe Conservation Strategy (NSCS) is currently under preparation in a participatory manner, focusing on both conservation and sustainable management of the natural resource base. Thematic working groups have been established to support development of the strategy. The National Steppe Conservation Strategy is drafted based on Turkey's National Strategy to Combat Desertification and the National BD strategy and Action Plan. The LDN project is one of the good opportunity to show that the activities are also aligned with other projects' activities. | The National Steppe Conservation Strategy (NSCS) is currently being finalized in a participatory manner with a dual focus on conservation and sustainable management of the natural resource base. It has been drafted based on Turkey's National Strategy to Combat Desertification and the National BD Strategy and Action Plan. |
| Recommendation 6-2a: Request a one-year no-cost extension to the Project to provide more time to successfully deliver its Outputs and maximize progress towards its Outputs and Outcomes. | 1,5 years of extension has been adopted during the 4th PSC Meeting with flexibility. | An extension of 1.5 years was adopted during the 4th PSC Meeting. An additional three-month extension was approved by the PSC at the 5th PSC Meeting held on 25 May 2021. |
| Recommendation 6-2b[2]: Strengthen the effective management of the Project and efficient (timely) delivery of Outputs, targets and global benefits by the following measures:- | i. The composition of the Project Management Team according to the ProDoc (page 64) is well detailed. The team is composed of a full-time National Technical Coordinator (NTC), an Operations Specialist, a | i. Effective coordination internally and with the stakeholders was pursued. However, it only partially resulted in timely delivery of the results. COVID-19 restrictions were also negatively affecting the outcomes. In order to mitigate, several tools and approaches have been |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>i. Strategically review project management team roles.</p> <p>ii. Revise the 2017-2020 Work Plan to maximize effectiveness and efficiency, taking into account lessons learned from technically weak deliverables from consultants.</p> <p>iii. Prepare an effective and efficient procurement plan for the remaining consultancies.</p> <p>iv. Develop an informal, written protocol between FAO and MAF on the use of translation services for consultant ToRs and their deliverables (reports).</p> <p>v. Prepare a Global Benefits Action Plan for review by PSC which defines exactly how, by whom and by when the project will deliver the targets in the Results Framework and the 15 global benefits identified in the ProDoc.</p> <p>vi. Prepare an Exit Strategy to ensure the sustainability of outputs and outcomes post closure of the project.</p> | <p>Procurement Associate, a Communication Specialist and a Project Assistant based in the FAO SEC Office. All the team members have responsibilities to follow the project activities in line with the ProDoc requirements and according to the AWP. With effective coordination internally and with the stakeholders, the team will be able to deliver the outputs timely.</p> <p>The NPC will be actively coordinating in timely delivery of the outputs and monitor the progress.</p> <p>ii. The project work plan has already been revised as per the decision of the 4th Steering committee that took place on April 2020.</p> <p>iii. An annual procurement plan has been already developed including the human resources (consultants) required for the rest period of the project.</p> <p>iv. FAO is mandated to use their translation facilities obtained from the professional translation companies under the Long Term Agreement (LTA) of FAO SEC.</p> <p>v. Until now, 1 out of 15 global benefits has been delivered. However it is expected to deliver global benefits at the end of the project since they depend extensively on the product delivered by service contractors or LoA partners and that will drastically change the response to this recommendation. This all, however, is subject of adoption of all products delivered by the project by MAF.</p> | <p>implemented such as zoom meetings, survey monkeys, and other IT based applications.</p> <p>ii. N/A in this reporting period, since done during 3rd PIR period</p> <p>iii. N/A in this reporting period, since done in the 3rd PIR period. However, newly gained delays in project implementation made it necessary to revise this procurement plan again. The reason was that originally planned extensions of contracts/LoAs were declined by operational colleagues due to exceeding duration limitations as stipulated in FAO rules and regulations</p> <p>iv. N/A in this reporting period, since related consideration felt in the 3rd PIR period</p> <p>v. A Global Benefits Action Plan was drafted by the NPC and submitted to LTO for his comments. Comments were provide, but not yet addressed. Other PTF members did not yet receive the opportunity to comment. The Action Plan will be after its completion shared with the next PSC.</p> <p>vi. The provincial and national steppe conservation strategies were finalized which will ensure the sustainability of outputs and outcomes. A management protocol for implementation of the Sanliurfa Steppe Conservation strategy was signed on 25 May 2021 between Sanliurfa Governorship and Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. The National Strategy was not yet adopted and the respective meeting with MAF is outstanding. Management plans and monitoring programme are in progress and consequently, no basis for a respective meeting with MAF is currently on the table</p> <p>In addition, the recent adoption of the Sanliurfa Steppe Conservation Strategy and the signed protocol (date 25 May 2021) for its implementation will see ministry units work in close cooperation over the next three years. Signed protocol is given in Annex V.</p> |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>vi. The management plans, monitoring program and national and provincial steppe conservation strategies are the backbone of the project, all prepared for a 10-year period. Hence, adoption of these backbone documents by MAF is considered the exit strategy by the project. Adopted docs have all a legacy which goes far beyond the project end. A meeting will be arranged with the Ministry to receive a written commitment that all above backbone docs will be adopted.</p> | |
| <p>Recommendation 6-2c: Establish a multi-disciplinary Karacadag Steppe Task Force of experts to develop a legitimate and realistic plan for legally protecting one or more core areas of steppe, comprising a total area of at least 10 000 ha, within Karacadag Steppes KBA. A biosphere reserve (BR) approach is recommended as an appropriate model to adopt for the Karacadağ Steppes Key Biodiversity Area.</p> | <p>In the current structure, there is a multi-disciplinary Independent Expert Group that has been established by the project. This group can be a major role for this purpose. However, the project should contribute of this group to participate to the meetings and WS (i.e. food, accommodation and transportation expenses)</p> <p>Biosphere Reserve Approach should be discussed with the Ministry before drafting of the nomination dossier. Also, the planning process should be indicated in more detail related to the BR approach. In this respect, after hiring a national consultant who will draft the nomination dossier, several meetings will be held to decide the management approach and conservation category for Karacadag steppes. The preparation stage will be initiated in this year and nomination dossier to establishment of a protected area will be submitted to the ministry mid of next year.</p> | <p>.</p> <p>After the groups were formed, they participated in two national workshops (one in 2019 (face to face) and the other in 2020 (in zoom)), especially during the preparation of national and province-based strategies (in 2019 and 2020). In addition, 3 separate zoom meetings were held with these groups in 2020. A wider participation survey monkey were held with these group in 2020, as well.</p> <p>The groups will especially actively participate in the planning processes. The project will cover the transportation, accommodation and other compulsory expenses of the group members</p> <p>A BR approach was discussed during the 4th and 5th Steering Committee Meeting held on 25 May 2021. The nomination dossier will be designed in accordance with this approach. In addition, the planning process should be related more closely to related to the BR approach However, preparation of the nomination dossier could not be initiated as indicated timeline.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Recommendation 6-3: Ensure that ethical standards of working practice are introduced/maintained in all cases where government employees are allocated tasks and/or travel on mission for the project. | This has been discussed during the 4th PSC Meeting: The Project will ensure equal accommodation and transport for the Ministry staff | . After the 4th PSC meeting, as agreed by the members, an accommodation and travel costs for the ministry staff are meeting by the project. For instance, almost 15 ministry staff who participated to the 5th PSC meeting and World BD Day celebrations had benefited from the project. |
| Recommendation 6-5a: Update and revise the project's Strategic Results Matrix, having thoroughly assessed how each target will be achieved and addressed the following matters . . . [refer to Section 6.5 for specific details]. | It will be updated in line with the 3 rd PIR approval which reflects already this revision | The Strategic Results Matrix has been updated following the approval of the 3 rd PIR which already reflects this revision. It is given in Annex VI. |
| Recommendation 6-5b: Enhance the project's management structure to strengthen its implementation, oversight and execution by the following means: - Restructure the Project Steering Committee and reinforce its terms of reference by . . . [refer to Recommendation 5b 164] - Review the National Project Implementation Unit with respect to the following considerations . . . [refer to Recommendation 5b 164] | In consultation with the MoAF, the project management structure will be developed. The new PS Committee member list submitted to the Committee has been adopted and the number of PSC members is reduced to 17 in order to enhance the project management structure Proposed activities will follow is a regular base. | The new PS Committee member list submitted and adopted by the Committee. The number of PSC members has been reduced to 17 in order to enhance the project management structure. The new list of the PSC members is given in Annex VII. |
| Recommendation 6-5c: Co-financing partners should confirm their financial support to the project for one extra year in order to secure the approval of an extension from the GEF Agency. | It is regularly followed-up by the co-financing partners. No problem related to co-financing | Co-financing partners communicate regularly with the project, and there have been no issues related to co-financing. |
| Recommendation 6-5d: The project should strengthen its engagement with stakeholders in the following structural ways: - Review the role and composition of the Independent Experts Group (IEG) and draw up ToRs accordingly. The IEG should be retitled the Independent Technical Advisory Group. - Radically re-vamp the role and composition of the Local Stakeholder Board by separating its policy and advisory role from its | Role and composition of Independent Experts Group has been revised and the new group has been established with participation of academicians from Harran University The name of the Local Stakeholder Board has been changed as Local Stakeholder Advisory Group These two groups will participate into the planning process effectively | The role and composition of the IEG has been revised and a new group has been established on June 2020 with the participation of academics from Harran University. The list of the IEG is given in Annex VIII. The name of the Local Stakeholder Board has been changed to the Local Stakeholder Advisory Group. The list of the Local Stakeholder Board is given in Annex IX. These two groups had been great role through the preparation of the National and Sanliurfa Province Steppe Conservation |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>conflict management role. The Local Stakeholder Advisory Group considered to be a more appropriate name because the term 'Board' suggests it makes decisions. - Address the conflict management role of LSB by establishing a Stakeholder Forum in each of the three project sites for which protected area management and grazing plans are to be designed, thereby providing a participatory consultative mechanism that promotes understanding of the different interests at stake to help generate consensus.</p> <p>- Empower the Independent Technical Advisory Group and the Local Stakeholder Advisory Group by allocating the chairperson or their nominee a seat on the Project Steering Committee.</p> <p>- Strengthen links with the relevant districts and municipalities and explore opportunities to foster support from the South-Eastern Anatolia Project (Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi, GAP) and its ÇATOMs (multi-purpose centres) in Şanlıurfa Province.</p> | <p>One of the members from Technical Advisory Group was invited to the 4th PSC meeting and he is listed in the revised and approved PSC list.</p> <p>The emphasized groups are the key stakeholders of the project and these groups are invited to the meetings and workshops which are doing under the project. After now, the regular meetings will be arrange with these groups as possible as.</p> | <p>Strategies and Action Plans, Additionally, these two groups will participate more effectively in the planning process.</p> <p>One of the members, Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali Culcu, from the Technical Advisory Group was invited to the 4th PSC meeting and is included in the revised and approved PSC list. Key stakeholders groups are invited to meetings and workshops organized under the project on a regular basis.</p> |
| <p>Recommendation 6-5e:</p> <p>Review the potential role of the General Directorate of Forestry as a co-financing partner and identify existing activities to which it can contribute, along with other interventions that will enhance the project.</p> | <p>GDF is giving co-financing support together with GDNCNP, OGM is mainly giving its support for the Karacadag project pilot site.</p> | <p>GDF is providing co-financing support together with GDNCNP. OGM is directing support mainly to the Karacadag project pilot site.</p> |
| <p>Recommendation 6-5f:</p> <p>In general, consultants should share the results of their surveys, studies and assessments with stakeholders, especially local communities, and this should be included in their ToR.</p> <p>In practice, the biodiversity and socio-economic survey findings should be introduced to local</p> | <p>OK</p> | <p>The biodiversity and socio-economic survey findings are used as a training and awareness materials. Booklets, brochures, posters and several publications have been designed and delivered to the stakeholders. A visitor centre in Tek Tek Mountains National Park is equipped with the results of the baseline surveys.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| stakeholders at the commencement of the management planning processes for the respective sites. | | |
| Recommendation 6-5g: Strengthen and update the Communications Strategy, ensuring it is re-aligned with the revised Multi-Annual Work Plan, and introduce a bi-monthly newsletter/ bulletin for distribution to all stakeholders. | The communication strategy will be updated | The communication strategy which has been prepared in the first year of the project is being implemented effectively with newsletters/bulletins being issued to inform all stakeholders about project progress and achievements. However, preparation of the update was not yet initiated |
| Recommendation 6-6: Prepare a Strategy and Action Plan to guide the mainstreaming of Social and Environmental Safeguards across project outputs. | An action plan will be developed to mainstream social and environmental safeguards by a national consultant. | No progress yet. |

Adjustments to the project strategy

Please note that changes to outputs, baselines, indicators or targets cannot be made without official approval from PSC and PTF members, including the FLO. These changes will follow the recommendations of the MTR or the supervision mission.

It has been done in 3rd PIR period.

| Change Made to | Yes/No | Describe the Change and Reason for Change |
|-----------------------------------|--------|---|
| Project Outputs | No | |
| Project Indicators/Targets | No | |

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, mid-term review, final evaluation or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

| Change | Describe the Change and Reason for Change |
|--------------------------|--|
| Project extension | <p>Original NTE: 15 January 2021 Revised NTE: 30 September 2022</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Project implementation and oversight of activities (technical, administrative, operational and financial) by FAO and its partners is strong, extensive and thorough at national, provincial and local levels.</p> <p>In general, staff within PMT, NPIU and the Field Office are competent, diligent, committed and work well together with enthusiasm. Routine activities, such as financial planning and accounting, work planning, progress monitoring and bi-annual (Progress Reports) and annual reporting (PIR) to PSC, are undertaken efficiently.</p> <p>Coordination and working relationships between these executing bodies are good, and the relevant authorities are working to accelerate the process and achieve the expected results in a timely manner.</p> <p>Many positive results have been achieved, but 6–12 month delays are hindering the delivery of outcomes/outputs by the end of the project.</p> <p>Many field activities have also been negatively affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. In particular, stakeholder engagement activities, field studies for planning activities, meetings, workshops, and training and awareness activities have been postponed for more than six months.</p> <p>Due to these delays, the majority of activities were initiated in the last quarter of 2019 or at the beginning of 2020. Specific examples include the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ establishment and operationalization of a new steppe PA (Output 1.1); ▪ development and effective implementation of PA management plans (Output 1.2); ▪ establishment and implementation of monitoring programmes for PA management (Output 1.3); ▪ operationalization of grazing management programmes (Output 2.1) and monitoring of their impacts (Output 2.2); ▪ steppe conservation training programmes for pastoralists (Output 2.3) and resource managers and decision-makers (Output 3.3). <p>Despite the existence of strong partnerships among government agencies and stakeholders, which are well represented within the project structure, delays have affected several activities at the field level. Furthermore, the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic means that it will not be possible to achieve all planned outcomes and objectives within the current project period (end of 2020).</p> <p>The MTR process has been completed and the final report was submitted on May 2020. The main recommendation of the report is a one-year, no-cost extension to allow for more time to deliver effectively planned outputs and to maximize progress towards outcomes</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>and objectives, such as the mainstreaming of demonstrated practices and lessons learned; and the institutionalization of outputs such as the monitoring of steppe landscapes within protected areas and production systems, and the implementation of training programmes on steppe conservation and sustainable grazing management.</p> <p>Additionally, a 1–1.5 year extension of the project (until June 2022) was adopted by the Project Steering Committee at the 4th PSC meeting, held on 17 April 2020 in Ankara via Zoom. Due to the increasing gravity of the COVID-19 pandemic and the imposition of a complete lockdown by the Turkish Government from 29 April to 17 May 2021 throughout the territory, many planned activities envisaged for WP-2021 did not commence on time. In this respect, an additional three-month extension of the project (until September 2021) was adopted by the Project Steering Committee at the 5th PSC meeting, held on 25 May 2021 in Sanliurfa.</p> <p>The competent, committed and enthusiastic teams are working well together, and are keen to fulfil their roles with a view to realizing the objectives and vision of the project. Several results have already been achieved and the majority of activities have been initiated. However, the replication and mainstreaming of project results will only be possible if significant additional time is made available.</p> |
|--|--|

8. Stakeholder engagement

Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes of stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan included in CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged:

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project;
- indicate if the project works with Civil Society Organizations and/or NGOs;
- briefly describe the stakeholder engagement events, specifying the time, date, stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision-making, etc.) and outcomes.

Please also indicate if the private sector has been involved in your project and provide the nature of the private sector actors, their role in the project and the way in which they were involved.

Even though there is no specific stakeholder engagement plan in the ProDoc, a comprehensive stakeholder analysis was undertaken as part of the project design stage which underpinned the establishment of partnerships and engagement with other stakeholders during project implementation.

The analysis covers the forestry and water, agriculture and livestock, development, culture and tourism sectors across government at national, regional (3rd) and provincial (Şanlıurfa) levels; international multilateral and bilateral agencies; national NGOs, universities and research institutions; agriculture, farmers' agricultural chambers, unions and associations; and the private sector with a focus on rural men and women, especially farmers and graziers.

Many of those identified during the preparatory phase are actively engaged in the project. For example, all levels of government are involved as partners in project execution via the NPIU and Project Field Office, and are also represented on the Steering Committee. Ten members of Harran University (Şanlıurfa) are members of the Independent Expert Group (IEG), and 38 stakeholders sit on the Local Stakeholder Board (LSB). The following table provides a list of stakeholders.

| List of stakeholders | Category | Engagement mechanism |
|---|------------|----------------------------------|
| Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF) – General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks (GDNCNP) | Government | Partnership, decision-making |
| General Directorate of Plant Production (GDPP), MAF | Government | Partnership, decision-making |
| General Directorate of Forestry (GDF) MAF | Government | Project partner, decision-making |
| Regional and sub-regional Directorates of GDNCNP and GDF | Government | Partnership, decision-making |
| Şanlıurfa Province Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry | Government | Partnership, decision-making |

| | | |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Şanlıurfa Governorship | Local administration/government | Project partner |
| Şanlıurfa Municipality | Local administration | Project supporter |
| Harran University | Academia | Project supporter |
| GAP Agriculture Research Institution | Research | Project supporter |
| GAP Administration | Regional administration/government | Project supporter |
| GAP International Agricultural Research and Training Centre | Research | Project supporter |
| ANCEO | Private sector | Contract |
| Nature Conservation Centre (DKM) | NGO | LoA |
| PGLOBAL | Private sector | Contract |

Additionally, three multi-diversity working groups were established during preparation of the National and Şanlıurfa Steppe Conservation Strategy and Action Plan, who represent government institutions, the private sector, civil society and academic organizations. The groups worked closely with the team on strategy development in order to exchange information and provide technical insights about the approaches.

The provincial working group consisted of the following key stakeholders:

- Şanlıurfa Governor's office
- provincial offices of MA,
- meadow commission members
- GAP representatives
- grazing union members
- representatives of CSOs
- academics
- protected area staff
- representatives of local herding and agricultural groups.

Members of the Provincial Steppe Conservation Working Group

| Name | Task | Institution |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Murat Aygun | Deputy Regional Director | 3rd Regional Directorate of MAF |
| Halil Sital | Deputy Province Director | Şanlıurfa Province Directorate of MAF |
| Ceren Sahin | Division Director | 3rd Regional Directorate of MAF |
| Fecir Ornek | Forestry engineer | 3rd Regional Directorate of MAF |
| Mehmet Gozoglu | Agricultural engineer | Şanlıurfa Province Directorate of MAF |
| Sulayman Seker | Agricultural engineer | Şanlıurfa Province Directorate of MAF |
| Abdulaziz Aktacir | Agricultural engineer | Şanlıurfa Province Directorate of MAF |
| Adnan Yetkin | Agricultural engineer | Şanlıurfa Province Directorate of MAF |
| Fatma Zehra Akkgunlu | Agricultural engineer | Şanlıurfa Province Directorate of MAF |
| Ecrin Kapusuz | Forestry engineer | Şanlıurfa Province Directorate under the 3rd Regional Directorate of MAF |
| Fecir Ornek | Forestry engineer | Şanlıurfa Province Directorate under the 3rd Regional Directorate of MAF |

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Fadil Topdag | Director of Forest Department | Sanliurfa Regional Directorate of Forestry |
| Abdulkadir Aykut | Director of Social Study and Project | Şanlıurfa Governorship |
| Siracetin İlhan | Director of Foundation | Directorate of Environment Conservation Foundation |
| İsmail Işıkdağ | Province Director | Province Directorate of Environment and Urbanization |
| Mustafa Şahin Canbaz | Deputy Province Director | Province Directorate of Environment and Urbanization |
| Resul Türkel | Division Director of Project | Province Directorate of Environment and Urbanization |
| Mehmet Açıkgoz | Deputy Head | GAP administration |
| Nusret Mutlu | General Coordinator of Economic Development | GAP administration |
| Celal Kaya | Contact person in the Agriculture and Forestry Unit | GAP administration |
| Akif Yenikale | Irrigation specialist | GAP administration |
| İbrahim Halil Çetiner | Director | GAPTAEM |
| Murat Tarini | Deputy Director | GAPTAEM |
| Mahmut Gayberi | Agricultural engineer | GAPTAEM |
| Hasan Arslan | Agricultural engineer | GAPTAEM |
| Halil Hatipoğlu | Deputy Director | GAPTAEM |
| Tahir Polat | Academic | Harran University |
| Abdullah Kahraman | Academic | Harran University |
| İrfan Özberk | Academic | Harran University |
| Eyüp Sabri Kirişçi | Gendarme commander | Provincial gendarmerie command |
| Aydın Aslan | Province Director | Province Directorate of Culture and Tourism |
| Hakan Kutluhan | Deputy Province Director | Province Directorate of Culture and Tourism |
| Necati Kizilelma | Province Director | Province Directorate of Meteorology |
| Mehmet Cüneyt Ateş | | Karacadağ Development Agency |
| Şerafettin Turan | Province Director | National Education Directorate |
| Cihan Bircan | Division Director | National Education Directorate |
| Halil Kirmizi | Department Director | Şanlıurfa Metropolitan Municipality – Department Directorate on Environment Protection and Control |
| Sercan Gelener | Division Director on Waste Management | Şanlıurfa Metropolitan Municipality – Department Directorate on Environment Protection and Control |
| Faik Yüksekayla | Department Director | Şanlıurfa Metropolitan Municipality. Department Directorate of Inventory and Project |
| Zehra Şeker | Architect | Şanlıurfa Metropolitan Municipality – Department Directorate of Inventory and Project |

| | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Sümeyye Kirişçi | Landscape architect | Şanlıurfa Metropolitan Municipality – Department Directorate of Inventory and Project |
| Raşit Dedeoğlu | | Şanlıurfa Metropolitan Municipality – Department Directorate of Inventory and Project |
| Mehmet Hicri Çubuk | Department Director | Şanlıurfa Metropolitan Municipality – Department Directorate of Rural Development |
| Mehmet Işık | Division Director | Şanlıurfa Metropolitan Municipality – Department Directorate of Rural Development |
| Mahmut İbrahimpaşa | Agricultural engineer | Şanlıurfa Metropolitan Municipality – Department Directorate of Rural Development |
| Pınar Çiftkardeş | Agricultural engineer | Şanlıurfa Metropolitan Municipality – Department Directorate of Rural Development |
| İzzettin Polat | Department Director | Şanlıurfa Metropolitan Municipality – Department Directorate of Strategy Development and Foreigner Relationship |
| Mehmet Bilal Kaytan | Project expert | Şanlıurfa B.B. – Strategy Development and Foreign Relations Department |
| Sadık Yetim | Province coordinator | TKDK Province Coordination Unit |

The National-level working group included representatives of government institutions including:

- Sub-agencies of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
- Ministry of Environment and Urbanization
- Ministry of Culture and Tourism
- Relevant civil society and academia representatives.

Members of the National Steppe Conservation Working Group

| Name | Position | Institution |
|---|---|--|
| MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY (MAF) | | |
| Mustafa Bulut | Deputy General Director | General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks (GDNCNP) |
| Seref Dagdelen | Department Directorate of National Parks | GDNCNP |
| Teoman Meric | Department Directorate of Sensitive Areas | GDNCNP |
| Selim Karaca | Department Directorate of Wildlife | GDNCNP |
| Osman Demirel | Department Directorate of Biodiversity | GDNCNP |
| Tugba Usta | Forestry engineer | GDNCNP |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Burak Tatar | Biologist | GDNCNP |
| Umit Bolat | Forestry engineer | GDNCNP |
| Osman Ugur Akinc | Forestry engineer | GDNCNP |
| Ergul terzioğlu | Biologist | GDNCNP |
| Serhat Erbas | Biologist | GDNCNP |
| Omer Faruk Aslan | Forestry engineer | GDNCNP |
| Abdulsamet Hacat | Forestry engineer | GDNCNP |
| Fatih Koyluoglu | Forestry engineer | GDNCNP |
| Suleyman Uner | Forestry engineer | GDNCNP |
| Mehmet Celik | Deputy General Director | General Directorate of Forestry (GDF) |
| Fahrettin Ay | Department Director | GDF |
| Kiyimet Keles | Technical staff | GDF |
| Ugur Tufekcioglu | Division Director | GDF |
| Senol Oktay Keten | Forestry engineer | GDF |
| Nuran Kacaroglu | Forestry engineer | GDF |
| Suat Yilmaz | Deputy General Director | General Directorate of Plant Production (GDPP) |
| Tuncay Gürsoy Yüce | Department Director | GDPP |
| Esra Esina | Geomatics engineer | GDPP |
| Sinan Aykan | Agricultural engineer | GDPP |
| Davut Özgür | Agricultural engineer | GDPP |
| Kürşat Kağan Yeşil | Agricultural engineer | GDPP |
| MINISTRY OF ENVIRONEMNT AND URBANIZATION (MEU) | | |
| Umit Turan | Department Director of Research and Inscription | General Directorate of Conservation of Natural Assets (GDCNA) |
| Ali Ozkir | Department Director of Conservation and Development | GDCNA |
| Guner Ergun | Division Director on Species and Habitat conservation | GDCNA |
| MINISTRY OF CULTURE AND TOURISM | | |
| Solmaz Karabasa | Culture and Tourism Expert-Ecology anthropologist | MCT |
| Representatives from UNESCO's Natural and Cultural Heritage Divisions | | MCT |
| UNIVERSITIES | | |
| Doc. Dr. Didem Ambarli | Academic | Duzce University |
| Prof.Dr. Mecit Vural | Academic | Gazi University |
| Prof. Dr. Nilgul Karadeniz | Academic | Ankara University |
| Prof. Dr. Hayrettin Kendir | Academic | Ankara University |
| Prof. Dr. Mukerrem Arslan | Academic | Ankara University |
| Prof. Dr. Can Bilgin | Academic | METU |
| Prof. Dr. Hayriye Esbag | Academic | ITU |
| Prof. Dr. Latif Kurt | Academic | Ankara University |
| Selcuk Tugrul Koruklu | Academic | Ankara University |

NON GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

KIRCEV

Nature Conservation Centre

WWF-Turkey

Natura Researches Association

Chamber of Agriculture Engineers

Chamber of Forest Engineer

The Scientific Advisor Group consisted of academics.

Members of the Scientific Committee

| Name | Institution | Field of Expertise |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Prof. Dr. Osman Tugay | Selçuk University | Botany |
| Prof. Dr. Hayri Duman | Gazi University | Botany |
| Prof. Dr. Kuddusi Ertuğrul | Selçuk University | Botany |
| Dr. Didem Ambarlı | Düzce University | Vegetation |
| Prof. Dr. Mecit Vural | Gazi University | Vegetation |
| Dr. Uğur Zeydanlı | DKM | Vegetation |
| Prof. Dr. Can Bilgin | METU | Fauna/birds and large mammals |
| Dr. Evrim Karaçetin | Erciyes University | Fauna/butterflies |
| Prof. Dr. Ahmet Karataş | Niğde Ömer Halisdemir University | Fauna/bats |
| Prof. Dr. M. Zülfü Yıldız | Adıyaman University | Fauna/herpetofauna |
| Prof. Dr. Recep Karakaş | Dicle University | Fauna/birds |
| Prof. Dr. Nuri Yiğit | Ankara University | Fauna/rodents |
| Prof. Dr. Güler Ekmekçi | Hacettepe University | Fauna/freshwater fish |
| Prof. Dr. Alptekin Karagöz | Aksaray University | Agriculture and rangelands |
| Durukan Dudu | Anadolu Meraları | Agriculture and rangelands |
| Prof. Dr. Zeki Acar | 19 Mayıs University | Agriculture and rangelands |

Several stakeholder engagement events were conducted during the reporting period as shown below:

| Stakeholder engagement events | Date | Purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision-making, etc.) | Outcomes |
|--|---|--|---|
| High-level meeting | 7 July 2020 | Consultation | Discussed the governance of the Şanlıurfa Steppe Conservation Strategy and Action Plan |
| Online meeting with the Regional Working Group and Scientific Advisory Group members | 22 September 2020 | Participation in decision-making | Drafted the Şanlıurfa Steppe Conservation Strategy and Action Plan and gathered final comments on the strategy from the experts |
| Online meeting | 6 October 2020 | Information and consultation | Drafted the National Strategy |
| Online meeting with the participation of Scientific Advisory Group Members | 22 October 2020 | Participation in decision-making | Listed Steppe terminology |
| Life in Steppes Poetry and Painting Competition award ceremony | 19 November 2020 | Collaboration | Increased awareness |
| Online meeting with project partners | 27 November 2020 | Consultation and participation in decision-making | Finalized indicators for the Şanlıurfa Steppe Conservation Strategy and Action Plan |
| Online meeting with the participation of the Regional and National Working Group and Scientific Advisory Group Members | 2 December 2020 | Consultation and participation in decision-making | Finalized National Steppe Conservation Strategy and Action Plan |
| 2nd National Steppe Conservation Workshop (online) | 30 December 2020 | Information and consultation | Strengthened collaboration and knowledge on steppe ecosystems |
| Wall painting activity in two schools: Karacadag School and Kukuksenemagara School | 17-18 November 2020 | Collaboration | |
| Online meeting on the grazing and livestock monitoring programme | 25 February 2021 | Information and consultation | Drafted grazing and livestock monitoring framework |
| Online meeting on BD monitoring programme | 26 February 2021 | Information and consultation | Drafted BD monitoring framework |
| Online meetings | Held between August 2020 and March 2021 | Consultation and participation in decision-making | Finalized five sets of publications, a Training |

| | | | |
|---|--------------------|--|---|
| | | | Manuel, five sets of brochures and five sets of posters |
| Ten-day Certificate Training Programme | 1-10 April 2021 | Information and consultation | Built and transferred knowledge, strengthened understanding, and increased expertise of protected area establishment, protected area management planning and monitoring |
| Wall painting activity In Karacadag schools | 21 April 2021 | Collaboration | Wall-painting activities undertaken with students and teachers to raise awareness about the untouched steppes of the project pilot sites |
| International BD Day Celebration | 25 May 2021 | Collaboration | Increased ownership, cooperation and awareness on steppe-related information |
| 5th Project Steering Committee Meeting | 25 May 2021 | Information and participation in decision-making | Informed SC members of project progress Approved the 2021 AWP and budget |
| Certificate Training on Grazing Planning | 30 May-5 June 2021 | Information and consultation | Improved knowledge and experience of grazing management planning |
| Online training on protected area establishment planning and monitoring | 01-11 June 2021 | | Built and transferred knowledge, strengthened understanding, and increased expertise of protected area establishment, protected area management planning and monitoring |
| Outdoor Training Demonstrations for Pastoralists | 10-12 June 2021 | Information | Increased awareness of sustainable management of steppe meadows |
| Kars-Ardahan Exchange Programme for pastoralists | 17-20 June 2021 | Information | Increased awareness and shared experiences of sustainable management of the meadows and rural development |
| Erzurum Exchange Programme for pastoralists | 21-23 June 2021 | Information | Increased awareness and shared experience of sustainable management of steppe meadows and rural development |

9. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on progress made on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made during the formulation or execution stages? Please briefly indicate the gender differences here.

Does the M&E system include gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender results and impacts?

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

- closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;
- improving women's participation in decision making;
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

The project is based on a participatory approach that ensures the participation of women and equity in terms of benefit sharing with increased women's mobility and public speaking. The approach is based on a socio-economic assessment, including a gender analysis of the project villages carried out at micro (household), mezo (institutions) and macro (policy) levels.

A comprehensive socio-economic survey was undertaken within the baseline survey study.

Training programmes and awareness-raising activities have been identified to strengthen gender mainstreaming in project activities and to increase the capacity of different social groups related to the project sites.

The project does not include any specific awareness-raising activities for women; however, several workshops and meetings were carried out during the reporting period and 30% of the participants were women.

A specific awareness and training programme was conducted for schoolteachers, with the participation of 25 teachers, half of whom were women. School activities include murals and the creation of a nature corner, with the participation of teachers and students. Seven school events have been implemented and almost 2 500 students actively participated in the events with a 50:50 ratio of boys and girls.

Management planning and the grazing management planning process started very recently with local stakeholder boards requested to participate in the planning process.

10. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities/products (when applicable) as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval

- Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project so far.
- Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.
- Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected global environmental benefits. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.
- Please provide links to publications, leaflets, video materials, related website, newsletters or other communications assets published on the web.
- Does the project have a communication and/or knowledge management focal point? If yes, please provide their names and email addresses

Within the framework of the communication strategy, there have been important developments this year.

- As visibility materials four different briefs notes are under preparation to inform the general public, NGOs, stakeholders, partners etc. about important outputs related to the project which was held in 2019.
 1. Second National Steppe Conservation Workshop for Common Understanding and Collaboration
 2. Guidelines that provide standards and recommended practices for the management of turkey's natural assets
 3. Steppe conservation awareness activities for children
 4. International Biodiversity Day celebration
 5. Media Field Visit
- FAO Turkey is published FAO monthly newsletter; second issue of the FAO Turkey Newsletter is biodiversity. <http://www.fao.org/3/cb4909en/cb4909en.pdf>
- Within the scope of the project, training programmes were developed for different target groups including (i) teachers and students, (ii) journalists, (iii) experts and decision makers responsible for management of protected areas. Therefore, the visibility materials listed below are prepared. These materials uploaded to the FAO Publications Workflow System (PWS) which is the corporate planning and monitoring tool that contributes to the production of cost-effective, high-quality and targeted publications.

Booklets for public to increase awareness on steppes

- ŞANLIURFA: THE BEGINNING OF HISTORY
- I'M FROM URFA ETERNALLY: LIFE IN ŞANLIURFA STEPPES
- THE LAST REFUGE OF GAZELLES: ANIMAL SPECIES OF THE ŞANLIURFA STEPPES
- ŞANLIURFA'S HIDDEN TREASURE: STEPPE PLANTS
- THE ANCESTORS OF GRAIN: OUR WILD PLANT SPECIES, THE INSURANCE OF OUR FUTURE
- Neighbourhood Guidebook - I Kızılkuyu Wildlife Reserve
- Neighbourhood Guidebook - II Tek Tek Mountains National Park
- Neighbourhood Guidebook - III Karacadağ Steppes

- Film documentary, social media spot and thematic shorts films
Two social media films were completed, shown in the events/meetings and shared on social media accounts in FAO and stakeholders. Please see below the links of them. Documentary is completed and waiting for the approval HQ video department. Four thematic shorts films are under preparation.

<https://youtu.be/s5l9razFTFY>
<https://youtu.be/vg9gCrP6LO8>

- One of the main target group was teachers and students, therefore education activities were planned for 10 selected schools in the project pilot sites (Tek Tek Mountains National Park, Kızılkuyu Wildlife Development Area and Karacadağ steppes) in Şanlıurfa to reflect the untouched steppes of the pilot sites of the project. In the first phases of this program a wall painting activity and establishment of a nature/ environment corner was prepared. The training programmes were designed for the stakeholders involved with school education including wall painting activities, kite festival and wared ceremony on poem competition for schools under a professional guidance of an artist. The training manuals which were listed below were completed and uploaded the PWS of FAO.
 - I AM LEARNING THE STEPPES STUDENT'S ACTIVITY BOOK PLANTS OF THE STEPPE
 - I AM LEARNING THE STEPPES STUDENT'S ACTIVITY BOOK THE STEPPE IS AN ECOSYSTEM
 - I AM LEARNING THE STEPPES STUDENT'S ACTIVITY BOOK LIFE ON THE STEPPE
 - I AM LEARNING THE STEPPES STUDENT'S ACTIVITY BOOK ANIMALS OF THE STEPPE
 - I AM LEARNING THE STEPPES TEACHER'S GUIDE

Please see below the next activities to increase awareness.

- Awareness raising event for stakeholders involved with school education for schools in the three project pilot sites
- Media Field Visit
Media Field Visit was organized for journalists within the scope of "Output 3. Training program on steppe conservation and management" specifically for the journalists. This program aims to promote the works carried out within the scope of the project, and natural and cultural values of the project pilot sites, and to communicate importance and need for conservation of the steppe ecosystems in Turkey through media. It was consisting of field visits, interviews with related experts and local authorities, and short walks and field observations in Tek Tek Mountains National Park, Kızılkuyu Wildlife Reserve, and visiting Göbeklitepe World Heritage Site. During the program, journalists were informed about the project experiences, wildlife elements, site management and natural resource use in the pilot sites. 13 media representative joined the visit.

The Outcome of the Media Field Visit;

<https://www.haberturk.com/sanliurfa-haberleri/87566713-sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi>
<https://www.sondakika.com/haber/haber-sanliurfa-bozkirlarinin-sahip-oldugu-biyolojik-14159322/>
<https://www.urfadasin.com/sanliurfa-nin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi>
<https://www.urfadegisim.com/gazeteciler-incelemeye-cikti-biyolojik-cesitlilik-tanitildi/45999/>
<https://yenicizgihaber.com/haber/sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-yerli-ve-yabanci-basina-tanitildi-haberi-152533.html>
<https://www.haberler.com/sanliurfa-bozkirlarinin-sahip-oldugu-biyolojik-14159322-haberi/>
<http://www.mardinhaber.com.tr/haber-sanliurfa-nin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi-94333.html>
<https://www.haberalanya.com.tr/cevre/sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi-h350961.html>
<https://urfapostasi.com/2021/05/27/sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi/?ajax=1>
<https://www.ulusalhaber.com.tr/sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi/285501/>
<https://www.haber16.com/sanliurfa-nin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi/391085/>
<https://www.nethaber.com.tr/sanliurfa-nin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi/76384/>

<https://www.sabah.com.tr/sanliurfa/2021/05/27/sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi>
<https://www.imaret.com.tr/sanliurfa-nin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi/84586/>
<http://www.tunaydingazetesi.com/haber/49632/anadolu-bozkirlari-insanliga-umut-oldu/>

Video News:

Videos on Tek Tek Mountains National Park and visitor center, interview with Ayşegül Selışık (FAO Turkey, Assistant Representative in Turkey), and Nihan Yenilmez Arpa (National Project Coordinator) were broadcasted:

- Haberler.com (duration 07:04): <https://www.dailymotion.com/video/x81jiyp>
- Beyazgazete (duration: 07:31): <https://www.dailymotion.com/video/x81jj0t>
- Beyazgazete (duration: 05:50): <https://www.dailymotion.com/video/x81jo1y>
- Mynet.com (duration 05:50): <https://www.mynet.com/sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi-7235600-myvideo>
- Sondakika.com (duration 07:24): <https://www.sondakika.com/haber/haber-sanliurfa-bozkirlarinin-sahip-oldugu-biyolojik-14159322/>
- Haberler.com (duration 07:24): <https://www.haberler.com/sanliurfa-bozkirlarinin-sahip-oldugu-biyolojik-14159322-haberi/>
- Deutsche Welle Turkish Special Video-news (17 June 2021), (duration: 10:30): <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZGqh6aPXQc8>

YouTube videos:

- The video-news was edited by Kamil Yılmaz: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MNtbs4-JpQc>
- Extended version of the video was edited by Kamil Yılmaz: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=brVvVP7yl_c
- Seven guidelines that provide standards and recommended practices for the management of Turkey's natural assets are under preparation. This year these materials completed and uploaded to the FAO Publications Workflow System (PWS) which is the corporate planning and monitoring tool that contributes to the production of cost-effective, high-quality and targeted publications.
 1. Guidelines for Establishing Protected Areas
 2. Guidelines for Protected Area Management Planning
 3. Guidelines for Monitoring
 4. Guidelines for Engaging Stakeholders in Managing Protected Areas
 5. Guidelines for Assessing the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Protected Areas
 6. Guidelines for Grazing Management Planning: A Holistic Approach
 7. Guidelines for Grazing and Livestock Monitoring
- Under the Development and Implementation of "Training Manual and Resource Materials under the Model Steppe Conservation Training Program for Pastoralist" component, posters and manuals were prepared. 5 manuals uploaded to the PWS of FAO.
 - Common Plant Species of Steppe Rangelands Booklets (5 different booklets)
 - Common Small Ruminant Diseases in Turkey's Steppe Ecosystems
 - Edible Wild Plants and Crop Wild Relatives of Steppes
 - Rangeland Training Manual for Managers and Technical Staff
 - Sheep and Goat Breeding in Steppe Rangelands

PROJECT WEBSITE

- ✓ The specific objective is to design, develop and maintain a public facing website as a custom-made web portal for the project. The main purpose is to raise awareness on the project and reflect on impact/success stories. The web portal will also serve as a learning platform for public involved in steppe management. It will be available for upload of all technically cleared resource materials, which have been produced and published under the project

- ✓ The web portal will be hosted under the General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks website. The MoAF will be responsible for management of the website after the closing of the project. Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected global environmental benefits. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.
- ✓ The website design and content is under preparation. This year it is planning the complete the process and launch the website

Main achievements:

- Utilization of innovative and creative approaches of the complex topic.

Constraints:

- Educational settings like secondary schools takes efforts and time for getting permissions for project interventions.

Key factors of success:

- Media Field visit increased the awareness on the steppe ecosystems, and they learnt that there are different species living in the steppes.
- Cooperation with school management on the initiative that led to creating a warm atmosphere and synergy between students, teachers and illustration team.
- To celebrate the Biodiversity Day in Şanlıurfa was helped to create awareness on the importance of the steppes in our life.

Photos:



Photo: ©FAO/ Media Field Visit



Öğrenciler okullarının duvarlarını bozkırın canlılarıyla renklendirdi

Türkiye'deki bozkırın biyolojik çeşitliliğinin korunması amacıyla Şanlıurfa'da yürütülen "Türkiye'nin Bozkır Ekosistemlerinin Korunması ve Sürdürülebilir Yönetimi" projesi kapsamında, öğrenciler okullarının duvarlarına bozkırda yaşayan bitki ve hayvanları resmetti.



Büyükşehir Milletler Gıda ve Tarım Örgütü (FAO), Tarım ve Orman Bakanlığı Doğa Koruma ve Milli Parklar Genel Müdürlüğü, Bilişim Üretim Genel Müdürlüğü ve Orman Genel Müdürlüğü Küresel Çevre Fonu finansal desteğiyle yürütülen "Türkiye'nin Bozkır Ekosistemlerinin Korunması ve Sürdürülebilir Yönetimi" kapsamında Şanlıurfa'nın Kuzlukuyu Yaban Hayatı Geliştirme Alanı, Tek Tek Dağları Milli Parkı ve Karacadağ Bozkırları bölgelerinde çeşitli çalışmalar yürütülüyor.

Çalışmalar sırasında bölge halkı ve çocuklarla da yakından temasta bulunduklarını anlatan Selçuk, şöyle devam etti: "Doğal kaynaklarımız bizim geleceğe mirasımız olacak. Onları ne kadar iyi korursak ve sürdürülebilir kılabilssek gelecek nesillerin gıda güvenliğini temin edeceğiz. Doğal kaynaklarımız bize gıdayı veriyor, insan sağlığının temel besin elementleri de gıdadan geliyor. Hepsinin sağlıklı beslenmesi gerekiyor, buradaki bütün endemik türler, yabani türler zincirin önemli bir parçası. O yüzden çocuklarımızın bunu öğrenmesi gerekiyor. Bozkırda yaşıyorlar, biliyorlar, biliyorlar ama o bilgileri ne işe yaradığını bu oyunlarla öğrenmiş oluyorlar. Burada hem duvar boyaması yaptık, Şanlıurfa'daki endemik türleri belirledik ve o türlerin duvarında birer resimlerini yaptık, tiyatro oyunu çalışmamız ve boyama kitaplarımız var."



hedeflediklerini anlatan Bulut, "Hedefimiz tam da burada bozkırın ortasındaki gençlere bozkır hakkında bir mesaj vermek, onları bilinçlendirip geleceğimize olan gençleri bilgilendirmek. Esas maksadımız olan eğitime katkıda bulunmak istedik. Gençler burada bozkırda yaşayan türleri okullarının duvarlarına resmettiler, bu okullarda bozkırda yaşayan türler hakkında da çok ciddi eğitimler gerçekleştirildi," dedi. Eyyübiye İlçe Milli Eğitim Müdürü Ahmet Demir de proje kapsamında öğrencilerin yaban hayatını tanıdıklarını ve doğaya olan ilgilerinin arttığını belirterek, çalışmada emeği geçenlere teşekkür etti. Proje kapsamında düzenlenen resim yarışmasında birinci olan 10 yaşındaki Esma Elinci, yarışmaya katıldığı için çok mutlu olduğunu söyledi. Bozkırın bir yaşam kaynağı olduğunu anlatarak herkes tarafından bozkırda yaşayan tüm canlıların korunmasını isteyen Elinci, "Bozkır olmasaydı hayvanlarımız yaşayamazdı ve bütün bilgilerimiz ölürdü," dedi. AA

Printed Media on School Activities.



Photo: ©FAO/ Şafak Toros / Training on Protected Area Establishment



Photo: ©FAO/ Şafak Toros

- Please provide links to publications, leaflets, video materials, related website, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.

Media Analysis

| NEWS TYPE | TOTAL NEWS NUMBER | TOTAL ACCESS |
|------------|-------------------|--------------|
| PRINT NEWS | 24 | 326.013 |
| INTERNET | 129 | 735.345 |
| TV | 1 | - |
| TOTAL | 154 | 1061.358 |

Media Links

<https://www.koykahvesi.com.tr/cevre/ciftciler-iklim-degisikligi-ve-kuraklikla-mucadeleyi-ogreniyor.html>
<https://tr.investing.com/news/markets/fao-anlurfa-bozkr-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plan-tum-iller-icin-ornek-olacak-2014646>
<http://www.etrhaber.net/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani/214198/>
<https://www.haber16.com/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani/202871/>
<https://www.samsungazetesi.com/m/sanliurfa/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani-h1338148.html>
<https://www.urfadegisim.com/urfa-bozkirini-korumak-icin-toplandilar/37296/>
<https://www.iha.com.tr/sanliurfa-haberleri/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani-2704472/>
<http://www.tarimpusulasi.com/tarim/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani-tum-iller-icin-ornek-olacak/31891>
<https://basakgazetesi.com/haber/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani-157414.html>
<https://www.istanbulhaber.com.tr/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani-haber-1593438.htm>
<http://www.medyaurfa.com/sanliurfa/fao-dan-urfa-bozkirini-koruyacak-proje-h91948.html>
<https://www.talasepresshaber.com/haber/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani-305926>
<http://www.karsmanset.com/haber/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani-329117.htm>
<https://www.haberofisi.com.tr/tr/haberler/sabah/sanliurfa/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani-451bDhiOgJ2B>
<https://www.haberturk.com/sanliurfa-haberleri/81053365-sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani>
<http://beyazgazete.com/haber/2020/9/23/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani-5751622.html>
<http://www.netmedya.com/?sayfa=haber&id=13621109>
<https://www.sabah.com.tr/sanliurfa/2020/09/23/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani>
<http://www.konyayenigun.com/haberi/oku-h359158.html>
<https://www.haberler.com/son-dakika-haberleri-avrupa-hareketlilik-haftasi-nda-cocuklar-spor-ve-13621113-haberi/>
<https://www.beyazgundem.com/sanliurfa/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani-h1036266.html>
<http://www.malatyaguncel.com/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani-1610192h.htm>
<https://www.dogurehberi.com/m/sanliurfa/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani-h2424600.html>
<https://www.urfadasin.com/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani>
<https://www.sanliurfaguncel.com/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani/120444/>
<http://beyazgazete.com/haber/2020/9/23/fao-dan-sanliurfa-nin-bozkir-ekosistemlerini-korumayi-amaclayan-proje-5751316.html>
<https://www.haberofisi.com.tr/tr/haberler/haberler/sanliurfa/faodan-sanliurfanin-bozkir-ekosistemlerini-korumayi-amaclayan-proje-MH0bkrBmc6AN>
<https://www.konhaber.com/haber-fao dan sanliurfa nin bozkir ekosistemlerini korumayi amaclayan proje-1444274.html>
<https://www.gidahatti.com/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-eylem-plani-ile-ornek-olacak-174659/>
<http://www.telehaber.com/haberler/haber-13621109/>
<https://www.yeniakit.com.tr/haber/faodan-sanliurfanin-bozkir-ekosistemlerini-korumayi-amaclayan-proje-1393682.html>
<https://www.sanliurfa63.com/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani/32533/>
<https://www.sondakika.com/haber/haber-fao-dan-sanliurfa-nin-bozkir-ekosistemlerini-13621109/>
<http://www.haberalanya.com.tr/haber/oku-h208435.html>
<https://www.sondakika.com/haber/haber-fao-dan-sanliurfa-nin-bozkir-ekosistemlerini-13621109/>
<http://nelero.com/detay/-haber-oku/171248>
<https://www.inegononline.com/guncel-olaylar/haber/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani-1658187/>
<https://www.dunya.com/ekonomi/fao-sanliurfanin-bozkir-ekosistemini-korumaya-alacak-haberi-482719>
<https://www.tokattan.com/sanliurfa/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani-h46459.html>
<http://www.bursahaber.com/sanliurfa/sanliurfa-bozkir-koruma-strateji-ve-eylem-plani-h1866053.html>
<https://tr.investing.com/news/markets/oku-2014859>
<https://www.plastikciyiz.biz/haberler/otomotiv/9540/fao-sanliurfanin-bozkir-ekosistemini-korumaya-alacak>

<https://www.sondakika.com/haber/haber-ogrenciler-okullarinin-duvarlarini-bozkin-13745528/>
<https://www.haberofisi.com.tr/tr/haberler/haberler/sanliurfa/sanliurfa-ogrenciler-okullarinin-duvarlarini-bozkin-canlilariyla-renklendirdi-Gh0BMrXajj2>
<https://www.urfanatik.com/haber/5719329/dkmp-heyetinden-vali-erine-ziyaret>
<https://www.urfadegisim.com/bozkin-renkleri-okul-duvarinda/38956/>
<https://www.haberturk.com/ogrenciler-okullarinin-duvarlarini-bozkin-canlilariyla-renklendirdi-2875000>
<http://www.konyayenigun.com/haberi/oku-h405427.html>
<https://www.haberler.com/ogrenciler-okullarinin-duvarlarini-bozkin-13745528-haberi/>
<https://www.urfanatik.com/haber/5718549/o-toplanti-urfada-yapildi>
<https://beyazgazete.com/haber/2020/11/19/ogrenciler-okullarinin-duvarlarini-bozkin-canlilariyla-renklendirdi-5842919.html>
<https://www.sondakika.com/haber/haber-ogrenciler-okullarinin-duvarlarini-bozkin-13745528/>
<https://www.mynet.com/ogrenciler-okullarinin-duvarlarini-bozkin-canlilariyla-renklendirdi-180105317115>
<https://www.yeniakit.com.tr/haber/ogrenciler-okullarinin-duvarlarini-bozkin-canlilariyla-renklendirdi--1451298.html>
<https://www.sondakika.com/haber/haber-ogrenciler-okullarinin-duvarlarini-bozkin-13745528/>
<https://www.haberturk.com/sanliurfa-ogrenciler-okullarinin-duvarlarini-bozkin-canlilariyla-renklendirdi-2875042>
<https://www.tarimpusulasi.com/haber/biyolojik-cesitliligimizin-vazgecilmez-parcasi-bozkirlar-32503>
<https://www.ehaberajansi.com.tr/haber/biyolojik-cesitliligimizin-vazgecilmez-parcasi-bozkirlar-h4087.html>
<https://www.ehaberajansi.com.tr/haber/biyolojik-cesitliligimizin-vazgecilmez-parcasi-bozkirlar-h4087.html>
<https://www.ehaberajansi.com.tr/haber/biyolojik-cesitliligimizin-vazgecilmez-parcasi-bozkirlar-h4087.html>
<https://www.ehaberajansi.com.tr/haber/biyolojik-cesitliligimizin-vazgecilmez-parcasi-bozkirlar-h4087.html>
<https://www.ehaberajansi.com.tr/haber/biyolojik-cesitliligimizin-vazgecilmez-parcasi-bozkirlar-h4087.html>
<https://www.haberx.com/post/636653>
<https://www.ciftlikdergisi.com.tr/bozkirlarin-korunmasi-ve-surdurulebilir-yonetimi-projesi/>
https://www.gazeteipekyol.com/gundem/urfa_yi_ilgilendiren_calistay_envanter_cikarildi-h58073.html
<https://www.ajansurfa.com/gundem/urfa-yi-ilgilendiren-calistay-envanter-cikarildi-h56659.html>
http://www.urfahizmet.com/haber/Gundem/Urfa_Bozkirlarinin_korunmasi_projesinde_yeni_asama/123193
<https://www.urfadasin.com/ozturkmen-dogal-hayat-ve-bozkirlarin-onemi-ortaya-cikacak>
<https://www.ajansurfa.com/gundem/urfa-yi-ilgilendiren-calistay-envanter-cikarildi-h56659.html>
<https://www.urfahaber.com/ekosistemlerin-korunmasi-calistayi-duzenlendi/10368/>
<http://www.kuzeyhaber.com/yazar-yazisi/gidada-uretim-duserken-fiyatlar-artiyor/13495>
<https://www.birgun.net/haber/oku-332065>
<https://www.tarimpusulasi.com/haber/fao-bozkir-projesi-kapsaminda-korunan-alan-ilani-katilimci-planlama-ve-izleme-egitimini-gerceklestiriyor-33520>
<https://www.oyakyatirim.com.tr/haberler/20210407131541/basin-bulteni-fao-bozkir-projesi-kapsaminda-korunan-alan-ilani-katilimci-planlama-ve-izleme-egitimini-gerceklestiriyor>
<http://finans.mynet.com/borsa/haberdetay/606d864d52faff0001a4c6e6>
<https://www.urfapusula.com/haber/7029325/urfanin-ekolojik-degerleri-belirlendi-ozturkmen-bizler-farkinda-degiliz>
<http://www.urfapusula.com/haber/7214006/bakan-yardimcisi-metin-urfaya-geldi-proje-yerinde-incelemesi-bekleniyor>
<https://www.ekovitrin.com/haber/oku-h260882.html>
<http://www.haberalanya.com.tr/haber/oku-h350961.html>
<https://www.medyaufurfa.com/sanliurfa/sanliurfa-nin-biyolojik-cesitlili-tanitildi-h95816.html>
<https://www.urfadegisim.com/haber-oku/45999/>
<https://malatyacagdas.com/haberi/213515/>
<https://www.inegolonline.com/haber/haber/oku-1869784/>
<https://www.urfadasin.com/sanliurfa-nin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi>
<http://www.aydin24haber.com/oku-623939h.htm>
<https://www.haberturk.com/sanliurfa-haberleri/87566713-sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi>
<https://ihavideo.com.tr/Video/Detay/1420235-sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi>

<https://www.bursahaber.com/cevre/sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi-h2069025.html>
<https://www.sondakika.com/haber/haber-sanliurfa-bozkirlarinin-sahip-oldugu-biyolojik-14159322/>
<https://www.beyazgundem.com/haber/oku-h1246854.html>
<https://www.hatayinternettv.com/haber/oku-434634>
<https://yenicizgihaber.com/haber/sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-yerli-ve-yabanci-basina-tanitildi-haberi-152533.html>
<https://www.talaseexpresshaber.com/haber/sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi-465835>
<https://www.iha.com.tr/sanliurfa-haberleri/sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi-3012429/>
<https://www.urfahaber.com/haber-oku/11852/>
<http://www.mardinhaber.com.tr/haber-sanliurfa-nin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi-94333.html>
<https://www.sanliurfaguncel.com/haber-oku/123611/>
<https://www.sabah.com.tr/sanliurfa/2021/05/27/sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi>
<http://www.dogurehberi.com/haber/oku-h2620237.html>
<http://www.urfadabugun.com/haber/144292/oku.html>
<https://www.haber16.com/haber-oku/391085/>
<https://www.61saat.com/cevre/sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi-h917738.html>
<https://www.haberler.com/sanliurfa-bozkirlarinin-sahip-oldugu-biyolojik-14159322-haberi/>
<https://www.medyagazete.com/haber/sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi-175959>
<http://www.istanbulhaber.com.tr/oku-haber-1778009.htm>
<http://www.karsmanset.com/haber/oku-541945.htm>
<https://www.gazeterize.com/cevre/sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi-h14395485.html>
<https://www.nehaber24.com/cevre/sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi-h608550.html>
<https://www.sanliurfa63.com/haber-oku/35880>
<https://www.urfa.com/sanliurfanin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi/>
<https://www.gazetedemokrat.com/haber-oku/344477/>
<https://www.guneydoguguncel.com/sanliurfa-nin-bozkirlarinin-biyolojik-yapisi-tanitildi/29816/>
<http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/07d76fff-8808-4942-ab3c-ee35faf45b29?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D>
<http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/27dea22d-d89f-447b-8227-af8bf4b2d55b?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D>
<http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/27dea22d-d89f-447b-8227-af8bf4b2d55b?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D>
<http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/0bff7661-5f9d-431c-a114-d6b09a259d0c?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D>
<http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/76d236b1-4155-4428-81c2-7a1549e2537d?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D>
<http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/3762572d-ce4e-4207-8a42-f5d7d6a8113b?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D>
<http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/0a0f802a-20d5-4dd8-b6e3-b5b80fbaf492?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D>
<http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/4532d7e0-8d96-4a70-a9c2-3a99db7d0de9?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D>
<http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/a5caa92c-30c5-4168-9935-0d0957a11a64?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D>
<http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/7744ad90-1143-4ecb-afea-f5a9b779096a?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D>
<http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/2ea78c24-2886-405d-b0e1-0e6b5d5cb8e5?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=55zaMAKyFAY>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kvHDAiB4qQw>

SOCIAL MEDIA LINKS

<https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1396065202026729474>
<https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1396064947256315909>
<https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1403281088047353858>
<https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1344570619086721024>
<https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1343548280211386368>
<https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1343548280211386368>
<https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1329007489166225415>
<https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1379089984062361602>
<https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1343951192007864321>
<https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1308711325682536448>
[https://twitter.com/search?q=bozk%C4%B1r%20\(from%3Afaoturkiye\)%20until%3A2021-07-01%20since%3A2020-07-01&src=typed_query](https://twitter.com/search?q=bozk%C4%B1r%20(from%3Afaoturkiye)%20until%3A2021-07-01%20since%3A2020-07-01&src=typed_query)

NEWS ON FAO TURKEY OFFICIAL WEBSITE

<http://www.fao.org/turkey/news/detail-news/en/c/1309361/>
<http://www.fao.org/turkey/news/detail-news/en/c/1366632/>
<http://www.fao.org/turkey/news/detail-news/en/c/1393819/>
<http://www.fao.org/turkey/resources/videos/en/>

- Does the project have a communication and/or knowledge management focal point? If yes, please provide their names and email addresses
 Şafak Toros
 FAO Turkey Communication Specialist
 safak.toros@fao.org

11. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.

If applies, please describe the process and current status of ongoing/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities
 Do indigenous peoples have an active participation in the project activities? How?

N/A

12. Innovative Approaches

Please provide a brief description of an innovative³⁰ approach in the project/programme, describe the type (e.g. technological, financial, institutional, policy, business model) and explain why it stands out as an innovation.

Detailed information on this section was provided for the 3th PIR. In order to avoid repetition, it was not supplied for this reporting period.

³⁰ Innovation is defined as *doing something new or different in a specific context that adds value*.

13. Possible impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the project

Please indicate any implication of the Covid-19 pandemic on the activities and progress of the project. Highlight the adaptative measures taken to continue with the project implementation.

- Are the outcomes/outputs still achievable within the project period?
- Will the timing of the project MTR or TE be affected/delayed?
- What has been the impact of COVID-19 on project beneficiaries, personnel, etc.?
- Are there good practices and lessons learned to be shared?

Project implementation and oversight at the level of activities (technical, administrative, operational and financial) by FAO and its partners is strong, extensive and thorough at national, provincial and local levels.

Despite the existence of strong partnerships among government agencies and stakeholders, which are well represented within the project structure, delays in some of the activities have severely affected field level implementations. Furthermore, the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic means that it will not be possible to achieve all planned outcomes and objectives within the current project period (end of 2020). Many field activities have also been negatively affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. In particular, stakeholder engagement activities, field studies for planning activities, meetings, workshops, and training and awareness activities have been postponed for more than one year.

The MTR process has been completed and the final report was submitted on May 2020. The main recommendation of the report is a one-year, no-cost extension to allow for more time to deliver effectively planned outputs and to maximize progress towards outcomes and objectives, such as the mainstreaming of demonstrated practices and lessons learned; and the institutionalization of outputs such as the monitoring of steppe landscapes within protected areas and production systems, and the implementation of training programmes on steppe conservation and sustainable grazing management.

A 1.5 year extension of the project (until June 2022) was adopted by the Project Steering Committee at the 4th PSC meeting. An additional three-month extension of the project (until September 2021) was adopted by the Project Steering Committee at the 5th PSC meeting, held on 25 May 2021 in Sanliurfa.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, meetings and workshops took place via the Zoom platform. Several technical meetings were held with implementing partners, Working Groups and Independent Expert Groups. Newly adopted measures incorporated the stakeholder engagement plan and related modalities. New modality approaches also included the establishment of WhatsApp groups with key partners and local stakeholders, the creation of mail groups consisting of scientific and independent experts, the use of web-based applications to ensure information flow among stakeholders, and the use of survey monkey and cloud-mapping applications.

In addition, several small group meetings were held with contracted companies and LoA holders (PGlobal and DKM teams) to finalize publications and awareness materials such as brochures, booklets, posters and so on.

Due to the continuing spread of COVID-19, the implementation of training programmes had to be postponed, and no planned training activities took place in 2020. To address this situation, a no-cost extension amendment was passed, and all envisaged training activities were moved from 2020 to 2021. The first training will be organized in the third week of April and will continue through to mid-June 2021.

14. Co-Financing Table

| Sources of Co-financing ³¹ | Name of Co-financer | Type of Co-financing | Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement/ approval | Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2021 | Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team) | Expected total disbursement by the end of the project |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Local government | MAF-GDNCNP | Cash and in-kind | 6 010 000 | 13 640 679 | 10 995 789 (2 820 940 in-kind+ 8 174 849 cash) | |
| Local government | MAF-GDPP | Cash and in-kind | 3 000 000 | | | |
| Local government | MAF-GDF | Cash and in-kind | - | | | |
| GEF agency | FAO | Cash and in-kind | 500 000 | 665 668 | 427 150 | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL | 9 510 000 | 14 306 347 | 11 422 939 | |

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement.

³¹ Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries Other.

Annex 1. GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** – Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** – Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** – Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** – Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** – Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** – The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as a “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

