



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	12
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	20
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	29
6. RISKS	31
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION (ONLY FOR PROJECTS THAT HAVE CONDUCTED AN MTR)	40
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	41
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	42
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	45
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	47
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	55
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	56

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Europe and Central Asia (REU)
Country (ies):	Türkiye
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 (years):	Four (4) years
Project coordinates:	<i>Provided separately</i>

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	28 April 2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	15 January 2017
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	30 September 2022
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	30 September 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) due to the impact of COVID-19 (<u>Annex IV- 25 May 2021 5th Project Steering Committee Decision</u>).

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	2,328,767
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	9,510,000

¹ As per FPMIS

² If NTE extension is requested and approved by the FAO-GEF CU.

³ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	2,060,529
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	15,269,535

⁴ For DEX projects, the GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with the Finance Division in HQ. For OPIM projects, the disbursement amount should be provided by Execution Partners.

⁵ Please refer to the section 12 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	25 May 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	-
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	September 2019 – May 2020
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	June 2022
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	YES, Annex 2.

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	Low
---	-----

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	5 th Final PIR
--	---------------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager	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 Turkiye (FAOSEC)	Viorel.Gutu@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Hernan M. Gonzalez, Technical Officer	Hernan.Gonzalez@fao.org

⁶ The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

⁷ The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

2. Progress towards Achieving Project Objective(s) (Development Objective)

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

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.							
Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹¹
Improve the conservation of Türkiye's steppe ecosystems through effective protected area management and	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 ¹² METT score TekTek: 28 Kizilkuyu: 51 Karacadag: 13	METT score TekTek: 40 Kizilkuyu: 64 Karacadag: 22	METT score TekTek: 50 Kizilkuyu: 71 Karacadag: 26	HS ¹³
		Established a monitoring programme for three pilot sites	TekTek: 0 Kizilkuyu: 0 Karacadag: 0	Not specified	TekTek: 1 Kizilkuyu: 1 Karacadag: 1	TekTek: 1 Kizilkuyu: 1 Karacadag: 1	HS

⁸ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic Co-benefits as well.

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

¹² Not specified but METT scored during the MTR period (2019) The scores are; Tek Tek Mountains: 28, Kizilkuyu WDA: 51 and Karacada[steppes: 13

¹³ The GEF5-BD monitoring effectiveness tracking tool (METT) is given in Annex-2

mainstreaming steppe biodiversity conservation into production landscapes.		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: 48 187 ha TekTek: 20 000 Kizilkuyu: 15 337 Karacadag: 12 850	S ¹⁴
		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: 66 560 TekTek: 13 732 Kizilkuyu: 5 664 Karacadag: 47 164.47 (24 366.74 ha buffer zone and 22 797.72 sustainable use zone)	HS ¹⁵
	Outcome 2 Steppe biodiversity conservation mainstreamed into	Total number of hectares managed according to improved sustainable grazing management program	Total hectares with sustainable grazing management programme: 0 ha	Not specified	Total hectares under the sustainable grazing management programme: 110 000 ha	A total of 118 732 ha is planned TekTek Mountains NP: 37 732 (20 000 ha core +13 732 ha buffer), Kizilkuyu:	S ¹⁶

¹⁴ 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. On the other hand, based on the results of the baseline survey, a 12 850-hectare land has been proposed as a hot spot in Karacadag due to its rich biological diversity and conservation priorities. Currently, the total steppe area within the core protected areas has increased from 40 000 ha to 48 187 ha in Şanlıurfa Province.

¹⁵ The buffer zones for the three project pilot sites have been identified based on the results of the baseline survey. Moreover, the buffer zones have been mapped along with their core zones. Baseline results, including proposed borders, have been reported.

¹⁶ Guidelines on Grazing Planning and Guidelines for Grazing and Livestock Monitoring that will serve as supportive documents for the grazing planning have been completed. The sustainable grazing management programme was initiated in March 2021 under the “Development of Grazing Management Plans and Management Plans for the Kizilkuyu Wildlife Development Area, TekTek Mountains National Park and (Şanlıurfa part of) Karacadag”. A total of 118 732 ha is planned to support sustainable grazing in 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). The grazing programme will be finalized at the end of June 2022.

	production landscapes		TekTek: 0 Kizilkuyu: 0 Karacadag: 0		TekTek: 25 000 Kizilkuyu: 25 000 Karacadag: 60 000	21 000 ha (15 337 ha core+ 5 664 ha buffer), Karacadag: 60 000 (12 835.53 ha core, 24 366.75 ha buffer and 22 797.72 ha sustainable use zones.	
		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: 650 TekTek: 200 Kizilkuyu: 100 Karacadag: 350	HS ¹⁷
		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 560 individuals of <i>Gazella marica</i> were recorded by the end of May 2022 in Kizilkuyu WDA (381 of them are free-roaming gazelle and 180 of them are in the gazelle breeding station)	HS

¹⁷ Several publications were drafted in 2020, 2021 and 2022; training programmes for pastoralists were produced to increase the capacity of pastoralists through development and implementation of the “Training Manual and Resource Materials under the Model Steppe Conservation Training Programme for Pastoralists” program. Implementation of the programmes was completed by the end-July 2021. Training programs for the ministry team on alternate grazing management and the field day activities for the pastoralist were conducted in May and June 2022 in the scope of grazing demonstration program.

		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	The monitoring program for the project sites was developed together with the relevant governmental institutions to facilitate implementation of the program. Even so, there are no concrete results. In addition, the grazing plans were drafted for these three project sites.	S ¹⁸
	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:	Not specified	Total government annual investment in steppe conservation: Şanlıurfa Province: USD 250 000 National:	Total government annual investment in steppe conservation: Şanlıurfa Province: USD 250 000	HS

¹⁸ 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 at the project sites (TekTek Mountains NP: 37 732 (20 000 ha. core +13 732 ha buffer), Kizilkuyu: 21 000 ha (15 33 ha core+ 5 664 ha buffer), Karacadag: 60 000 (12 835.53 ha core, 24 366.75 buffer 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.

			MFAL: USD 1 million * MFWA: USD 250 000* *Total investment is determined by the Division of National Parks and the Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry.		MoAF-GDPP: USD 1.5 million MAF-GDNCNP: USD500 000	National: GDNCNP+GDF: US\$ 12 006 581 million GDPP: US\$ 2 331 344 Total co-financing: USD 14 587 925	
		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* *According to the GAP Region	Not specified	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). ¹⁹	S ²⁰

¹⁹ A protocol has been signed between the Şanlıurfa Governorate, the Şanlıurfa Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry and the Regional Directorate of National Parks.

The process is followed by the local authority according to this protocol. No written statement has yet been submitted.

²⁰ The total meadow-pasture area in the GAP Region (including six provinces) covers 2.2 million ha, while the area covered by steppe forests and bushes 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 pastures. The Şanlıurfa Steppe Conservation Strategy and Action Plan was drafted. The Strategy and Action Plan is under implementation by the Şanlıurfa Governorship and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. A protocol was signed on 22 May 2021 for implementation of this strategy. The strategy will be the main instrument for achievement of this indicator. Some 756 000 ha of steppe pastures will be managed strategically in accordance with this protocol. The finalized strategy was delivered to all provinces in Türkiye by GDPP.

			Agricultural Master Plan				
		Number of government policies fully integrating steppe conservation principles and practices	Government policies integrating improved steppe conservation: GDNCNP National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan: 0 National MoAF Annual Strategic Performance Document: 0 Şanlıurfa Governorship's five-year development plan: 0		Government policies integrating improved steppe conservation: GDNCNP National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan: 1 National MoAF Annual Strategic Performance Document: 1 Sanliurfa Governorship's five-year development plan: 1	GDNCNP National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan: 1 (MAF, 2019. National Biodiversity Action Plan 2018-2028) National MoAF Annual Strategic Performance Document: 1 (MoAF, 2019. Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry 2019-2023 Strategic Plan) Şanlıurfa Governorship's five-year development plan: 1 (2020. Sanliurfa Vision 2023 Feasibility Report)	HS ²¹

²¹ The Şanlıurfa Steppe Conservation Strategy and Action Plan was drafted 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 22 May 2021 incorporated the strategy into the Şanlıurfa Governorship's five-year development plan. In addition

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
OUTCOME 1	N/A	N/A	N/A
OUTCOME 2	N/A	N/A	N/A
OUTCOME 3	N/A	N/A	N/A

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as per the Implementation Plan/Annual Workplan)

Outcomes and Outputs ²²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ²³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ²⁴ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1	New steppe protected area established and operational			
Output 1.1.1	Surveys and assessment of biodiversity in Karacadağ, Tek Tek Mountains NP and Kızılkuyu WDA	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 1.1.2	Surveys and assessment of social and economic issues in Karacadağ, Tek Tek Mountains NP and Kızılkuyu WDA	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 1.1.3	Preparing Guideline on Establishment of Protected Areas for establishment of a new protected area	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 1.1.4	Preparing Guideline on Establishment of Protected Areas for establishment of a new protected area	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	Name of this guideline was changed to "Guideline for Assessing the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Protected Areas "
Output 1.1.5	Involving and consulting stakeholders through a series of meetings and workshops on assessments	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance

²² Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

²³ Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

²⁴ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Output 1.1.6	Developing and circulating the Stakeholder Engagement Guideline	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	Name of this guideline was changed to "Guideline for Engaging Stakeholders in Managing Protected Areas"
Output 1.1.7	Finalizing the protected area proposal dossier and submitting it to Min. of Environment and Urbanization.	Reviewing applicability of criteria/requirements for registering Karacadag as OECM and compilation of information/road map for OECM registration	An international consultant was recruited to review applicability of criteria for Karacadag. The report will be submitted by the expert at the end of June and drafted report will be reviewed by the Ministry.	At the Ad-hoc Project Steering Committee Meeting which was held on 04 November 2021, it was decided to go ahead with the "Other effective area-based conservation measure" (OECM) approach for Karacadağ
Output 1.1.8	Undertaking communication activities, raising of public awareness, and publishing information materials, strategies, guidelines and other field survey results	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 1.1.9	Undertaking a series of activities (training, workshop etc.)	Training on Assessing the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Protected Areas	Implemented between 06-10 June 2022.	No variance
Output 1.1.10	Declaring the protected area	It is linked to 1.1.7	It is linked to 1.1.7	Steering Committee Meeting which was held on 04 November 2021, it was decided to go ahead with the "Other effective area-based conservation measure" (OECM) approach for Karacadağ. Instead of declaring the protected area, the assessment will be done together with a road map for OECM registration.
Outcome 1.2.	Effective management plans for three steppe protected areas created and implemented			
Output 1.2.1	Preparing Guidelines for Protected Area Management Planning	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance

Output 1.2.2	Completing the draft management plan for Kizilkuyu to revise the existing management plan	Drafting the management plan	Linked with 1.2.3; 1.2.4; 1.2.5; 1.2.7; and 2.1.3 because they are under the same tender. The planning process was initiated on March 2021. The works will be completed by the end of June 2022.	No variance
Output 1.2.3	Finalizing and ratifying the all three management plans based on the Kizilkuyu management planning experience and adapting according to the different formats and needs.	Finalizing three management plans	The planning process was initiated on March 2021. Linked with 1.2.2; 1.2.4; 1.2.5; 1.2.7; and 2.1.3 because they are under the same tender. The management plans have been pre-approved by the ministry. English version of the reports in progress submitting to LTO for technical clearance.	No variance
Output 1.2.4	Implementing and modeling the priority management interventions	An exit strategy about Implementing and modeling the priority management interventions	It has been listed in AWP, couldn't not initiated yet.	No variance
Output 1.2.5	Developing a specific "Species Action Plans" for managing and conserving important (flag) species	Developing specific "Species Action Plans	The planning process was initiated on March 2021. Linked with 1.2.2; 1.2.3; 1.2.4; 1.2.7; and 2.1.3; because they are under the same tender	No variance
Output 1.2.6	Realizing some key investments in infrastructure required to operationalize management planning (signboards, demarcation of borders etc.)	Assembling the park infrastructures	Linked with 1.2.4. It is in the tender stage.	No variance
Output 1.2.7	Using the management planning process for capacity building at all levels through developing guidelines, ensuring active	Organizing workshops and stakeholder meetings according to the concluded management planning contract	Linked with 1.2.2; 1.2.3; 1.2.4; 1.2.5; and 2.1.3 because they are under the same tender.	No variance

	participation of key staff and a series of other capacity building activities.		Necessary meetings and WSs were organized by the contractor.	
Outcome 1.3	Rigorous monitoring program for three steppe protected areas established			
Output 1.3.1	Generating and publishing a simple Monitoring Handbook	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	Name of this guideline was changed to "Guideline for Monitoring Biodiversity"
Output 1.3.2	Catalyzing the establishment of a monitoring group to advice and support the protected area managers with the design and implementation of a rigorous biodiversity monitoring program.	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 1.3.3	Preparing a monitoring program for three project pilot sites according to the guidance of Monitoring Handbook and set in place a monitoring program for all three protected areas	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 1.3.4.	Providing equipment and tools required to initiate the monitoring program	Finalization of procurement for the monitoring equipment and tools	Tender process was completed, technical evaluation is ongoing	No variance
Outcome 2.1	Sustainable grazing management program operational across three steppe protected areas and associated buffer zones			
Output 2.1.1	Guideline on Grazing Planning and Management	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 2.1.2	Analyzing the on-going grazing activities and baseline surveys with each of the protected areas and associated buffer zones dealing with grazing	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 2.1.3	Identifying the best grazing management models for each site	Finalizing grazing management plans	The grazing planning process was initiated on March 2021.	No variance

	and Preparing grazing plans for three sites		Linked with 1.2.2; 1.2.3; 1.2.4; 1.2.5; and 1.2.7 because they are under the same tender. The works will be completed by the end of June 2022.	
Output 2.1.4	Implementing the new grazing management plans with a Common Agriculture Practice (CAP) and Trade approach	An exit strategy about implementing the new grazing management plans with a Common Agriculture Practice (CAP) and Trade approach	Almost impossible to carry this out due to extensive project delays.	No variance
Output 2.1.5.	Preparing land use management plans for three sites	An exit strategy about preparing land use management plans for three sites	Almost impossible to carry out due to extensive project delays.	No variance
Output 2.1.6.	Establishing and functionalizing an effective coordination system between government agencies and livestock producers	Finalizing grazing management plans	Linked with 2.1.3 The works will be completed by end of June 2022.	No variance
Output 2.1.7.	Establishing the Grazing Working Group to ensure that lessons-learned are captured and disseminated	Finalizing grazing management plans	This activity was initiated on March 2021. Linked with 2.1.3. The works will be completed by end of June 2022.	No variance
Output 2.1.8	Developing and implementing a grazing management demonstration program	Finalization of the demo program	This activity was initiated on June 2021. The works will be completed by end of June 2022.	No variance
Output 2.1.9	Supporting implementation of the grazing management plan through necessary equipment and tools	Listing the equipment and tools for implementation of the grazing management plan; preparing the technical specifications for the necessary equipment and tools	Linked with 2.1.3. Tender process was completed, technical evaluation is ongoing	No variance
Outcome 2.2.	Impacts of the sustainable grazing management program monitored at three steppe protected areas			
Output 2.2.1	Developing grazing monitoring system and linked BD monitoring programme (Ecosystem	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	Name of the respective Guideline is Guidelines for Grazing and Livestock Monitoring

	monitoring-Impact Monitoring, socio-economic and land use applications and livestock monitoring with linked BD Monitoring program)			
Output 2.2.2	Developing Livestock Monitoring Programme and incorporating it into the Grazing Monitoring System	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 2.2.3	Creating a livestock sales program linked to “steppe friendly” production methods (in grazing plan)	An exit strategy about a livestock sales program linked to “steppe friendly” production methods	Almost impossible to carry out due to extensive project delays.	No variance
Output 2.2.4	Developing alternative income generation activity opportunities for three project sites	Developing grazing management plans	It was started on March 2021. Linked with 1.2.2; 1.2.3; 1.2.4; 1.2.5; 2.1.3; 2.1.7; and 2.1.9 because they are under the same tender. The works will be completed by the end of June 2022	No variance
Output 2.2.5	Completing the livestock monitoring protocols and baseline analysis with ecological, herd production and social indicators	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 2.2.6	Implementing the monitoring protocols	Signing a LoA with DKM to implement monitoring program using monitoring protocols	Signing process for LoA is still ongoing.	No variance
Output 2.2.7	Improving and/ or revising the grazing management plan upon the findings of the monitoring	Almost impossible to carry this out due to extensive project delays and will be included under the exit strategy.	N/A	No variance
Output 2.2.8	Supporting the impact monitoring of the sustainable grazing management program through necessary equipment and material	Preparing the technical specifications for the necessary equipment and tools	Tender process was completed, technical evaluation is ongoing	No variance

Outcome 2.3.	Model steppe conservation training program for pastoralists emplaced			
Output 2.3.1	Creating a project training strategy and training program on steppe management, monitoring	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 2.3.2	Developing a Training Manual and resource materials for trainings	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 2.3.3	Implementing the training program in line with the demonstrations	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 2.3.4	Integrating the training program into government operations	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Outcome 3.1	Şanlıurfa provincial steppe conservation strategy and associated enabling environment improvements implemented			
Output 3.1.1	Establishing the Şanlıurfa Steppe Conservation Technical Working Group under the Pasture Commission	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 3.1.2	Designing and developing a Model Steppe Conservation Strategy on Provincial Level (Series of workshops and meeting will be held during the preparation process)	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 3.1.3	identifying alternative income generating activities in the Steppe Conservation Strategy	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 3.1.4	Mainstreaming the strategy objectives and priorities into operational budgets, human resources and policies of local and regional organizations	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Outcome 3.2	National steppe conservation strategy and associated enabling			

	environment improvements established			
Output 3.2.1	Establishing a Steppe Conservation Working Group as a joint initiative of MFAL and MFWA	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 3.2.2	Preparing the National Steppe Conservation Strategy for National Level (Series of workshops and meeting will be held during the preparation process)	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 3.2.3	Mainstreaming the national strategy into the national policy and strategy documents, annual plans etc.	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Outcome 3.3	National steppe conservation training and awareness program for decision-makers and resource managers			
Output 3.3.1	Designing and implementing the Steppe Conservation and Management Training Program for agricultural extension officers and national parks extension officers	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 3.3.2	Organizing annual steppe conservation seminars/workshops	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 3.3.3	Preparing and distributing the model steppe conservation recommendations and instructions in order to increase the awareness of 81 pasture commissions in Türkiye	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance
Output 3.3.4	Generating and publishing training materials	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR.

During this reporting period, great effort was made to ensure that approximately 25 publications prepared under the project could be published upon OCC approval as FAO publications. The ISBN numbers and barcodes for these publications were provided by the OCC team.

Preparation of the nomination dossier for Karacadag, which was on hold for a long time, was finally kicked-off. It was decided to go ahead with the “Other effective area-based conservation measure (OECM)” approach for Karacadağ. An international consultant was recruited to review the applicability of criteria for Karacadag. The report will be submitted by the expert at the end of June and the drafted report will be reviewed by the Ministry.

The Training on Assessing the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Protected Areas was one of the trainings expected to be implemented within the scope of the project. It was carried out between 06-10 June 2022 in Kizilcahamam/Ankara with participation of 100 technical staff members from the Ministry and 20 representatives from the academia and NGOs. The training was not only a capacity building program but also was a chance to assess the protected areas in Türkiye by using the RAPPAM methodology.

The preparation of management plans for the project sites and the development of species/multi species action plans were the main focused tasks for this period. The preparation of grazing management plans is also included in the same contract and is being undertaken simultaneously. Therefore, special importance was attached to the preparation of the management plans, species action plans and grazing plans. During this process, regular meetings were held especially with the Ministry partners and field-based stakeholders. Eight separate thematic workshops and two technical group meetings were held under the activity entitled “*Development of Grazing Plans for the Şanlıurfa Kızılkuyu Wildlife Development Area, Tek Tek Mountains National Park, and Karacadağ Steppes*”. At the same time, many small group meetings with the Ministry team, either technical or the decision-makers level, were held to strengthen participation of stakeholders in preparation of consensus-based qualitative plans.

The grazing management demonstration program was initiated. A two-day practical training on grazing demonstration was organized within the scope of this program and the majority of the demonstration infrastructure was set up.

The grazing management demonstration program to implement the alternate grazing practices in Karacadag steppes was one of the field-based and practical applications under the project. The purpose of this demonstration program was to contribute to the understanding of alternate grazing approaches to improve shepherds’ and livestock owners’ quality of life and to increase animal welfare. For this purpose, 15 ha of pasture and/or grazing area was fenced. The area was divided into 7 paddocks and a rotational grazing program was developed to demonstrate the effects of the alternate grazing against the ongoing daily grazing model. Practical trainings and field days were organized for shepherds, animal owners, Şanlıurfa-based stakeholders and Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry staff members in order to share information, increase awareness of the demonstration program and its results. The demonstration program has implications

not only for sustainable management of pastures and steppes but also grazing of animals and animal welfare. Therefore, 5 separate canopies, each with a capacity of 500 heads of standard sheep, were built. Two wooden signboards (1mx1.5m each) explaining the project and the demonstration area were prepared. Visible marking signs were placed for each paddock to make it easier for those concerned to enter and exit the paddock. 20 metal mangers, each large enough for 100 heads of sheep at the same time, were provided for the animals to be given salt, feed or other supplements. 2 simple scratching posts (8 in total) were placed for each canopy. For each canopy, a total of 8 water troughs were provided, 2 of which are solid, made of metal with a minimum capacity of 250 liters. 4 solar-powered cooking stoves were provided. Two 1x1.5 m main signboards were prepared. An at least 0.5 m² paddock sign was placed next to the entrance gate of each paddock so that it can be seen from afar. A total of 4 information signs, 2x4 m in size, 1 in each canopy, containing basic information and suggestions such as grazing management, biodiversity, and animal husbandry practices were designed and installed.

An indicator-based monitoring program for all three project sites along with the technical specifications of the listed equipment and tools was developed and finalized in the previous reporting period. In this period, the purchasing process for the monitoring equipment such as GPS collar set, GPS transmitter and camera trap set for biodiversity monitoring and soil sampling auger, wind erosion measurement setup, weather-control station for environmental monitoring was initiated and the offers were collected in order to achieve rigorous monitoring of the selected indicators and to support conservation of the natural resources in the project sites.

The priority management interventions such as park infrastructure, sign boards, information panels etc. were modelled and the technical specifications were finalized. Tendering process is going on. This will contribute to increasing management effectiveness of protected area system to conserve steppe biodiversity in three-project pilot sites.

In addition to raising awareness, the web portal, which will serve as a learning platform for achieving public involvement in steppe management, was developed. The portal is an interface under the General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Park's web page.

The portal is open to all technically cleared resource materials, which are produced and published under the project. The link of this portal is given in below.

<https://bozkirprojesi.org/>

Besides, the project team tried to broadcast, on TRT, a documentary about the project and the steppes, which was produced within the scope of the project, based on a decision made at the 5th Steering Committee Meeting that was held on 25 May 2021 in Sanliurfa. The Ministry started off an initiative in line with this decision, and the Ministry and FAO cooperatively followed up on all necessary procedures to broadcast the documentary.

Challenges

Although they were included in the PP and the technical specifications were in place, two procurement activities listed below could not be finalized because technical clearance and procurement process took longer than expected. These two activities are still ongoing:

- Realizing some key investments in infrastructure required to operationalize management planning (signboards, demarcation of borders etc.)

- .
- Although a protocol has been prepared for the monitoring program, it has not been implemented yet.
- Arranging the monitoring training for the Ministry staff to implement monitoring program and monitoring protocols.

As for the management plans for the three project sites, all the sections were drafted and approved by the Ministry. However, except the first sections, the remaining are either under language editing or going through technical clearance process.

The management planning process requires the involvement of many different stakeholders. This is also time-consuming. On the other hand, the reports should be prepared in Turkish in the first place because of the necessity to get comments and recommendation from the primary land managers and Ministry staff members. At the second stage, the reports are translated into the English and submitted to FAO for technical approval. This process is taking longer than expected. Not only this process, but also the low quality of the submitted reports causes the planning process to be prolonged.

Unfortunately, as stressed in the previous reporting periods, due to a lengthy technical clearance and preparatory process for RFP together with the subsequent procedures, the management planning activity could not be launched in the planned period. It took approximately 20 months, from August 2019 to March 2021, to complete the preliminary procedures required to start the planning work. The contract could only be signed with the company in March 2021. While approximately two years is considered reasonable for the tender process, it is not acceptable to prepare 3 management plans, 3 species/multi species action plans and 3 grazing plans and organizing approximately 8 workshops in cooperation with the participants and different stakeholders. However, all the process has been followed in close cooperation with the Ministry team and the service provider to complete the listed plans.

The technical specifications of the equipment, tools and materials were clearly defined in each monitoring program, with estimated budget for each item. However, these equipment, tools and materials could not be purchased to date as the LTO requested technical clearance from the Headquarters. Therefore, the technical clearance from both HQ and LTO prolonged the procurement process. The prolongation of the technical clearance processes also caused the cost of the activities to be conducted and the materials to be purchased to be much higher than expected due to the rising inflation rates in Türkiye.

Other problems encountered in the reporting period included the following: reaching a consensus on reports, products and technical proposals both internally and externally (FAO and Ministry partners) required a significant amount of time. Especially, the length of the FAO tendering processes in general and consequent evaluation and decision-making processes hamper the progress of the project.

Likewise, the tendering process for developing and implementing a grazing management demonstration program could not be initiated as planned. The spring 2021 was a lost season for the field-based demonstrations because of the delays in contract awarding, which could only be concluded in the summer season (June 2021). Therefore, the demonstration activities especially on alternate grazing program and environmental and biodiversity monitoring regarding grazing applications could be launched in the mid May 2022.

In general, important problems concerned can be specified as follows:

- 1) the Covid-19 pandemic resulting in obligatory measures to be taken for protection,
- 2) delays in concluding the tender for grazing and management planning,
- 3) delays in concluding the tender for grazing demonstration program,

- 4) length of OCC clearance process, and
- 5) length of internal clearance process and procedures and
- 6) issue related to late submission of the reports and poor performance by SPs and consultants.

Several actions were taken to reduce the impact of the encountered problems. In order to improve the quality of the reports and products delivered by the contracted SPs and consultants, regular team meetings were held via face to face, zoom, skype and telephone meetings. NPC worked in close cooperation with the three focal points from the General Directorates, and directly with the Deputy General Directors from each General Directorate to get their suggestions and inputs to increase the quality of the products. External and internal support was provided especially to increase the language quality of the publications.

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 reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	FY2022 Development Objective rating²⁵	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating²⁶	Comments/reasons²⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<p>Project has achieved all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “ a good practice”. Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project.</p> <p>More specifically, the scope of the project is very broad. It has been implemented in the three pilot areas that are very far from each other. On the other hand, it is aimed to carry out studies on a national basis. So it is a very ambitious project for the conservation and sustainable management of steppe biodiversity in Türkiye. Comprehensive baseline surveys, management and grazing planning, monitoring and capacity building activities are all directly related to expertise, stakeholder participation, budget and time. Despite being so comprehensive, the budget and implementation time is almost impossible in terms of dissemination of all results. If it is expected that realizing sustainable natural resource management with a participatory approach, it has to be consider much more time and budget. In the current situation, due to the limited time for actions and budget constraint, there is a few unfinished small scale activities which do not affect the project results to be achieved globally. During the implementation of the project, the contribution and support of the central and provincial units of the ministry and other key</p>

²⁵ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.

For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

²⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

²⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

			stakeholders has been the most important driving force in the successful execution of the project. For this reason, the feasibility of the above-mentioned unfinished activities is under the guarantee of the Ministry.
Budget Holder	MS	MS	The project achieved important objectives, and contributed sustainability of the steppe ecosystems both national and regional level with national and regional steppe conservation strategies, management plans, grazing management plans and species/multiply species action plans. In addition to being carried out in harmony with other projects implemented in this field, it has been observed that it contributes significantly to the strategic goals of GEF, UN and FAO. It is a quite ambitious project considering its national, regional and site level outputs. Implementation of all outputs is in considerable compliance with the original/formally revised work plan for the project. Some of the activities did not initiated on time and also a few activities have been still going on.
GEF Operational Focal Point²⁸	MS	MS	The achieved results and outputs of the project contributed significantly to the conservation of Turkey's steppe ecosystems and to achieve the CBD targets. For the first time, steppe ecosystems have been comprehensively evaluated, and a national strategy and seven sets of guidelines have been prepared. On the other hand, comprehensive baseline surveys conducted; participatory management planning, comprehensive grazing planning and species/multi-species action planning have been prepared that will lead to the conservation of the steppe species and its habitats. For the first time, the steppe ecosystem was widely publicized. The steppe documentary, which is an effective work of the project on raising awareness and informing the public, has been evaluated for broadcasting on TRT. Prepared strategies have been integrated into national and regional plans. A comprehensive monitoring program has provided a model monitoring approach for protected areas, as well as enabling the monitoring and evaluation of steppe ecosystems. On the other hand, the evaluation of the field with the OECM approach is an important initiative in order to achieve the CBD Targets. Again, the studies on presenting Karacadag rice as GIAHS is a first application. In addition to

²⁸ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

			<p>these, there are currently a few activities that will not adversely affect the overall project but have not been completed during the project process.</p> <p>Unfortunately, many activities were carried out later than planned due to the fact that the process and technical permissions of the executive institution and technical unit take time. And the project was implemented slower than expected. Despite everything, it is quite successful in terms of achieved results.</p> <p>The significant effort was made to manage and coordinate the project together with the relevant ministry partners. All three general directorates have been actively participated in the process and activities.</p> <p>Actually, the project is comprehensive. Its components can be a separate project. Being so comprehensive required meticulous management in terms of coordination, budget and time. This issue was very well managed by the project coordinator with the relevant Units of our Ministry.</p> <p>The most important gain for BUGEM has been the increased capacity in grazing planning, management and protection of steppe pastures. In a project, steppe pastures have been comprehensively discussed at national, regional and local levels. With this project, BUGEM took part in such a comprehensive project for the first time and had important gains.</p> <p>Of course, there were some restrictions in the process. In particular, the long duration of FAO's procurement and technical approval procedures caused a significant delay in the activities of the project.</p> <p>Despite everything, the results obtained are of a quality that will make a very important contribution to the protection and management of Turkey's steppe pastures. The outputs obtained can be presented as an example of good practice and dissemination of the project. Therefore, it is a very useful and successful project for BUGEM.</p>
Lead Technical Officer²⁹	MU	MU	<p>Outcomes of the project are somewhat on track, but their ratification is outstanding. Numerous important GEB will be not reached. This has been already noted at the MTR, but the requested action plan has not been finalized (status is 20 July 2020). Overall, all technical deficiencies reported in previous PIR reports are still valid. Additionally, technical quality of the actual project outputs that are underlying project outcomes is at low level. Most notably, the following</p>

²⁹ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

			<p>shortcomings were noted within the reporting period: Participatory approach for management planning is limited to GoT, only a limited number of CSO is involved. Farmers including women farmers are not included in the process. Alternative approach for Karadacag PA (i.e. nomination as OECM) will likely not materialize due to massive grazing interventions. Management plan for Tek Tek will not be based on internationally recommended state of the art IUCN categorizations. Capacity development activities failed to reach their objectives as evidenced by failure to initiate implementation of the Monitoring program and issues associated with understanding of the ongoing planning process for development of the Grazing and PA Management plans (of which ratification is likely not achievable within the project life time). Demo activities will not be able to produce results to showcase the advantage of the alternative rotational grazing as the actual monitoring results will not be available due to delays within the project life time. Numerous activities were not initiated at all (apart of implementation of the initially foreseen Grazing and PA Management plans and Monitoring program), such as for instance development of a land use management plan and livestock sale program). Sound exit strategy could to a certain extent mitigate these shortcomings, but it is not yet available.</p>
--	--	--	--

FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	S	<p><i>As highlighted in the MTR, the project had some design issues. These were addressed after the MTR, and a revised results framework was developed to better reflect the reality on the ground. The project achieved its revised objectives. The project is highly relevant for Turkiye and has set important groundwork to support the conservation and sustainable use of the country's steppe ecosystems, including comprehensive baseline surveys, planning and monitoring capacity building, and ground-breaking work (at the national level) on OECMs.</i></p> <p><i>The project faced some challenges completing the activities for some of the outputs regarding the implementation of management interventions, grazing management plans, and land-use management plans. Nevertheless, the major objectives of the project have been achieved and 45 out of 53 outputs have been successfully completed or are on track to be finalized by project end. The remaining Outputs have faced significant challenges, but measures are being taken to address the challenges and the exit strategy of the project will take the necessary actions to complete the remaining activities.</i></p> <p><i>Nevertheless, as outlined in table 2 above, the major objectives of the project have been achieved (and in many cases targets have been surpassed), and 45 out of 53 outputs have been successfully completed or are on track to be finalized by project end (table 3 above). The remaining Outputs have faced significant challenges, but measures have been put in place to address the challenges and the exit strategy of the project will take the necessary actions to complete the remaining activities</i></p> <p><i>.</i></p>
--	----------	----------	--

. Establishing the Şanlıurfa Steppe Conservation Technical Working Group under the Pasture Commission.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made complying with the approved ESM plan. 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. Add new ESS risks if any risks have emerged during this FY.

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 (ESS) Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ³⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
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.

--

³⁰ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation (including COVID-19 related risks). The last column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in the project, as relevant.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
--	--------------	---------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	---

³¹ Risk ratings means a rating of accesses the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

1	Challenging project coordination	High	Y	<p>Close and collaborative cooperation between many institutional stakeholders (particularly the MAF will be essential for the project to achieve its stated goal and objectives. Related risk 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.</p>	<p>As the project has several different partners, 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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>ii) The NPC will be actively coordinating in timely delivery of</p>
---	----------------------------------	------	---	--	---	---

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
						the outputs and monitor the progress In consultation with the MoAF, the project management structure will be developed
2	Low capacity of local and national institutions	Medium	Y	National institutions' (MAF) capacity and technical expertise is weak at various levels. 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 trainings at central and local levels.	The project foresees significant capacity-building activities and implementation of a communication plan.	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Climate change	Low	Y	Climate change will require evolving research on the proposed approaches and new best practices. MAF, 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, climate change can also increase political support for the project.	The project is not directly affected by climate change. Best practices are considered for all contractual works.	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	Low ownership and lack of sustainability of new technologies and techniques	Low	Y	Lack of ownership and subsequent lack of sustainability of new technologies promoted under the project could cause difficulties in achieving desired adoption levels. This risk 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 not adequate to generate engagement	Medium	Y	<p>The project is designed to engage fully with local stakeholders. This will make certain that stakeholders, 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 were established to encourage intensive participation by local stakeholders. An independent expert group and a local stakeholder group were established to strengthen stakeholder participation throughout the implementation process. Field-level focal groups including teachers, mukhtars and academics were established with associated WhatsApp groups.</p> <p>Outdoor trainings for pastoralists to introduce them to the methods of sustainable grazing management and conservation of biodiversity in rangelands were arranged and almost 250 pastoralist participated in the training programs. Several publications and promotional materials have been</p>	
---	---	--------	---	---	---	--

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
					<p>produced and almost 500 items of these materials have been 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 trigger security measures limiting implementation	Medium	Y	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 conflicts and outside of places of security risks. FAO/Turkiye 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 were undertaken for the project team during the field mission period. 4X4 fully equipped vehicles were used and strict security rules were implemented during the missions.	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
7	<p>COVID-19 pandemic (NOT FORESEEN IN PRODOC, ad hoc addition here, see detailed report under section 13</p> <p>Possible impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the project)</p>	High	N	<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 activity 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 considering alternative tools and approaches such as IT-based forms of implementation (Zoom, Skype business, etc.)</p>	<p>The majority of activities were conducted via Zoom, supported 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 field works, face to face meetings, trainings and study tours could not be conducted in this period.</p>	

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	M	

7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1:	It was done in 4 th period.
Recommendation 2:	It was done in 4 th period.
Recommendation 3:	It was done in 4 th period.
Recommendation 4:	It was done in 4 th period.

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	Not yet
---	---------

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines³². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

It was done in 4th PIR period.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule			
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity			
Other			

32 Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval during this reporting period.

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 were actively engaged in the project. For example, all levels of government were 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.

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholder Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) – General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks (GDNCNP)	Executing agency	A strong cooperation and collaboration have been conducted through the project.	The participation of the representatives of the Ministry has always been at the highest level and effective. The main difficulty in participation was due to the fact that the accommodation and transportation expenses of the ministry team could not be covered by the project. This issue has also been resolved through mutual relations and cooperation. Another issue is that ministry staff have to follow the traces of daily routine. In other words, they carried out their current duties in both the project and the ministry at the same time. This situation may cause delays in the organization of activities from time to time.
General Directorate of Plant Production (GDPP), MoAF	Executing agency	A strong cooperation and collaboration have been conducted through the project.	
General Directorate of Forestry (GDF) MoAF	Executing agency	A strong cooperation and collaboration have been conducted through the project.	
Regional and sub-regional Directorates of GDNCNP and GDF	Extension office of the executing agency in Sanliurfa	A strong cooperation and collaboration have been conducted through the project.	
Şanlıurfa Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry	Extension office of the executing agency in Sanliurfa	A strong cooperation and collaboration have been conducted through the project.	

Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
Nature Conservation Centre (DKM)	LoA Partner	The participation of the LoA partner was limited to the implementation of the their tasks in the scope of the signed LoA. Even so, they participated to the other events of the project and also engaged to the MTR evaluation process.	The works and results have been conducted effectively and efficiency due to having qualified technical team of the LoA partner. The main challenges has been regarding to the timing. There have been delays in reporting and implementing activities due to the LoA partner has many other responsibilities in their own works.
Private sector entities			
ANCEO	Service provider	The participation of SP was limited to the implementation of the tasks in the scope of the signed contract. Even so, they participated to the other events of the project and also engaged to the MTR evaluation process.	The works and results have been conducted effectively and efficiency. The main challenges has been regarding to the timing and reporting. There have been delays in reporting and implementing activities due to the weak quality of the reports. One other challange has been related with the language of the reports. In the firt stage, the reports has been drafted Turkish because of getting approval by the ministry, then translated to the EN. It tooks time and also decrease the language quality. Therefore, the reports need a professional editing. It was the one of the reason to delay of the reports as well.
PGOBAL	Service provider	The participation of SP was limited to the implementation of the their tasks in the scope of the signed contract	No cahhalges
UYUM	Service provider	The participation of SP was limited to the implementation of the their tasks in the scope of the signed contract	The works and results have been conducted effectively and efficiency. The main challenges has been regarding to the timing and reporting. There have been delays in reporting and implementing activities due to the missed season to implement the activities.

Others[1]			
Şanlıurfa Governorship	Local administration/government, Steering Committee member	Good cooperation and collaboration has been conducted	As a steering committee member, the Şanlıurfa Governorship has always supported of the project activities and to invite all the other relevant stakeholders to the project activities
Şanlıurfa Municipality	Local administration- rather than execution of the project, a key stakeholder for implementation of decisions in rural areas.	Good cooperation and collaboration has been conducted	Especially its department on Agriculture has actively participated to the project activities.
Harran University	Academia. Member of the Steering Committee. Member of the independent Expert Group	Good cooperation and collaboration has been conducted	As a member of Independent Experts Group, an effective support has been provided by the University. In the process one of the member has been appointed a member of the steering committee.
GAP Administration	Local administration/government	Good cooperation and collaboration has been conducted	No challenge
New stakeholders identified/engaged			
Union of Sheep and Goat Breeders	Local NGO	Good cooperation and collaboration has been conducted	No challenge
Union of Cattle Breeders	Local NGO	Good cooperation and collaboration has been conducted	No challenge

[1] They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women's groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then.

10. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.

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 that was carried out at micro (household), mezo (institutions) and macro (policy) levels.

Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	No	However, a comprehensive socio-economic survey was undertaken within the baseline survey study.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	Training programmes and awareness-raising activities were identified to strengthen gender mainstreaming in project activities and increase the capacity of different social groups related to the project sites.
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	
Any other good practices on gender	Yes	The project does not include any specific awareness-raising activities for women; however, several workshops and meetings were carried out during the project period and almost 30-35% of the participants were women.

		<p>A specific awareness and training programme was conducted for school teachers, with the participation of 25 teachers, half of whom were women. School activities included murals and creation of a nature corner, with the participation of teachers and students. Seven school events were implemented and almost 2 500 students actively participated in the events with a 50:50 ratio of boys and girls.</p> <p>A specific field day and training were conducted for livestock owners and shepherds. Almost 120 participants participated in these events and 30% of them were women.</p> <p>Through the management planning and the grazing management planning process, special interviews were conducted with women to understand their expectations regarding the living environment and income generating activities.</p> <p>One of the participatory activity was drafting a GIAHS dossier for Karacadag rice. The team mainly communicated with women who used rice for food and rice producers who were actively present in the field to produce this traditional product.</p> <p>In addition, throughout the grazing demonstration process, women were the main actors to implement the program because of their major role in milking and grazing.</p>	
--	--	--	--

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
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 thus far.	
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	<p>Yes, The project communication strategy has been implemented during the project events, workshops and missions. These activities have been published for awareness raising on social media and web. The photos and videos were taken from the events, workshops and trainings</p> <p>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 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seven Guideline • Booklets (5 different booklets) • Film documentary, social media spot and thematic shorts films • Village guidebooks for each project site (total 3) • Teacher guidebook and activity books to kids for nature activities in schools • Booklets for rangelands (5 different booklets) <p>The web-page custom-made web portal for the project was published under the General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks website. 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. The website prepared both in English and Turkish.</p> <p>https://www.tarimorman.gov.tr/DKMP/Link/15/Dis-Kaynakli-Projeler https://www.bozkirprojesi.org/</p>

	<p>A press trip program was organized for journalists within the scope of “Conservation and Sustainable Management of Turkey’s Steppe Ecosystems Project”. This program was developed as a part of “Output 3. Training program on steppe conservation and management” specifically for the journalists.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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, visiting Kızılkuyu Wildlife Reserve, and Göbeklitepe World Heritage Site.</p> <p>During the program, it was aimed to introduce important species of Şanlıurfa steppes and to draw attention to the effects of climate change on steppe ecosystems and agricultural areas. In addition, the experiences of the efforts made for the conservation and sustainable management of the Şanlıurfa steppes, where steppe and human interaction have been experienced for thousands of years, and the ancestors of grain are still naturally grown, was shared.</p> <p>Upon the meetings with FAO and the project partners, 2 press trip program was prepared, and carried out in Tek Tek Mountains National Park, Kızılkuyu Wildlife Reserve, and Göbeklitepe World Heritage Sites.</p> <p>Sheikh Ahaduzzaman (FAO Turkey, Programme Officer), Ayşegül Selışık (FAO Turkey, Assistant Representative in Turkey) Dr. Nihan Yenilmez Arpa (National Project Coordinator) shared information about the importance of steppe ecosystems in Şanlıurfa and the project at local and national scale participated in the trip and gave information about the project, activities at pilot sites and shared information on the importance and conservation needs of the steppe ecosystems in detail.</p> <p>In the first press trip, press took photographs, aerial views with drone, and made interviews with FAO team about importance of the project, findings, and ongoing studies. Then, Soğmatar Ancient City (Yağmurlu Village) was visited. Children living in the village introduced to the historical value of the Ancient City. Mrs. Yenilmez Arpa gave detailed information about the site in the project context.</p> <p>At the second day, Kızılkuyu Wildlife Reserve, and 75th Year Gazelle Breeding Station were visited. In the station, a veterinarian from General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks Şanlıurfa Provincial Branch Directorate introduced the station, giving detail on the life cycle of the gazelles, threats, and conservation efforts. Two expert ornithologist who were recording the important bird species in the field introduced Şanlıurfa steppe ecosystem significance in the context of bird habitat. Then, Güzelkuyu Primary school was visited. The teachers gave information about the school activities carried out within the project, and their influences on students and the families. They mentioned the linkages between conserving steppes and nature education, and awareness rising activities. Lastly, Göbeklitepe which is one of the most important UNESCO World Heritage Site was visited. The site was introduced by an expert archeologist and underlined the influence of nature on civilization.</p>
--	---

	<p>During the program, the participants had the opportunity to be informed about the works carried out within the scope of the project, they also observed the practices in the field. According to face-to-face conversations, press members mentioned Şanlıurfa steppes has the great potential to UN Sustainable Development Goals (Goal 2: Zero Hunger). They also experienced the devastating effects of climate change in Şanlıurfa steppes.</p> <p>Experts on certain subjects and a wildlife technician from General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks Şanlıurfa Provincial Branch Directorate informed the press members on the natural and archaeological values of the pilot sites, and cultural and natural importance of the steppe ecosystems.</p> <p>In the second press trip, Nihan Yenilmez Arpa (National Project Coordinator) shared information about the importance of steppe ecosystems in Şanlıurfa and the project at local and national scale. Tek Tek Mountains National Park Visitor Center was introduced by Nihan Yenilmez Arpa. The journalists and press members who are a part of this press trip took photographs and made interviews with the coordinator and experts about importance of the project, findings, and ongoing studies. Prof. Dr. Ali Rıza Öztürkmen informed them about climate change effects on steppe ecosystems, and its relationship with important species. He also introduced conservation studies for this area.</p> <p>The importance of the Rüstemdere Valley was highlighted on the two important tree species which are Pistacia palaestina (Terebinth) and Pistacia vera (Pistachio nut). Mrs. Yenilmez Arpa and Prof. Dr. Ali Rıza Öztürkmen gave information on threats to these species and conservation measures within the scope of the project. Dr. Seçil Çokoğullu introduced the archaeological values of Sogmatar Ancient City and Şuayip Şehri.</p> <p>At the second day, Kızılkuyu Wildlife Reserve, and 75th Year Gazelle Breeding Station were visited. In the station, a wildlife technician from General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks Şanlıurfa Provincial Branch Directorate introduced the station, giving detail on the life cycle of the gazelles, threats, and conservation efforts.</p> <p>Lastly, Göbeklitepe which is an UNESCO World Heritage Site was visited. The site was introduced by an expert archeologist and underlined the influence of nature on civilization.</p> <p>Participant List of Media Milliyet Newspaper Köy TV Köy TV Tünaydın Newspaper Deutsche Welle Atlas Dergisi Republic of Turkey Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Department of Education and Publication Republic of Turkey Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Department of Education and Publication FOX TV FOX TV</p>
--	---

	<p>İHA Anadolu Ajansı TRT Diyarbakir Hürriyet Newspaper MAGMA Magazine MAGMA Magazine Permanent Press Card Holder-Lawyer-Author Tünaydın Newspaper Sonan Newspaper Independent Turk EKOIQ Magazine</p> <p>These project materials (in Turkish) were shared with the participants in the press trip;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project tote bag • Booklet containing the works and materials prepared within the scope of the project • Hardcopy of the project materials (brochures, booklets, activity books, neighbourhood guidebooks) • USB with project title, having PDF versions of the documents produced by the project. <p>All the participants stated their thanks for the organization in words and some of them sent follow up phones and emails after the program. During the press visit, participants shared their views as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This program increased my awareness on the steppe ecosystems. • I learnt that there are different species living in the steppes. • During our visit, we saw the impacts of drought and climate change in the region. • I am glad to learn the ancestors of the cereals surviving in Şanlıurfa. • <p>The participants also stated that they will prepare news for their organization on the project sites and experiences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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/ • 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/ <p>YouTube videos:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
<p>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. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please</p>	<p>Field visit to Karacadag-participate to the 3rd field day event</p> <p>Voices from the field:</p> <p>Mustafa Tekin, Muhtar: "Thank you very much for your contribution to FAO in the demonstration area. Our animals grew up without additional feed. This will be done in the whole region, so that we will feed better quality and healthy animals."</p>

also include related photos and photo credits.																
Please provide links to related website, social media account.	<p>Media Links and Evaluation</p> <p>News Number: Indicates the amount of news in the printing media.</p> <p>Total Access: It refers to how many people the reflections in the publications reach with the calculation made within certain criteria.</p> <table><tr><th>NEWS TYPE</th><th>TOTAL NEWS NUMBER</th><th>TOTAL ACCESS</th></tr><tr><td>PRINT NEWS</td><td>7</td><td>176,400</td></tr><tr><td>INTERNET</td><td>12</td><td>216,145</td></tr><tr><td>TV</td><td>1</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>126</td><td>392,545</td></tr></table> <p>Website</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• https://www.fao.org/turkey/news/detail-news/tr/c/1418738/• https://www.fao.org/turkey/news/detail-news/en/c/1393819/ <p>PRINT NEWS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/e134eb13-074c-470c-aa5f-00d2b9740312?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D• http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/acd3c932-d5ca-4106-8c53-11af7740bf83?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D• http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/b348778a-c819-4198-9463-3240da7a71fd?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D• http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/97bdd54a-71a4-428e-87b0-fa4bf7fa8ff3?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D• http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/d36953c6-47cb-40a0-b9cd-9cee2ed83c4e?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D• http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/ed9da21a-e409-491c-8714-3bf5477fb346?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D• http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/971fb96e-7e30-44d8-8ddd-10c9b7483d38?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D <p>TV NEWS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• http://web.interpress.com/app/document/viewer/155e90c9-dcf0-4cbc-bfa1-ec647cca2948?cid=25RiJvHgX4c%3D <p>INTERNET NEWS</p> <p>Access number: 216.145</p>	NEWS TYPE	TOTAL NEWS NUMBER	TOTAL ACCESS	PRINT NEWS	7	176,400	INTERNET	12	216,145	TV	1	-	TOTAL	126	392,545
NEWS TYPE	TOTAL NEWS NUMBER	TOTAL ACCESS														
PRINT NEWS	7	176,400														
INTERNET	12	216,145														
TV	1	-														
TOTAL	126	392,545														

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • http://www.edessatv.com/haberi/oku-h65419.html • https://indyturk.com/node/440706/haber/i%CC%87klim-de%C4%9Fi%C5%9Fikli%C4%9Finin-%C3%B6n%C3%BCne-ge%C3%A7mek-i%C3%A7in-bozk%C4%B1rlara-sahip-%C3%A7%C4%B1k%C4%B1mal%C4%B1 • https://www.koroglugazetesi.com/haber/fatih-metin-odessada.html • http://www.boluekspres.com/icerik/haber.php?i=71913 • https://www.boluhavadis.net/fatih-metin-odessada-temaslarda-bulundu • http://www.ozgurbolu.com/haber/31028/oku • https://www.sabah.com.tr/sanliurfa/2021/10/02/sanliurfa-bozkirin-kadinlarina-belge-verildi • https://www.urfanatik.com/haber/7865083/sanliurfanin-bozkir-kadinlarina-belge • https://ekoig.com/2021/09/16/ya-bozkirlarin-iklimi/ • https://ekoig.com/2021/09/16/ya-bozkirlarin-iklimi/ • https://indyturk.com/node/407491 • http://www.risalehaber.com/haber-411894h.htm <p>Twitter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1519975803794214912 • https://twitter.com/FAOLivestock/status/1519926461737676803 • https://twitter.com/FAOLivestock/status/1529017249692012545 • https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1540292177867194369 • https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1540292547792306177 • https://www.facebook.com/357579324352693/posts/4312283768882209/ • https://twitter.com/TmmobOrmuh/status/1456884254097526784 • https://www.facebook.com/277886302887329/posts/850869438922343/ • https://twitter.com/fatihmetintr/status/1455176456355696651 • https://www.facebook.com/410106592444065/posts/4543120762475940/ • https://twitter.com/trtradyo/status/1447907402473349122 • https://twitter.com/TRTRadyo1/status/1447907402607742979 • https://twitter.com/BOLGE3DKMP/status/1447543255940354048 • https://www.facebook.com/1569004663412162/posts/2842622249383724/
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	<p>Guidelines for Establishing Protected Areas http://www.fao.org/3/cb8356en/cb8356en.pdf</p> <p>Guidelines for Biodiversity Monitoring http://www.fao.org/3/cb8370en/cb8370en.pdf</p> <p>Guidelines for Engaging Stakeholders in Managing Protected Areas http://www.fao.org/3/cb8347en/cb8347en.pdf</p> <p>Guidelines for Assessing the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Protected Areas http://www.fao.org/3/cb8349en/cb8349en.pdf</p> <p>Guidelines for Grazing and Livestock Monitoring http://www.fao.org/3/cb8361en/cb8361en.pdf</p> <p>I am learning the steppes student's activity book life on the steppe http://www.fao.org/3/cb8379en/cb8379en.pdf</p> <p>I am learning the steppes student's activity book animals of the steppe https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb8386en</p> <p>I am learning the steppes teacher's guide http://www.fao.org/3/cb8382en/cb8382en.pdf</p>

Please indicate the communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details	Şafak Toros FAO Turkey Communication Specialist safak.toros@fao.org

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.

If applicable, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities.

Do indigenous peoples and or local communities have an active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

N/A

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ³³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	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-GDF	Cash and in-kind	6 010 000	12 256 581	10 995 789 (2 820 940 in-kind+ 8 174 849 cash)	
Local government	MAF-GDPP	Cash and in-kind	3 000 000	2 331 334		
GEF agency	FAO	Cash and in-kind	500 000	681 620	427 150	
		TOTAL	9 510 000	15 269 535	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

³³ 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 Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
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. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
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 resented as “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.

Risk rating. It should assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.