



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2023

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	11
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	20
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	25
6. RISKS	27
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION (ONLY FOR PROJECTS THAT HAVE CONDUCTED AN MTR)	31
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	32
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	33
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	36
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	38
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	40
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	41

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Europe and Central Asia
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
Initial project duration (years):	Four (4) years
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> a) Projects with 1st PIR; b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.	<i>[Projects in a) and b) categories should indicate YES here and provide the geocoded data in Annex 2]</i>

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	28 April 2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	15 January 2017
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	15-Jan-2021
Revised project implementation End date (if approved) ²	<p>31 December 2022</p> <p><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>Project Steering Committee Decision that was held 17 April 2020 :</u> 1.5 year extension of the project (until June 2022) as per the MTR recommendation and the impact of COVID-19. <u>Steering Committee Decision that was held 25 May 2021:</u> additional 3 months extension of the project (until September 2022) due to the impact of COVID-19. Project finally was extended the last time to Dec 31, 2022 due to ongoing site activities and to acquire their expected results within the implementation period.</p>

¹ As per FPMIS

² If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit.

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	2,328,767
Total Co-financing amount (USD) ³ :	9,510,000
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	2,324,056
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD) ⁴ :	2,324,075
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023 ⁵	17,600,879 (The project was closed on 31 December 2022. Therefore, the end of 2022 has been considered for total co-financing)

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	25 May 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date ⁶ :	n/a
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	September 2019 – May 2020
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date ⁷ :	Ongoing 2023
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	[It is mandatory for projects to update the TT or CI before Mid-Term or Terminal Evaluation stage. For projects that have a planned MTR or TE in the next fiscal year, please indicate YES here and provide the updated TT or CI as Annex.] It has been submitted previous PIR period (

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	Satisfactory
Overall implementation progress rating:	Satisfactory
Overall risk rating:	Low

ESS risk classification

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

Status

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

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

⁴ The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

⁵ Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

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.

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Nihan Yenilmez Arpa	Nihan.YenilmezArpa@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Viorel Gutu, SEC-SRC and FAO Representative in Türkiye (FAOSEC)	Viorel.Gutu@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Ebubekir Gizligider, Deputy Minister; Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	Ebubekir.Gizligider@tarimorman.gov.tr
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Peter Pechacek, Forestry Officer (FAOSEC)	Peter.Pechacek@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Kaan Evren Basaran, GEF Support Specialist (REU)	Kaan.Basaran@fao.org

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 TargetMid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
Improve the conservation of Türkiye's steppe ecosystems through effective protected area management and mainstreaming steppe biodiversity	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
		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). Refer to Annex 1.

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

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 ¹³
		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 ¹⁴
	Outcome 2 Steppe biodiversity conservation mainstreamed into production landscapes	Total number of hectares managed according to improved sustainable grazing management program	Total hectares with sustainable grazing management programme: 0 ha TekTek: 0 Kizilkuyu: 0 Karacadag: 0	Not specified	Total hectares under the sustainable grazing management programme: 110 000 ha TekTek: 25 000 Kizilkuyu: 25 000 Karacadag: 60 000	A total of 118 732 ha is planned 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 and 22 797.72 ha sustainable use zones.	HS ¹⁵

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

¹⁴ 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.

¹⁵ 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 was finalized at the end of June 2022. The grazing demonstration program for Karacadag was also completed and a sustainable grazing demonstration program has been developed and delivered to the main beneficiary.

		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 ¹⁶
		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
		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	Designation of sustainable use zones was aimed and grazing plans and monitoring program for the project sites has been developed together with relevant governmental institutions. The implementation is expected to be carried out by the	MU

¹⁶ 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.

						Government counterparts. ¹⁷	
	Outcome 3 Enabling environment established for the effective conservation of steppe biodiversity across large landscapes	Total government annual investment in steppe area conservation	Total government annual investment in steppe conservation: Şanlıurfa Province: USD 100 000* National: MFAL: USD 1 million* MFWA: USD 250 000* *Total investment is determined by the Division of National Parks and the Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry.	Not specified	Total government annual investment in steppe conservation: Şanlıurfa Province: USD 250 000 National: MoAF-GDPP: USD 1.5 million MAF-GDNCNP: USD500 000	Total government annual investment in steppe conservation: Şanlıurfa Province: USD 250 000 National: GDNCNP+GDF: US\$ 14 587 925million GDPP: US\$ 2 331 344 Total co-financing: US\$ 16,919,269	HS
		Total number of hectares of steppe	Total hectares planned for	Not specified	Total hectares planned for	Total hectares to be protected from	S ¹⁹

¹⁷ 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 has been completed and delivered to the Ministry partners. The monitoring programme will then be implemented to monitor and evaluate the results by the beneficiary.

¹⁹ 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

		ecosystems outside of protected areas conserved from future agricultural and urban expansion as indicated within the GAP strategy	cultivation within SE Anatolia: 3.3 million ha* *According to the GAP Region Agricultural Master Plan		cultivation within SE Anatolia: 3.7 million ha	cultivation and agricultural expansion in SE Anatolia (outside of PAs): 3.4 million (FAO-MoAF, 2020. Şanlıurfa Steppe Conservation Strategy and Action Plan). ¹⁸	
		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		Government policies integrating improved steppe conservation: GDNCNP National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan: 1 National MoAF Annual Strategic Performance Document: 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. Şanlıurfa	HS ²⁰

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.

¹⁸ 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.

²⁰ 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

			Şanlıurfa Governorship's five-year development plan: 0		Sanliurfa Governorship's five-year development plan: 1	Vision 2023 Feasibility Report)	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------------	--

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
The project was closed on 31 December 2022			

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ²¹	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ²² (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ²³ 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	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	No variance

²¹ Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

²² 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)

²³ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

	meetings and workshops on assessments			
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	Completed end of December 2022	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. An OECM nomination dossier was developed and submitted to the Ministry to follow the further steps. In addition, an informative meeting and briefing was for the high level decision makers, DG, Deputy DGs, Department Directors about OECM and prepared nomination dossier to increase their knowledge on OECMs.
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 Kızılkuyu to revise the existing management plan	Drafting the management plan	Completed at the end of December 2022. The final plan was print out by mid of January 2023 and delivered to the beneficiary's end of February 2023.	No variance
Output 1.2.3	Finalizing and ratifying the all three management plans based on the Kızılkuyu management planning experience and adapting according to the different formats and needs.	Finalizing three management plans	Completed at the end of December 2022. The final plan was print out by mid of January 2023 and delivered to the beneficiaries' end of February 2023.	No variance
Output 1.2.4	Implementing and modeling the priority management interventions	An exit strategy about Implementing and modeling the priority management interventions	The priority management interventions were listed in the management plans and delivered to the beneficiary end of February 2023.	No variance
Output 1.2.5	Developing a specific "Species Action Plans" for managing and conserving important (flag) species	Developing specific "Species Action Plans	Completed at the end of December 2022. The final plan was print out by mid of January 2023 and delivered to the beneficiary end of February 2023.	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	Some key investments such as park infrastructure (information, direction and educational panels and boards) were produced and	No variance

			installed at the end of December 2022.	
Output 1.2.7	Using the management planning process for capacity building at all levels through developing guidelines, ensuring active participation of key staff and a series of other capacity building activities.	Organizing workshops and stakeholder meetings according to the concluded management planning contract	Completed end of December 2022 linked with the management planning process.	No variance
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		No variance
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	The grazing management plans were submitted to the beneficiaries both hard and soft copy end of February 2023. The plans are including the guidance information regarding with	No variance

		Practice (CAP) and Trade approach	a Common Agriculture Practice (CAP) and Trade approach. In addition an exit strategy was also drafted and submitted to the beneficiary mid of June 2023 to follow this approach.	
Output 2.1.5.	Preparing land use management plans for three sites	An exit strategy about preparing land use management plans for three sites	The grazing management plans were submitted to the beneficiaries both hard and soft copy end of February 2023. The plans are including the guidance information regarding land use management plans. In addition an exit strategy was also drafted and submitted to the beneficiary mid of June 2023 to follow this approach.	No variance
Output 2.1.6.	Establishing and functionalizing an effective coordination system between government agencies and livestock producers	Finalizing grazing management plans	The grazing management plans were submitted to the beneficiaries both hard and soft copy end of February 2023. The plans are including the guidance information regarding with establishment and functionalization an effective coordination system between government agencies and livestock producers	No variance
Output 2.1.7.	Establishing the Grazing Working Group to ensure that lessons-learned are captured and disseminated	Finalizing grazing management plans	The grazing management plans were submitted to the beneficiaries both hard and soft copy end of February 2023. The plans are including the guidance information regarding establishment of Grazing Working Group to ensure that lessons-learned are captured and disseminated.	No variance
Output 2.1.8	Developing and implementing a grazing management demonstration program	Finalization of the demo program	The grazing demonstration program was implemented in Karacadag between August 2021-September 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	Listing and technical specification for necessary equipment and tools were completed and shared with the beneficiary.	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 monitoring-Impact Monitoring, socio-economic and land use applications and livestock monitoring with linked BD Monitoring program)	n/a	Completed in previous reporting periods	Name of the respective Guideline is Guidelines for Grazing and Livestock Monitoring
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	The grazing management plans were submitted to the beneficiaries both hard and soft copy end of February 2023. The grazing management plans are covering a livestock sales program linked to “steppe friendly” production methods (in grazing plan).	No variance
Output 2.2.4	Developing alternative income generation activity opportunities for three project sites	Developing grazing management plans	The grazing management plans were submitted to the beneficiaries both hard and soft copy end of February 2023. An alternative income generation activity opportunities for	No variance

			three project sites have been given with the plans.	
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	The protocol has been delivered to the beneficiary. Process is being followed by the Ministry.	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	Purchasing of the equipment was completed beginning of June 2023.	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 outcomes of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (max 400 words)

On the one hand, the project focused on the planned management and conservation of relatively intact and rare examples of steppe habitats and species in the Tek Tek Mountains NP, Kızılıkuyu WDA and Karacadağ Steppes, in cooperation with relevant stakeholders; and on the other hand, it conducted studies to contribute to the conservation of Türkiye's unique steppe values at the national level.

The National Steppe Conservation Strategy and Action Plan that was produced during the project is very valuable in this regard. In addition, seven sets of guidelines were prepared to contribute to the conservation and management of all assets of Türkiye, including steppes, among other contributions.

The Sanliurfa Provincial Steppe Conservation Strategy and Action Plan, which will contribute to the conservation of Sanliurfa steppes and their management was also prepared, in cooperation with all relevant stakeholders. This strategy, which represents a first in terms of scope and purpose, sets a model for other provinces in terms of conservation and sustainable management of natural resources, as well as its expansion to 33 steppe provinces within the Irano-Turanian phytogeographical region of Anatolia.

The management plans of the two conservation areas were revised and a management plan proposal was prepared for the Karacadağ Steppes. The most important differences that distinguish these plans from the existing plans include approaches such as supporting food systems and food security, reflecting the impacts and consequences of climate change, managing invasive species, supporting nature-human balance through ecosystem services, and supporting landscape integrity and landscape restoration. These studies will also set an example for future plans.

Specific "Species Action Plans" for managing and conserving important (flag) species were prepared (Wild Pistachio [*Pistacia palaestina* Boiss.], Cream-coloured Courser [*Cursorius cursor*]) and wild crop relatives. For the first time, wild relatives of cultivated species were extensively researched and recorded as important germplasm in inventory studies. In addition, a species action plan for species that have economic value (Terebinth-Wild pistachio [*Pistacia palaestina* Boiss.]) and a multitaxa action plan for wild relatives of cultivated species that were germplasm (including wild wheat, wild lentil, wild chickpea, and wild pea) were prepared in support of sustainable management of genetic resources.

A monitoring programme covering more than one component (monitoring of environmental, biodiversity, socio-economic and management effectiveness) was developed and reported for the first time in conservation areas.

In order to take the first steps towards the implementation of Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures (OECM), necessary studies were carried out, a report was drafted for Karacadağ Steppes, and the OECM approach was brought to the agenda in Türkiye for the first time.

The “Rotational Grazing Management Demonstration Programme in Karacadağ” was implemented to support sustainable grazing activities together with opportunities to improve livelihoods in the project sites.

The management and sustainable grazing activities together with the monitoring of both biodiversity and grazing activities were completed and several facilities and equipment have been provided and installed to the project sites.

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.

	FY2023 Development Objective rating²⁴	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating²⁵	Comments/reasons²⁶ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<p>The project was fully aligned with the overall strategic priorities and needs of the Government related to biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of the protected areas and mostly conservation of steppe ecosystems. Moreover, the project was also directly relevant to the mandate of the state institutions engaged in the project implementation.</p> <p>The project facilitated the creation of methodological and technical documents and guidelines as well as strategic and action plans, which serve as valuable and practical tools for the Government of Türkiye to facilitate and replicate further interventions in sustainable management of the steppe ecosystem and biodiversity in the country. In addition, the project significantly increased the awareness and capacity of different stakeholders (at national and provincial levels) about the importance of the biodiversity conservation agenda and sustainable management of steppe ecosystems in the country.</p> <p>The project facilitated the creation of methodological and technical documents and guidelines as well as strategic and action plans, which serve as valuable and practical tools for the Government of Türkiye to facilitate and replicate further interventions in sustainable management of the steppe ecosystem and biodiversity in the country. In addition, the project significantly increased the awareness and capacity of different stakeholders (at national and provincial levels) about the importance of the biodiversity conservation agenda and sustainable management of steppe ecosystems in the country.</p> <p>The project issued different printed materials, including books and other materials for local schools, developed and printed posters for the project sites, developed a project</p>

²⁴ **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.

²⁵ **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.

²⁶ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

			<p>webpage to raise awareness about the project, posting guidelines on the FAO website, and a YouTube video. All these tools and sharing canals increased the outreach and the impact of project-based learning as well as potential replication and scale-up of the project results.</p> <p>At the end of the project, almost 90% of output indicators were fully achieved, despite shortcomings in procurement and tendering, project staffing and recruitment, delays with necessary clearances of the project outputs, and extended duration that was required for the implementation.</p>
Budget Holder	S	S	<p>Within the project, significant support was provided to assist Türkiye to catalyze immediate conservation gains, in terms of improved conservation of globally significant biodiversity within existing and new steppe protected areas.</p> <p>The project laid the foundation required to identify and conserve biologically critical steppe habitats at national level. For a relatively small investment, the project catalyzed a long-term and lasting change via concrete outputs and results.</p> <p>By the end of the project, many of the key stakeholders and high-level decision-makers had acquired much better knowledge and capacity to substantially increase the effectiveness of conserving globally significant steppe biodiversity at the protected area, provincial and national levels.</p> <p>It was not possible to complete some of the activities within the originally planned time frame and allocated budget. Almost all of them were implemented with close cooperation and co-financing support provided by the project partners.</p> <p>The results and experiences obtained with the project have revealed how important the Anatolian steppes are in terms of ecology, economy and food security. The successful results and experiences and the devoted work shown in this project can be extended not only to Turkey but also to other countries with similar characteristics.</p>
GEF Operational Focal Point²⁷			<i>Ratings/comments</i>

²⁷ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

Lead Technical Officer²⁸	MU	MU	Given the limited time up to the NTE within the PIR period, almost no change in progress compared to the previous PIR period: Outcomes of the project were not ratified, numerous important GEBs not reached. Action plan based on MTR not finalized. All technical deficiencies reported in previous PIR reports still valid. Technical quality of the actual project outputs at low level. Most notably: participatory approach for management planning limited to GoT, limited number of CSO involved, farmers including women only marginally included in the process. Alternative approach for Karadacag PA (i.e. nomination as OECM) did not materialize. Capacity development activities failed to reach their objectives: failure to initiate implementation of the Monitoring program, issues associated with understanding of the ongoing planning process for development of the Grazing and PA Management plans. Demo activities did not produce results to showcase the advantage of the alternative rotational grazing, reasonable monitoring results not available. Numerous activities not initiated at all (apart of implementation of the initially foreseen Grazing and PA Management plans and Monitoring program) including land use management plan, livestock sale program, trade and cap approach. Exit strategy not developed. Further details are included in already available Terminal project report and in Terminal evaluation report.
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	S	S	The project has delivered a lot of knowledge products and raised awareness on the importance of steppe ecosystems, providing technical capacity development support to the relevant stakeholders as well as experience in the pilot interventions. Further work needs to be done for institutionalization of the results and improving the quality of the policy framework and technical capacity for the improved conservation efforts.

²⁸ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made to comply 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. Please indicate if new 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:

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁹ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
n/a	n/a

<i>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.</i>

²⁹ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (Esm-unit@fao.org) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 <https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf>)

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified during the 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 ³⁰	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with PMU
1	Challenging project coordination	High	Y	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.	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 NTC. NTC is working in close cooperation with the project and Ministry teams to strengthen collaboration and cooperation. In addition, formal and informal meetings and events between high-level decision-makers are being organized to strengthen collaboration and support continued information flow.	The composition of the Project Management Team according to the ProDoc (page 64) is well detailed. The team is composed of a full-time National Technical Coordinator (NTC), an Operations Specialist, a Procurement Associate, a Communication Specialist and a Project Assistant based in the FAO SEC Office. All the team members have responsibilities to follow the project activities in line with the ProDoc requirements and according to the AWP. The project management structure has been developed in consultation with MoAF.
2	Low capacity of local and	Medium	Y	National institutions' (MAF) capacity and technical expertise is weak at various levels. To mitigate this risk, the National	The project foresees significant capacity-building activities and implementation of a communication plan.	The capacity development activities have been carried out during the implementation.

³⁰ Risk ratings means a rating of 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.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³⁰	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with PMU
	national institutions			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.		
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.	
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 has included significant capacity-building activities.	
5	Incentives for local stakeholders not adequate	Medium	Y	The project is designed to engage fully with local stakeholders. This will make certain that stakeholders, including local resource users both women and men,	Several working groups were established to encourage intensive participation by local stakeholders.	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³⁰	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with PMU
	to generate engagement			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.	An independent expert group and a local stakeholder group was established to strengthen stakeholder participation throughout the implementation process. Field-level focal groups including teachers, mukhtars and academics were established with associated WhatsApp groups. 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 produced and almost 500 items of these materials have been delivered to the locally based stakeholders. 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.	
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 ³⁰	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with PMU
7	COVID-19 pandemic	High	N	<p>The pandemic is considered to 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 during the pandemic period.</p>	

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	L	Majority of the activities were completed through the previous periods. Only last reports which have been initiated in previous reporting period such as management plans, grazing plans, species action plans and alternate grazing demonstration program and monitoring training were finalized and delivered to the beneficiary. In addition, two type of equipments for monitoring of birds and mammals were purchased and delivered.

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>
Recommendations 1 through 6:	Implemented during the previous reporting periods.

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize	Yes
	<p>The exit strategy, that will guide the stakeholders, in order to follow the unfinished activities and to follow-up supporting sustainability of the project outputs and results includes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following up on recommendations for the nomination of Karadacag as OECM. • Implementing and modelling the priority management interventions. • Preparing Land use management plans for the sites once the duration of the current Management Plans expires. • Improving and/ or revising PA Management Plans and Grazing Plans according to the monitoring results. • Implementing the new Grazing management plans with a Common Agriculture Practice (CAP) and Trade approach. • Developing livestock sales programs linked to “steppe friendly” production methods. • Continuing with Grazing demonstration activities created by the project in order to obtain monitoring results. • Follow-up taxa/multi taxa action plans and monitoring programs. • Follow-up signed protocols in order to monitor results of activities and outcomes

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 Guidelines³¹. 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 previous 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 minor project amendment (define)			

31 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 National Project Implementation Unit 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)	Main counterpart	A strong cooperation and collaboration has been conducted through the project.	The participation of the representatives of the Ministry has always been at the highest level and effective. 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 led to some delays in the organization of activities from time to time.
General Directorate of Plant Production (GDPP), MoAF	Main counterpart	A strong cooperation and collaboration have been conducted through the project.	
General Directorate of Forestry (GDF) MoAF	Main counterpart	A strong cooperation and collaboration have been conducted through the project.	
Regional and sub-regional Directorates of GDNCNP and GDF	Extension office of the main counterpart in Şanlıurfa	A strong cooperation and collaboration have been conducted through the project.	

Şanlıurfa Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry	Extension office of the main counterpart in Şanlıurfa	A strong cooperation and collaboration have been conducted through the project.	
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
Nature Conservation Centre (DKM)	LoA Partner	The active involvement of the LoA partner was limited to the implementation of their tasks in the scope of the signed LoA. Even so, they participated to the other events of the project and also engaged in the MTR evaluation process.	The works and results have been conducted effectively and efficiency due to the LoA partner having qualified technical team. The main challenges have been regarding the timing. There have been delays in reporting and implementing activities due to the LoA partner having many other responsibilities in other work.
Private sector entities			
ANCEO	Service provider	The active involvement 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 have 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 challenge has been related with the language of the reports. In the first stage, the reports have been drafted Turkish in order to get approval by the ministry, then translated to the EN. It took time and also decreased the language quality. Therefore, the reports needed 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 their tasks in the scope of the signed contract	No challenges
UYUM	Service provider	The participation of SP was limited to the implementation of their tasks in the scope of the signed contract	The works and results have been conducted effectively and efficiency. The main challenges have been regarding the timing and reporting. There have been delays in reporting and implementation of 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 the project activities and inviting 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 in 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 members 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.

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. In addition, gender related tasks have been indicated through the management planning and grazing planning period.
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 and implemented to strengthen gender mainstreaming in project activities and increase the capacity of different social groups related to the project sites. In addition, all the relevant stakeholder, especially women and youth from project sites have been engaged to the planning processes.
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	Even if, the project does not include any specific awareness-raising activities for women; special attention has been given for the participation of women. For instance, meetings were arranged with small groups in villages with women and several meetings and trainings were arranged to support participation of women through the life of project.

		<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.	No
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	<p>Yes,</p> <p>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>
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 also include related photos and photo credits.	In that period we do not have any human interest story.
Please provide links to related website, social media account	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=55zaMAKyFAY https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kvHDAiB4qQw https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1575789572469903360 https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1540292177867194369 http://www.karsmanset.com/haber/oku-939450.htm https://www.gazetekars.com/komisyon-baskani-yunus-kilic-fao-ile-tarim-bakanliginin-yuruttuğu-proje-toplantısına--39630h.htm https://www.haberturk.com/ankara-haberleri/29018021-sanliurfadaki-bozkir-ekosistemlerini-korumayi-amaclayan-proje-diger-illere-ornek-olacak https://www.konhaber.com/haber-haberi-oku-1844624.html

	https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/yesilhat/dogal-yasam/sanliurfadaki-bozkir-ekosistemlerini-korumayi-amaclayan-proje-diger-illere-ornek-olacak/1817918
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cc5121en http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb8390en http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb8384en http://www.fao.org/3/cb8379en/cb8379en.pdf https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb8386en http://www.fao.org/3/cb8382en/cb8382en.pdf http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb8374en http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb8591en http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb8592en http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb8344en http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cc0046en http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb8369en http://www.fao.org/3/cb8370en/cb8370en.pdf http://www.fao.org/3/cb8356en/cb8356en.pdf http://www.fao.org/3/cb8349en/cb8349en.pdf http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb8369en http://www.fao.org/3/cb8361en/cb8361en.pdf
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details	Şafak Toros 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 ³²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ³³	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	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	14 587 925	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	17 600 879	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?

³²Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

³³Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions)

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf

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 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 will 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

Annex 2.

GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.