



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Europe
Country (ies):	Turkey
Project Title:	Conservation and Sustainable Management of Turkey's Steppe Ecosystem
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/TUR/061/GFF
GEF ID:	5657
GEF Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry(MAF); General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks and General Directorate of Plant Production
Project Duration:	Four (4) years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	28 April 2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	15 January 2017
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	15 January 2021
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	N/A
Actual Implementation End Date³:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 2,328,767
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	USD 9,510,000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	USD 875,495

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

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

Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	USD 5,766,626
--	---------------

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	07 March 2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	1 September 2019
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes GEF Tracking Tool

Ratings

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

Status

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

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

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

Project Contacts

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

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s): to improve the conservation of Turkey's steppe ecosystems through effective protected area management and mainstreaming steppe biodiversity conservation into production landscapes.						
Outcome 1: Effectiveness of protected area system to conserve steppe biodiversity increased	Management effectiveness of protected areas increased according to total score of GEF5-BD monitoring effectiveness	METT score TekTek: 64 Kizilkuyu: 68 Karacadag: 51		METT score TekTek: 80 Kizilkuyu: 85 Karacadag: 70	GEF5-BD monitoring effectiveness tracking tool will be submitted before mid- term review	N/A
	Established a monitoring programme for three pilot sites	TekTek: 0 Kizilkuyu: 0 Karacadag: 0		TekTek: 1 Kizilkuyu: 1 Karacadag: 1	Preconditions for establishment of the monitoring program for the project sites are pre-feasibility studies, development of the BD Monitoring Guideline and field baseline survey studies. All activities were completed.	MS

⁷ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

⁸ 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.

⁹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Marginally Satisfactory** (MS), **Marginally Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU).

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					<p>The ToR for establishment of a monitoring program has been drafted in line with drafted BD Monitoring Guideline and baseline survey results.</p> <p>Tender process will be initiated once the ToR is final to establish the monitoring program for three project sites.</p>	
	Total hectares of steppe area contained within core protected areas of Sanliurfa Province	<p>Total hectares: 40,000 hectares</p> <p>TekTek: 20,000 Kizilkuyu: 20,000 Karacadag: 0</p>		<p>Total hectares: 50,000 hectares</p> <p>TekTek: 20,000 Kizilkuyu: 20,000 Karacadag: 10,000</p>	<p>According to the baseline survey results 12,850 ha land has been proposed as a hot spot in Karacadag due to its rich biological diversity and conservation priorities.</p> <p>Now, the total steppe area increased from 40,000 ha to 52,850 ha in Sanliurfa Province.</p> <p>TekTek: 20,000 Kizilkuyu: 20,000 Karacadag: 12,850</p>	S
	Total hectares of steppe area conserved within protected area buffer zones of Sanliurfa Province	<p>Total hectares: 0 hectares</p> <p>TekTek: 0 Kizilkuyu: 0 Karacadag: 0</p>		<p>Total hectares: 60,000 hectares</p> <p>TekTek: 5,000 Kizilkuyu: 5,000 Karacadag: 50,000</p>	The buffer zones for the three project pilot sites have been identified according to the baseline survey results. Moreover,	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					<p>the buffer zones were mapped together with it is core zones.</p> <p>The baseline results and proposed borders were reported under the baseline survey study.</p> <p>TekTek: 5,000 Kizilkuyu: 10.000 Karacadag: 37,000</p> <p>The ecological corridors in Karacadag region were not considered as buffer zone. However, these corridors will be considered as buffer zones during the planning process.</p>	
Outcome 2: Steppe biodiversity conservation mainstreamed into production landscapes	Total hectares managed according to improved sustainable grazing management program.	<p>Total hectares with sustainable grazing management program: 0 hectares</p> <p>TekTek: 0 Kizilkuyu: 0 Karacadag: 0</p>		<p>Total hectares with sustainable grazing management program: 110,000 hectares</p> <p>TekTek: 25,000 Kizilkuyu: 25,000 Karacadag: 60,000</p>	<p>The Grazing Management Planning-Transition Guideline and the Guideline for Grazing and Livestock Monitoring were completed.</p> <p>These guidelines were the first priority to improve the grazing management program in the field.</p>	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					<p>The Baseline Surveys and Assessments on Biodiversity, Socio-economic and Socio-cultural Aspects, Ongoing Grazing Activities and Livestock Situation were completed in and around the project pilot sites. The results of the baseline surveys were also the first priority to improve the grazing management program in the field.</p> <p>The ToR for sustainable grazing management program will be reviewed based on final guidelines and baseline survey results.</p>	
	Number of pastoralists with enhanced steppe conservation knowledge participating in sustainable grazing management programs.	<p>Total pastoralists with enhanced steppe conservation capacity: 0</p> <p>TekTek: 0 Kizilkuyu: 0 Karacadag: 0</p>		<p>Total pastoralists with enhanced steppe conservation capacity: 500</p> <p>TekTek: 200 Kizilkuyu: 100 Karacadag: 200</p>	<p>The ToR on development and implementation of “training manual and resource materials under the model steppe conservation training program for pastoralist” is ready. The RFP procedures have been initiated; Capacity building and training activities will be carried out during the second half</p>	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					of the current year.	
	Total number of free ranging gazelle in Sanliurfa Province	Total free-roaming gazelle: 200 individuals		Total free-roaming gazelle: 300 individuals	Conservation, and monitoring activities are carried out regularly by Sanliurfa Division Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry. There is strict control over hunters and threats affecting the habitat of the gazelles. The number of free-roaming gazelle is commonly increasing thanks to effective patrolling and monitoring. The existing number of free-roaming gazelle is 300 individuals.	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		Number of overgrazed hectares: TekTek: 5,000 Kizilkuyu: 5,000 Karacadag: 20,000		N/A
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: Sanliurfa Province: US\$ 100,000 * National: MFAL: US\$ 1		Total government annual investment in steppe conservation: Sanliurfa Province: US\$ 250,000 National: MAF-GDPP: US\$ 1,5	The co-financing report proves that the total government annual investment in steppe conservation has been realized.	HS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
		million * MFWA: US\$ 250,000 * *Total investment is determined by Division Directorate of National Parks and the Province Directorate of Food, Agriculture and Livestock.		million MAF -GDNCNP: US\$ 500,000		
	Total hectares of steppe ecosystems strategically managed for improved conservation	Total hectares national steppe strategically managed for conservation: Sanliurfa Province: 0 ha South Eastern Anatolian Region: 0 ha National Steppe: 0 ha		Total hectares national steppe strategically managed for conservation: Sanliurfa Province: 40,000 ha South Eastern Anatolian Region: 200,000 ha National Steppe: 8,000,000 hectares	LoA has been signed with an experienced NGO to carry out the above mentioned tasks. Additionally, a tender dossier has been prepared to get professional support from national companies to increase the awareness and capacity on strategic management of the steppes in Turkey.	MS
	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 Gap Region Agriculture Master Plan		Total hectares planned for cultivation within SE Anatolia: 3.7 million ha		N/A

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	Number of government policies fully integrating steppe conservation principles and practices	<p>Government policies integrating improved steppe conservation:</p> <p>GDNCNP National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan: 0</p> <p>National MAF Annual Strategic Performance Document: 0</p> <p>Sanliurfa Governor's 5-year development plan: 0</p>		<p>Government policies integrating improved steppe conservation:</p> <p>GDNCNP National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan: 1</p> <p>National MAF Annual Strategic Performance Document: 1</p> <p>Sanliurfa Governor's 5-year development plan : 1</p>		N/A

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1: Effectiveness of protected area system to conserve steppe biodiversity increased	- Preparing <u>Guideline on Establishment</u> of Protected Areas	- International Protected Areas Planning and Management Specialist	By end of September 2019
	- Publication and circulation of the guideline		
	- Preparing a <u>Guideline for Assessing the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Protected Areas</u>	- National Protected Areas Planning and Management Specialist	By end of September 2019
	- Publication and circulation of the guideline		
	- Developing the <u>Guideline for Engaging Stakeholders in the Managing Protected Areas</u>	- National Protected Areas Planning and Management Specialist	By end of September 2019
	- Publication and circulation of the guideline		
	- Preparing <u>Guideline for Protected Area Management Planning</u>	- International Protected Areas Planning and Management Specialist	By end of September 2019
	- Publication and circulation of the guideline		
	- Completing the draft management plan for Kızılkuyu to <u>revise the existing management plan.</u>	- Service provider to be contracted;	By end of October 2020
Outcome 2: Steppe biodiversity conservation mainstreamed into production landscapes	- Developing a specific “Species Action Plans” for managing and conserving important (flag) species	- Service provider to be contracted;	By end of October 2020
	- Generating and publishing <u>BD Monitoring Guideline</u>	- International Protected Areas Planning and Management Specialist	By end of September 2019
	- Publication and circulation of the guideline		
	- Preparing a monitoring program for three project sites	- Service provider to be contracted	By end of October 2020
Outcome 2: Steppe biodiversity conservation mainstreamed into production landscapes	- <u>Grazing Management Planning- Transition Guideline</u>	- International Grazing and Grassland Biodiversity Specialist	By end of September 2019
	- Publication and circulation of the guideline		
	- Identifying the best grazing management models for each site	- Service provider to be contracted;	By end of October 2020
	- <u>Prepare grazing plans for three site</u>		
Outcome 2: Steppe biodiversity conservation mainstreamed into production landscapes	- Developing <u>Grazing and Livestock Monitoring Guideline with</u> linked BD monitoring Guideline	- National Grazing and Grassland Biodiversity Specialist	By end of September 2019

Outcome 3: Enabling environment established for the effective conservation of steppe biodiversity across large landscapes	- Establishing the <u>Sanhurfa Steppe Conservation Technical Working Group</u> under the Pasture Commission	- LoA supplier under the Province level Steppe Conservation Strategy	By end of May 2020
	- Developing <u>A Model Steppe Conservation Strategy on Province Level</u>	- LoA supplier (DKM)	By end of May 2020
	- Designing and developing <u>A Model Steppe Conservation Strategy on Province Level</u>	- LoA supplier (DKM)	By end of May 2020
	- Establishing <u>A Steppe Conservation Working Group</u> as a joint initiative of MAF.	- LoA supplier (DKM)	By end of May 2020
	- Preparing the <u>National Steppe Conservation Strategy</u> for National Level	- LoA supplier (DKM)	By end of May 2020
	- Implementing the <u>Steppe Conservation and Management Training Program</u> for agriculture extension officers and national parks extension officers	- LoA supplier (DKM)	By end of May 2020
	- Organizing <u>annual steppe conservation seminars/workshops</u>	- LoA supplier (DKM)	By end of May 2020

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. Status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1. New steppe protected area established and operational	Q4 Y4	Baseline surveys for the new steppe protected area Drafting establishment and assessment guideline	Identification of the borders together with it is buffer zones and ecological corridors, drafting management plan Finalization of guidelines	Preparation of nomination dossier, submission to the relevant institutions Finalization of the management plan	Undertaking communication activities, raising of public awareness, and publishing information materials, strategies, guidelines and other field survey results	n/a	%50	The baseline survey studies and identification of the borders together with buffer zones and ecological corridors have been completed. The guideline has been drafted, and editing and translation process is in progress.
Output 1.2. Effective management plans for three steppe protected areas created and implemented	Q2 Y3	Drafting planning and stakeholder engagement	Draft Management plans for three pilot sites	Final Management plans for three pilot sites	Key investments such as sign boards, demarcation	n/a	% 25	Both guidelines have been drafted, and editing and translation process is in progress . ToR for developing the

¹¹ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹² As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹³ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁴ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

		<i>t guideline</i>	<i>Finalization of the guidelines key investments such as sign boards, demarcation of borders etc.</i>	Species Action Plans	<i>of borders etc.</i>			management plans for the three pilot sites has been drafted. However, due to the time-consuming preparation and discussion of the Guideline on Planning, the management planning process couldn't be initiated as planned
		%15	%50	%20	%15			
Output 1.3. Rigorous monitoring program for three steppe protected areas established	Q4 Y4	<i>Drafting a BD Monitoring Guideline</i> %10	<i>Generating and publishing a BD Monitoring Guideline</i> %40	<i>Set up monitoring program for three project sites, Establishment of a monitoring group</i> %30	<i>Carry out monitoring activities by monitoring group</i> %20	n/a	%40	The guideline has been drafted, and editing and translation process is in progress.
Output 2.1 Sustainable grazing management program operational across three steppe protected areas and associated buffer zones	Q4 Y4	<i>Baseline surveys on on-going grazing activities, Establishment of the Grazing Working Group</i> %25	<i>Guideline on grazing planning and management,</i> %25	<i>Grazing plans for three sites,</i> %25	<i>Necessary equipment and tools for implementation of grazing management plans</i> %25	n/a	%50	The baseline survey studies for ongoing grazing activities have been completed. The ToR for grazing working group has been drafted. The guideline has been drafted, and editing and translation process in progress.
Output 2.2 Sustainable grazing management	Q4 Y4	n/a	<i>Grazing and livestock</i>	<i>Grazing management</i>	-	n/a	%50	The guideline has been drafted, and editing and translation process is in progress.

impacts monitored at three steppe protected areas			<i>monitoring guideline</i> %50	<i>demonstration program</i> %50				
Output 2.3 Model steppe conservation training program for pastoralists emplaced	Q4 Y4	<i>n/a</i>	<i>training strategy and training program on steppe management and monitoring training manual and resource materials for trainings</i> %50	<i>Training activities</i> %25	<i>Necessary equipment and tools for implementation of grazing monitoring</i> %25	<i>n/a</i>	%25	The training strategy and training program on steppe management and monitoring has been drafted. Development of a training manual and resource materials for trainings has been put out to tender. The tender dossier has been drafted as well.
Output 3.1 Sanliurfa Province steppe conservation strategy and associated enabling environment improvements implemented	Q4 Y4	<i>n/a</i>	<i>Şanlıurfa Steppe Conservation Technical Working Group</i>	<i>A Model Steppe Conservation Strategy on Province Level</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	-	-
Output 3.2 National steppe conservation strategy and associated enabling environment improvements established	Q4 Y4	<i>n/a</i>	<i>A Steppe Conservation Working Group as a joint initiative of MFAL and MFWA</i>	<i>National Steppe Conservation Strategy for National Level</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	-	-

Output 3.3 National steppe conservation training and awareness program for decision-makers and resource managers	Q3 Y4	<i>n/a</i>	<i>Steppe Conservation and Management Training Program</i>	<i>annual steppe conservation seminars/workshops</i>	<i>annual steppe conservation seminars/workshops</i>	<i>n/a</i>	%	-
--	-------	------------	--	--	--	------------	---	---

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

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

Max 200 words:

The majority of the planned activities were achieved during this reporting period. The surveys and assessment of biodiversity, socio-economic and socio-cultural aspects, ongoing grazing activities and livestock situation together with ecological corridors and buffer zones have been completed for the three project pilot sites and their buffer zones. Seven guidelines have been translated and submitted to the Partner for review. The evaluation and revision process of the guidelines is going on in close cooperation with the Ministry. The guidelines and baseline surveys are the main pillars of further activities such as management planning, grazing planning and establishment of a monitoring program. The project communication strategy and action plan have been developed in close cooperation with key stakeholders. Stakeholder engagement and awareness raising activities are regularly carried out both at local and province levels. Cooperation with local and central units of MAF is one of the regular activities. All activities are carried out in close cooperation with the ministry. The stakeholder engagement is another significant objective of the project. Most of the events are carried out in Sanliurfa Province in order to strengthen the cooperation, increase the knowledge and share the experience among project team members and key stakeholders. These activities are major deliverables of the project under the components one and two. Moreover, ToRs for further activities are drafted, and finalization process of the guidelines and communication activities is ongoing.

Under component 3, Letter of Agreement was signed with Nature Conservation Centre (DKM) to develop the Provincial and National Steppe Conservation Strategy and Action Plan, organize annual steppe conservation seminars/workshops, and design and implement the Steppe Conservation and Management Training Program for agricultural and national parks extension officers.

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

Max 200 words:

The major problem was the late submission and technically low-quality deliverables by consultants. Moreover, low quality translation of the technical reports has caused additional delays. The revision process and improvement of the quality of the guidelines took more time than expected. Principally, there is no possibility to share the documents such as guidelines, workshop agenda, work plan, technical reports and technical specifications with the project partners for their feedback without following the rules and procedures of FAO (i.e. obtaining all necessary clearances). Only documents that are found technically sound are shared. However, deliverables of consultants/contractors required multiple revisions to increase the quality. Additionally, revisions of translations took time: translations were poor, required regular corrections. This caused (apart of high cost) major delays in the implementation of the project activities.

NPC is working in close cooperation with both the project partners and service providers in order to avoid further delays and to increase the quality for the guidelines and technical reports.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating ¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	MS	S	<p>Despite some delays, the project made good progress in delivering the major outputs such as baseline surveys and assessment of biodiversity, socio-economic and socio-cultural aspects, ongoing grazing activities and livestock situation for the project pilot sites. A comprehensive baseline survey study has been done to provide the major inputs for management planning and grazing management planning for the pilot sites.</p> <p>Seven guidelines have been drafted by the national and international consultants. NPC and the Ministry provided additional effort and input to increase the technical quality of the guidelines.</p> <p>All actions to avoid any delays in the delivery of project outputs have been taken, and a well functioning coordination, and collaboration mechanism has been established by NPC.</p> <p>All planned activities are on-track and are being implemented successfully with the full support of the executing partners as well as stakeholders. Therefore, the success rating is S.</p>

¹⁵ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

Budget Holder	MS	S	Although there is some delay, the project has gained speed when compared to the previous years. Majority of the planned activities are on track. Project management is strong, and there is well-established communication and cooperation among FAO and project executive partners that ensures the progress towards the achievement of the outputs.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	MS	MS	This project is designed to build up on fundamental components (e.g. Guidelines for management planning) which provide basis for further work (e.g. Management plans). Commissioning of further works (through FAO implementation modalities such as contracts, LoAs, consultancies) draws on input from the fundamentals (e.g. list of points to be considered for Management plans). Until these fundamentals are missing, the follow up components cannot be commissioned. Hence, delays in deliveries of the fundamentals negatively impact progress of follow up activities. Attempts are currently on the way to change implementation modality from consultants to contracts/LoAs when possible. Lack of qualified/dedicated consultants seems to be the major driving force behind the delays.
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	S	<p>Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes</p> <p>The project is moving forward towards enhancing steppe ecosystem conservation in timely manner and is expected to achieve its objectives. The monitoring programmes for the 3 pilot sites under Outcome 1 are pending. Nonetheless, a feasibility study, a BD monitoring guideline and field baseline survey have already been carried out. Corrective actions are awaited in the second half of 2019.</p> <p>The sustainable grazing management program yet is being developed, i.e. the program guideline and grazing plans are expected in September/October 2019. There is no area of steppe ecosystems under strategic management for improved conservation yet. Nevertheless, DKM (Nature Conservation Centre) has already been chosen to perform the task.</p> <p>Implementation Progress</p> <p>The delivery of the majority of outputs is on track and are expected to be completed at the scheduled date.</p>

¹⁷ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

3. Risks

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁸ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Project is low risk	No constraints noticed

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant.</i>

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
--	------	---------------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------------------------

¹⁸ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

¹⁹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²⁰ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Challenging project coordination	M	N/A	N/A	
2	Low capacity of local and national institutions	M	The project foresees a significant capacity building activities and communication plan		
3	Incentives for local stakeholders are not adequate to generate engagement	M	The project carries out socio-economic and socio-cultural report and gender mainstreaming strategy		
4	Regional political conflict may stimulate security measures limiting implementation	M	N/A	N/A	
5	Climate change	L	N/A	N/A	
6	Low ownership and lack of sustainability of new technologies and techniques	L	N/A	N/A	

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	M	

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²¹

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	-
Project Outputs	No	-

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<div>Original NTE: Revised NTE:</div> <div>Justification:</div>

²¹ Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

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

The project is based on a participatory approach to ensure participation of women and equity in benefit: sharing, increasing women's mobility and their experience in public speaking. This approach is based on a socio-economic assessment, including gender analysis in the project villages, and has been carried out at micro (household), mezo (institutions) and macro (policy) level.

A comprehensive socio-economic survey has been undertaken under the baseline survey study.

The training programs and awareness activities have been identified to strengthen the gender mainstreaming in project activities and to increase the capacity of different social groups related with project sites.

The specific awareness activities for women have not been implemented till now. However five separate workshops have been carried out through the reporting period and 30% of participants were women.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

N/A

7. Stakeholders Engagement

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

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

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

- **list all stakeholders engaged in the project;**

List of stakeholders	Category	Engagement mechanism
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF)- General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks (GDNCNP)	Government	Partnership, decisions making
General Directorate of Plant Production (GDPP), MAF	Government	Partnership, decisions making
General Directorate of Forestry (GDF) MAF	Government	Project partner, decisions making
Regional and sub-regional Directorates of GDNCNP and GDF	Government	Partnership, decisions making
Sanliurfa Province Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry	Government	Partnership, decisions making
Sanliurfa Governorship	Local Administration/ Government	Project partner
Sanliurfa Municipality	Local Administration	Project supporter
Harran University	Academia	Project supporter
GAP Agriculture Research Institution	Research	Project supporter
GAP Administration	Regional Administration /Government	Project supporter
GAP International Agricultural Research and Training Center	Research	Project supporter
ANCEO	Private Sector	Contract
Nature Conservation Centre (DKM)	NGO	LoA

- **Briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.**

Stakeholders' engagement events	Date stakeholders engaged	Purpose (Information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.)	Outcomes
Workshop on Development of the Communication Strategy	16 July 2018	consultation	Finalization of the draft Communication Strategy in close cooperation with participants
WS on Surveys and assessments on biodiversity, socio-economic and socio-cultural aspects, ongoing grazing activities and livestock situation	20-21 September 2018	information	Clarified methodology on baseline surveys on biodiversity, socio-economic and socio-cultural aspects, ongoing grazing activities and livestock situation
Steering Committee Meeting	08 March 2019	information	The SC members have been informed on project progress. 2019 AWP and Budget have been approved
WS on Surveys and assessments on biodiversity, socio-economic and socio-cultural aspects, ongoing grazing activities and livestock situation	28-30 April 2019	consultation	Increased knowledge and information on current structure and studies on baseline survey results, process and progress
WS on "Surveys and assessments on biodiversity, socio-economic and socio-cultural aspects, ongoing grazing activities and livestock situation"	12-13 June 2019	consultation	<p>Information about the newly recorded species and findings related to biodiversity shared</p> <p>Participants informed about constraints and threats on the values in the project sites and recommendations to strengthen the management effectiveness, and further stages of the project</p>

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

- Please tell us the story of your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihood and how it is contributing to achieve the expected global environmental benefits
- Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc.

<http://www.milliparklar.gov.tr/haberler/t%C3%BCrkiye-nin-bozkir-ekosistemleri-korunuyor>
<https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/turkiye/turkiyenin-bozkirlari-korumaya-aliniyor/988981>
<https://www.gidahatti.com/sanliurfanin-bozkir-ekosistemleri-korunacak-80876/>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k-vzRi9nYGk>
<http://www.cankayagazetesi.com/2018/09/fao-turkiyedeki-bozkir-ekosistemleri-destekleyece>
https://www.tarimorman.gov.tr/BUGEM/Haber/494/Turkiyenin-Bozkir-Ekosistemleri-KorunuyorKorunuyor&psig=AOvVaw0bjqKOxdzq6tmSd6xJHHz_&ust=1564125820581017&ictx=3&uact=3
<https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/turkiye/turkiyenin-bozkirlari-korumaya-aliniyor/988981>
https://www.tarimorman.gov.tr/BUGEM/Haber/484/Turkiyenin-Bozkir-Ekosistemlerinin-Korunmasi-Ve-Surdurulebilir-Yonetimi-Gcp_tur_061_gff-Projesi
<https://www.bmdergi.org/language/tr/sanliurfanin-bozkir-ekosistemleri-korunacak/>
<https://www.tarimtv.gov.tr/tr/video-detay/bozulmamis-bozkir-alanlari-sanliurfa-da-10297>
http://www3.milliparklar.gov.tr/anasayfa/resimlihaber/17-05-29/T%C3%9CRK%C4%B0YE_N%C4%B0N_BOZKIR_EKOS%C4%B0STEMLER%C4%B0_KORUNACAK.aspx?sflang=tr
<http://www.urfanatik.com/sanliurfa/bozulmamis-bozkir-alanlari-sanliurfa-da-2-h85315.html>
<http://www.sanliurfagazetesi.com/turkiye-nin-bozkir-ekosistemlerinin-yonetimi-calistayi-yapildi/91754/>
<https://www.gidahatti.com/turkiyenin-bozkir-ekosistemlerine-fao-korumasi-143961/>
<https://www.star.com.tr/yerel-haberler/turkiyenin-bozkirlari-korumaya-aliniyor-177581/>
http://www3.milliparklar.gov.tr/anasayfa/resimlihaber/17-05-29/T%C3%9CRK%C4%B0YE_N%C4%B0N_BOZKIR_EKOS%C4%B0STEMLER%C4%B0_KORUNACAK.aspx?sflang=tr
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yC0mX3xFsuM>
<https://www.ayrintilihaber.com.tr/genel/turkiyenin-bozkir-ekosistemlerinin-yonetimi-calistayi-h20459.html>

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Local Government	MAF-GDNCNP	Cash & in-kind	6,010,000	5,385,654		
Local Government	MAF-GDPP	Cash & in-kind	3,000,000	210,872		
GEF Agency	FAO	Cash & in-kind	500,000	170,100		
		TOTAL	9,510,000	5,766,626		

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

²² Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

Implementation Progress Rating – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be 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.