



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)	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	9
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	13
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	15
6. RISKS	17
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	20
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	21
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	22
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	24
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	25
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	32
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	33

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Europe and Central Asia
Country (ies):	Türkiye
Project Title:	Sustainable Land Management and Climate-Friendly Agriculture
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP /TUR/055/GFF
GEF ID:	4583
GEF Focal Area(s):	BD, LD, CC
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF), Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change (MEUCC)
Project Duration (years):	4 years
Project coordinates:	The project coordinates shared in previous reports and the project polygons added as a layer to the global map.

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	3 November 2014
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	4 September 2015
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31 December 2018
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	28 February 2023

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 5,750,000
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	USD 22,300,000
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	USD 5,700,334
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	USD 5,698,542
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	USD 92,027,190

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

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.

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	7 October 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	N/A
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	April 2018
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	28 February 2023
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Yes

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

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

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Fatma Güngör, NPC (FETUR)	Fatma.Gungor@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Viorel Gutu, SEC-SRC and FAO Representative in Türkiye	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 (REU)	Kaan.Basaran@fao.org

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

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

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

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

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
To improve agriculture and forest land use management through the diffusion and adoption of low-carbon technologies with win-win benefits in land degradation, climate change, and biodiversity conservation and increased	Outcome 1	Land cover delivering global environmental benefits in the project target area as reported in the GEF LD tracking tool	16 650 hectares of vegetative cover 1200 Kg C/ha/year of biomass 30 trees per ha	30 000 hectares of vegetative cover 1450 Kg C/ha/year of biomass 40 trees per ha	60 000 hectares of vegetative cover 1600 Kg C/ha/year of biomass 50 trees per ha	66,408 ha of vegetative cover 2400 kg C/ha/year of biomass ¹² 500 trees per ha.	HS
		Avoided emissions and carbon sequestration delivering global environmental benefits in the project target area as reported in the GEF LD and CC tracking tools	20,000 Ha of degraded forest targeted by the project No arable land under conservation agriculture due to	10,000 Ha of degraded forest rehabilitated, 20-25,000 ha of arable land under	20,000 Ha of degraded forest rehabilitated, capturing 43,600 tons of CO ₂ eq per year 40-50,000 ha of arable land under conservation agriculture, avoiding	41,834 ha of degraded forest rehabilitated, capturing 91,370 tCO ₂ eq per year 59,867 ha of arable land under conservation agriculture (41,467 ha CA+18,399 ha	HS

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

⁹ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

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

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

¹² The data extracted from Eregli Integrated Forest Management Plan developed under the project and it reflects the carbon stock calculated per ha of degraded forests of the Plan,

farm profitability and forest productivity.		project intervention	conservation agriculture	25,000 tons of CO ₂ eq per year	manure application), avoiding 36,768 tCO ₂ eq per year	
		No degraded rangelands and pastures under improved management due to project intervention	15,000 of degraded rangelands and pastures under improved management	30,000 ha of degraded rangelands and pastures under improved management capturing 103,498 tons of CO ₂ eq per year ¹³	24,574 ha (MAF) of degraded pastures rehabilitated, capturing 84,696 tCO ₂ eq per year	
		No methane capture sites developed due to project intervention	8-10,000 tCO ₂ -eq avoided from methane capture sites	8-10,000 tCO ₂ -eq avoided from methane capture sites	The total methane capture is 518.80 tCO ₂ /year by considering 200 cattle in each farm. Hence, the systems mitigate 10,376 tons of CO ₂ over their service life (20 years).	
	Number of hectares of forest, pasture, and arable land with biodiversity mainstreamed in management practices resulting from project investments at site level	Biodiversity mainstreamed into management practices covering: 0 ha forest 0 ha pasture 0 ha arable land	Biodiversity mainstreamed into management practices covering: 10,000 ha forest 10,000 ha pasture 10,000 ha arable land	Biodiversity mainstreamed into management practices covering: 20,000 ha forest 30,000 ha pasture 30,000 ha arable land	Biodiversity mainstreamed into management practices covering: 69,147.3 ha forest 122,314.5 ha pasture 360,853.6 ha arable land	HS
	Spatial coverage of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes as reported in GEF LD tracking tool	Spatial coverage of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes: 0 million ha agricultural lands	Spatial coverage of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes: 0 million ha agricultural lands	Spatial coverage of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes: 2.2 million ha agricultural lands 1.8 million ha pasture lands	Spatial coverage of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes: 0.60 million ha agricultural lands 0.24 million ha pasture lands 69,147.3 ha forests	S

¹³ As the rangeland does not legally exist inside forests according to National Forestry Law, the rangeland target will be compensated by increasing degraded forest rehabilitation.

			0 million ha pasture lands 0 ha forests	0 million ha pasture lands 0 ha forests	700,000 ha forests ¹⁴		
		Total emission reductions resulting from project related forest and rangeland management improvements	0 tCO ₂ eq mitigated as a result of improved range and pastureland management	-	66,000 tCO ₂ eq mitigated per year as a result of rehabilitated forests and improved range	91,370 tCO ₂ eq per year	HS
		Hectares of rehabilitated forest land sequestering CO ₂ as a result of project investments	0 ha of rehabilitated forest land	10,000 ha of forest land rehabilitated	20,000 hectares of forest land rehabilitated	41,834 ha of degraded forest rehabilitated	HS
		Hectares of degraded range and pasturelands rehabilitated as a result of project investments	0 ha of range and pastureland rehabilitated	10,000 ha of range and pastureland rehabilitated	30,000 ha of range and pastureland rehabilitated	24,574 ha of degraded pastures rehabilitated. Since, there is no rangeland inside forests according to national forestry legislation, the target; 10,000 ha rangeland rehabilitation, was compensated by rehabilitating 20,000 ha degraded forest.	S
		Measurable global biodiversity benefits in the project target area as reported in the GEF LD tracking tool	Wetland in the pilot site is legally protected, but no ecological restoration plan is in place	Ecological restoration plan developed for 6,680 hectares of protected habitat	6,680 hectares of protected habitat managed under ecological restoration plan	Restoration recommendation report is completed for Eregli Marshes (Akgol-6680 ha) and Meke Lake (202ha)	S
	Outcome 2	Total hectares under conservation agricultural practices as a result of project investments	0 hectares under project driven conservation agricultural practices	20,000 hectares under project driven conservation agricultural practices	40-50,000 ha under conservation agriculture practices	59,388.5 ha of agricultural land is under CA through raised awareness and demonstrations	S

¹⁴ The project end target covers whole basin not the project pilot sites, thus the score is rated as "S" by considering pilot sites

		Total emissions reduced as a result of project driven conservation agricultural practices	0 tCO ₂ eq reduced as a result of project driven conservation agricultural practices	7,000 tCO ₂ eq reduced as a result of project driven conservation agricultural practices	23,000 tCO ₂ eq reduced as a result of project driven conservation agricultural practices	36,768 tCO ₂ eq as a result of expansion of no till practices, pasture rehabilitation, limited irrigation and improved crop management practices	HS
		Total amount of GHG emissions reduced as a result of project driven livestock production improvements, including digesters	0 tons CH ₄ emissions reduced	8,000 tons CO ₂ eq CH ₄ emissions reduced as a result of project driven livestock production improvements, including digesters	10,000 tons CO ₂ eq CH ₄ emissions reduced as a result of project driven livestock production improvements, including digesters	Four biogas digesters are operational. The digester locations have been selected based on 100 cattle criteria. The total avoided emission calculated as 10,376 tons of CO ₂ over their service life (20 years). Upgrading of biogas systems (integration of co-generation units and automation systems) was completed	S
		Number of livestock/poultry producers and number of livestock contributing to digesters as a result of project investments	0 livestock/poultry producers and 0 head of livestock contributing to digesters	20 livestock/poultry producers and 2,500 head of livestock contributing to digesters	4 livestock/poultry producers and 1200 head of livestock contributing to digesters (please see section 6. Adjustments to Project Strategy)	4 Biogas systems were established in four farms. The total number of contributing cattle heads is 4040. ¹⁵ The number of livestock producers are 33, including 30 members of a farm owned by a cooperative.	S
	Outcome 3	Number of farm and/or ranch households adopting improved practices that support biodiversity conservation, SLM, and	Number of farm and/or ranch households adopting new practices that support biodiversity	Number of farm and/or ranch households adopting new practices that support biodiversity	Number of farm and/or ranch households adopting new practices that support biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change mitigation: 500	1000 farms have adopted new practices as confirmed by Konya and Karaman Provincial Directorates	S

15 The total number of the cattle heads contributing to the systems in four farms in 2020, 2021 and 2022.

	climate change mitigation	conservation, SLM, and climate change	conservation, SLM, and climate change mitigation: 150			
	Number of FFS participants	Number of FFS participants: 0 males 0 females	Number of FFS participants: 500 males 250 females	Number of FFS participants: Target=31 FFS x average 20 members=620	31 FFSs completed. Number of FFS participants reached 923 (114 women). FFS approach has also been implemented in drought tolerant varieties of Legumes demonstrations under component two.	HS
	Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management score as reported in GEF LD tracking tool	Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management score of 1	Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management score of 2	Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management score of 2	Eregli Integrated Forest Management Plan (EIFMP), Biodiversity Management Plan, Identification & qualification of ESs were completed. SLM board had been rejected earlier because alternative options are already available	HS
	Forest policy enhancement score as reported in GEF LD tracking tool	Forest policy enhancement score of 2	Forest policy enhancement score of 2	Forest policy enhancement score of 2	EIFMP, Concept Proposal, Rehabilitation Strategy for Dryland Forestry (project site level) and Improvement of EIFMP according to international best practices (national level) were completed.	S
	Agriculture policy enhancement score as reported in GEF LD tracking tool	Agriculture policy enhancement score of 2	Agriculture policy enhancement score of 2	Agriculture policy enhancement score of 3	Rehabilitation Strategy for KCB and Best Practices Guideline were completed at site level. SLM board has been rejected because alternative options are already available (best practices of SLM are funded by national funds)	S

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹⁶	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹⁷ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁸ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1. Degraded range and forest lands rehabilitated	Total emission reductions resulting from project related forest and rangeland management improvements	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	N/A
	Hectares of rehabilitated forest land sequestering CO2 as a result of project investments	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	N/A
	Hectares of degraded range and pasturelands rehabilitated as a result of project investments	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	N/A
	Measureable global biodiversity benefits in the project target area as reported in the GEF LD tracking tool	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	N/A
Output 1.1. Innovative rehabilitation technologies and practices introduced	N/A	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	N/A
Output 1.2. Decision-making tools established	N/A	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	N/A
Outcome 2. Capacities built to apply climate smart agriculture	Total hectares under conservation agricultural practices as a result of project investments	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	N/A

¹⁶ Outputs as described in the project Log frame or in any approved project revision.

¹⁷ Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Work plan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁸ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

techniques across productive landscapes				
	Total emissions reduced as a result of project driven conservation agricultural practices	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	N/A
	Total amount of GHG emissions reduced as a result of project driven livestock production improvements, including digesters	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	N/A
	Number of livestock/poultry producers and number of livestock contributing to digesters as a result of project investments	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	N/A
	Average annual income from crop and livestock production as reported in GEF LD tracking tool remains constant and/or improves for farmer field school participants	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	N/A
Output 2.1. Innovative agricultural land rehabilitation technologies introduced	N/A	- Training of Farmers and technical staff on the importance of windbreaks combatting wind erosion and climate change -Training session of farmers on the drought tolerant varieties of legumes and their production technics	Completed in this reporting period.	
Output 2.2. Innovative methane capture and agriculture production technologies introduced	N/A	-Upgrading biogas digesters	Completed in this planning period. Integration of co-generators and automation system was completed, and farm owners were trained.	The project consultant, who worked from the installation of the biogas systems to the testing process, had a very serious accident and the recovery process took a very long time. The work was planned to be completed with a different expert, but

				<p>hesitations arose as the experts were not involved in the process from the beginning. The process could only be completed by an expert working in another FAO project, in consultation with the project consultant during his recovery process.</p> <p>In addition, the tests of the cogeneration units could not be completed in the planned time due to the fact that the expert of the manufacturer company stayed in the hospital for a long time as a result of a serious accident.</p>
Outcome 3. Enabling legal, policy and institutional environment for sustainable land management strengthened	Number of farm and/or ranch households adopting improved practices that support biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change mitigation	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	N/A
	Number of FFS members	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	
	Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management score as reported in GEF LD tracking tool	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	
	Forest policy enhancement score as reported in GEF LD tracking tool	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	
	Agriculture policy enhancement score as reported in GEF LD tracking tool	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	
	Number of pilot site level policy frameworks operationalized to integrate SLM, BD, and CC based land use planning and monitoring across productive landscapes	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	
	Number of national policy frameworks operationalized to integrate SLM, BD, and CC based land	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	

	use planning and monitoring across productive landscapes			
	Number of national level monitoring programs for CC, BD, and SLM to inform management decision-making	N/A	Completed in previous planning period	
Output 3.1. Institutional integrated management capacity building programme established for national and local level decision-makers	N/A	Printing, publishing and distributing project reports	Completed.	
Output 3.2. Comprehensive SLM and CSA extension and awareness programme emplaced	N/A	N/A-	Completed in previous planning period	
Output 3.3. Project monitoring and carbon monitoring system based on EX-ACT established	N/A	N/A -	Completed in previous planning period	

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (Max. 400 words).

All project indicators were achieved in previous planning periods, and the activities completed in this planning period are following.

- Training of Farmers and technical staff on the importance of windbreaks combatting wind erosion and climate change
- Training session of farmers on the drought tolerant varieties of legumes and their production technics
- Upgrading biogas systems and training farm owners. Moreover,
- Closing workshop of the project
- A study visit to Uzbekistan with the participation of the decision makers and technical staff from center and local project sites
- Operational closure and final evaluation of the project were conducted and,
- The terminal report of the project was completed and cleared.

The main challenge that the project faced in this planning period was that the project consultant, who worked from the installation of the biogas systems to the testing process, had a very serious accident and the recovery process took a very long time. The work was planned to be completed with a different expert, but hesitations arose as the experts were not involved in the process from the beginning. The process could only be completed by an expert working in another FAO project, in consultation with the project consultant during his recovery process.

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 rating¹⁹	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating²⁰	Comments/reasons²¹ justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<i>A few activities that could not be done due to unexpected circumstances in previous planning period were completed in this period and the project outcomes and outputs were achieved successfully.</i>
Budget Holder	S	S	<i>The project outcomes and outputs were achieved with the completion of remaining project activities.</i>
GEF Operational Focal Point²²	HS	S	<i>The progress was rated by considering the ratings included in Section 2: Progress towards Achieving Project Objective(s) (Development Objective) and Section 3: Implementation Progress (IP)</i>
Lead Technical Officer²³	S	S	<i>Remaining project activities set to achieve outcomes/outputs as per the Prodoc.</i>
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	S	<i>The project has completed its activities according to the final workplan that was agreed upon and finalized the work that was delayed due to unforeseen circumstances.</i>

¹⁹ **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.

²⁰ **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.

²¹ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

²² In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

²³ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made complying with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Add new ESS risks if any risks have emerged during this FY.

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

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

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁴ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	Yes

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.

No complaints were received.

²⁴ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

6. Risks

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁵	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Poor coordination for SLM	Low	Y	Close and collaborative cooperation between the many institutional stakeholders (particularly the MFWA and the MFAL) will be essential for the project to achieve its stated goal and objectives. This is mitigated to some extent by the positive collaboration experience of the AWRP, and further through the structure of a PMU, project management and project steering committee for project management, in addition to the new SLM mechanism that will be piloted under Component 3.		
2	Weak capacity of local and national institutions	Low	Y	Capacity of staff at various levels, particularly limited understanding of new technologies, may impede adoption rates. This will be mitigated through the development of a capacity building program and training at central and local levels		

²⁵ Risk ratings means a rating of accesses the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

3	Low ownership and lack of sustainability of new technologies and techniques	Low	Y	<p>Lack of ownership and subsequent lack of sustainability of new technologies promoted under the project could cause difficulties in achieving desired adoption levels. This will be mitigated through the above mentioned capacity building program and through an awareness campaign targeted at project beneficiaries. This capacity building program will involve tools, such as economic models and plans, economic analysis that clearly show that there is an economic and social benefit to the adoption of these technologies (win-win).</p> <p>The GoT has already developed and put into place incentive programmes for CA and land rehabilitation that specifically include equipment and machine support up to 70% of the cost, as well as support for private afforestation and nursery development. The Project will contribute to linking existing incentive systems into integrated sustainable land management practices in order to develop a holistic approach.</p>		
4	Natural calamities	Medium	Y	<p>Natural calamities, such as drought and floods, may impede the adoption of new technologies. The project is designed as a multi-year intervention, where demonstrations can be run over several seasons. The project will also be linked to the early warning services of the MFWA.</p>		

5	Climate change	Low	Y	On the one hand, climatic changes will require evolving research on the best approach for the newly proposed technologies. The MFAL and the MFWA, with support of FAO technical expertise, are in a good position to adopt forthcoming research results. On the other hand, climatic changes can also increase political support for the project.		
---	----------------	-----	---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

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
Low	Low	<i>The project has completed its activities.</i>

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

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

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	The project developed templates, replication plans, national scaling-up plans, a biodiversity monitoring concept, a concept proposal and a rehabilitation strategy for dryland forestry and best practices for Conservation Agriculture, which have been adopted and will be implemented by the government after the project.
---------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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 Guidelines²⁶. 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.

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			

²⁶ 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.

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
MAF	Executing partner, Main Beneficiary	The capacity in SLM and Implementation FFSs in the field has strengthened	The ministry staff involved in the project has not sufficient time to allocate to the project due to other responsibilities
Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change (MEUCC)	Project lead Institute, Main Beneficiary	The capacity of Project Lead Institute, GD of Combatting Desertification and Erosion Control, in SLM and FFSs approach has strengthened	The lead institute has recently become a part of MEUCC. Although, this presented a good opportunity to integrate the main responsible institution for Climate change into the project, the short remaining time of the project duration has limited the benefits from this opportunity.
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
Nature Conservation Center	LoA and project partner	The technical and financial capacity and collaboration with FAO have strengthened	
Private sector entities			
Konya Seker	Project Partner	The awareness in SLM and environmental issues have increased	
Honey producers	Information, incentives provision	The awareness in SLM and biodiversity have increased and income generated	
Temmuz Organic Farming	Collaborator	The collaboration with FAO and Ministries has increased	
Others[1]			
Farmers, shepherds	Local beneficiary,	The awareness in SLM, BD and CC has increased. The	The involvement of female farmers in the project activities

[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.

	FFS, incentives provision	capacity of analyzing their ecosystems, identifying problems and finding solutions have strengthened.	
Konya Teknokent / Selcuk University Konya	Academia, LoA Partner	The technical and financial capacity and collaboration with FAO has strengthened	
Bahri Dagdas International Agricultural Research Institute	Research, LoA Partner	The technical and financial capacity collaboration with FAO has strengthened	
Field Crops Central Research Institute Directorate	Research, LoA Partner	The technical and financial capacity and collaboration with FAO has strengthened	
<i>New stakeholders identified/engaged</i>			
Women-led cooperatives	Local beneficiary incentives provision	The capacity in basic cooperative training, business management and e-marketing has increased. The awareness in biodiversity has strengthened	The insufficient involvement of female farmers in cooperatives & trainings due to traditional and cultural values

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.	Yes	Socio-economic assessment was made and a Gender Action Plan was developed during execution stages
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	<p>-The Project supported the establishment of two women-led cooperatives in project implementation site. In this context, basic cooperative training and business development training have been conducted. In addition, the necessary equipment and material support to the cooperative have been provided by the project. The fact that the chairman of the Cooperative Board of Directors is the only female Mukhtar in rural areas in Project sites makes this support of the project unique and important. These activities have been conducted in order to implement Activity 3.1. "Trainings for women farmers about the significance of getting organized" and Activity 3.6. "Women's cooperatives in Konya-Karaman region" of the Gender Action Plan.</p> <p>-Project encouraged female participation to achieve at least 30% participation rate of women beneficiaries in the project activities. Besides, female farmers were invited with their husbands and children to the sessions of FFSs and project activities to make participation more attractive.</p>
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		Although it was not identified in the project design stage, The project conducted Socio-economic surveys including depth interview with 20 women and developed GAP by considering GEF Gender Policy and GEF GAP and FAO Gender Approach in the executing stage. Thus, the contribution of the project addressed a), b) and c).
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?	N/A	
Staff with gender expertise	FAOSEC gender consultant	Project activities for women in media and publications have been promoted.
Any other good practices on gender		

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval during this reporting period.

<p>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.</p>	<p>All knowledge materials produced are deposited in the Project Management Depository of FAO. Similarly, official publications are deposited and published in the official website of the organisation. These are also shared with the Ministry.</p> <p>The knowledge products and outcomes of the interventions are communicated on public channels.</p> <p>In the scope of the project there are a lot of good practices. These are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is the first time that FFSs implemented in Türkiye in a wide scale with this project. • It is the first time that government extension officers and lead farmers working together through an established coordination mechanism to increase awareness in SLM through FFS approach under this project. • It is the first time, even it is a challenge, Project has increased the visibility of women in agriculture by considering awareness increase in biodiversity and climate change. In this context, Gender Action Plan is developed, and two women-led cooperatives were supported for implementation of the Plan. The fact that the chairperson of the one of the Cooperative Board of Directors is the only female Mukhtar in rural areas in Konya and Karaman makes this support of the project unique and important. • It is the first time when low productivity dry land forests are certified with respect to sustainable management, and the potential to apply this certification for marketing of non-wood forest products. • It is the first Biodiversity Management Plan covering pastures, wetlands, protected areas, agricultural lands and forests in Konya Closed basin was developed. Within the scope of biodiversity management plan, sensitive areas were determined. Recommendations were prepared for each sensitive area depends on target species (endemic plant species, bird species under threat because of hunting etc.) and/or habitat types. Strategic target and action plan were given, and methods were set out for monitoring and research programmes. Biodiversity Management Plan serves as a template for biodiversity upscaling and mainstreaming at national level. • A typical framework of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) was developed as a first effort in the country, attempting to integrate agriculture, pasture, wetlands, and forests. Hence, Integrated Land Use Plan of one of the project sites, Eregli Integrated Forest Management Plan was developed with a multidisciplinary approach. A governance system with a special unit consisting of representatives of stakeholder institutions was proposed. The Plan consists of six sub-plans: forest management, non-wood forest products, grazing and pasture management, apiculture, socio-economic and biodiversity conservation. The plan encapsulates the summary of the major activities of all sub-plans. • The region is facing serious water deficiency and increasing irrigated production is putting more pressure on water resources. The programmed irrigation approaches introduced and demonstrated to the farmers in 28 demonstration plots. The results combined with two-year implementation; indicated mean water and electricity savings in demonstration plots over traditional irrigation practices were 25.5 % and 23.2 % for sugar beet and 23.5 % and 23.9 % for grain maize. This is considered as an enormous gain on behalf of the farmers, also considering the yield increases of 9 % in sugar beet (sugar yield) and 29.2 % in maize with the programmed irrigation over farmers' practices. This was a robust evidence and message to farmers showing that more can be produced with less inputs being a practical example of the 'save and grow' concept of FAO.
<p>Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications</p>	<p>The project communication strategy has been implemented during the implementation of the project activities, events, workshops, and missions conducted at the local sites. These activities have been well publicized for awareness raising using appropriate promotional materials and approaches.</p> <p>Main achievements:</p> <p>This year, all of the components of the project were completed, and visual tangible outputs were obtained. In this context, there were many points to be shown to the press and opinion leaders. A media trip was organized to the pilot area of the project in the summer. 16 national and local press representatives attended the media tour.</p>

<p>successes and challenges this year.</p>	<p>Participants: Agro TV, Independent Turk, Habertürk, Posta, Platin, Milliyet, Agricultural Journalist, Atlas Magazine, Ekoiq Magazine, AA, Ministry of Economy and Agriculture and Forestry Extension Department. The greenhouse area, biogas facilities and women-led cooperative were visited. These successes of the project carried out was met with great interest by the press. Anadolu Agency Agriculture Economy team made a special news about the honey forest. Another important event this year was the closing meeting of the project. The closing meeting was concluded with ministry representatives, technical team, academia, FAO senior officials and project beneficiaries. Success stories of the project were told. All studies lasting seven years were transferred to the participants in the meeting. Press participation was intense and press reflections were also effective.</p> <p>Constraints: There was no restriction in terms of communication this year.</p> <p>Key factors of success: In communication studies, concrete outputs of the project were explained. their stories were constructed. In addition, the use of the visuals of the project as a whole in communication works and the delivery of the messages as a whole were more clearly understood by the target audience.</p>
<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.</p>	<p>Gender Equality Action Plan was prepared as a result of socio-economic surveys conducted in the field and interviews with 20 women within the scope of the project. This action plan underlines the priority of addressing gender issues in the agricultural sector in the project area and emphasizing collaborations between government agencies, NGOs and women's groups. In addition, it is recommended to increase the number of women-oriented cooperatives in order to increase the representation of women in decision-making mechanisms.</p> <p>In this context, FAO held training on the history of the cooperative business model, production and branding in cooperatives, community building, decision-making, management, production and packaging for female cooperative women in the Emirgazi district of Konya between 23-24 November. Bahcesehir University academician Elif Okan, who participated in the training, also gave information to women about sales, marketing and branding in cooperatives. Thus, cooperative studies to support women entrepreneurs in GEF projects were initiated with the "Sustainable Land Management and Climate Friendly Agriculture" project.</p> <p>Emirgazi Öbektaş Neighborhood Headperson and S.S. Emirgazi Women's Initiative Production and Business Cooperative President Özlem Çelik and S.S. Emrulgazi Women's Entrepreneurship, Production and Business Cooperative President Özlem Ünlü said, "We want women to bring everything they can produce to the sales stage, earn money and stand on their own feet. We believe that this region is a very important opportunity to promote products that are also beneficial to us.</p> <p><i>Photo: ©FAO</i></p> 
<p>Please provide links to related website, social media account</p>	<p>PRINTED MEDIA: Username:fao / Password:fao8452</p> <p>https://web.interpress.com/app/document/detail/1737277819/2/dd2882c6-70f1-6c24-6bfc-6c402e8fac9e</p>

<https://web.interpress.com/app/document/detail/1737205527/2/dd2882c6-70f1-6c24-6bfc-6c402e8fac9e>

<https://web.interpress.com/app/document/detail/1738881320/2/dd2882c6-70f1-6c24-6bfc-6c402e8fac9e>

<https://web.interpress.com/app/document/detail/1738257373/2/dd2882c6-70f1-6c24-6bfc-6c402e8fac9e>

<https://web.interpress.com/app/document/detail/1780503076/2/dd2882c6-70f1-6c24-6bfc-6c402e8fac9e>

<https://web.interpress.com/app/document/detail/1738825281/2/dd2882c6-70f1-6c24-6bfc-6c402e8fac9e>

<https://web.interpress.com/app/document/detail/1742396327/2/dd2882c6-70f1-6c24-6bfc-6c402e8fac9e>

<https://web.interpress.com/app/document/detail/1738513375/2/dd2882c6-70f1-6c24-6bfc-6c402e8fac9e>

<https://web.interpress.com/app/document/detail/1749243365/2/dd2882c6-70f1-6c24-6bfc-6c402e8fac9e>

<https://web.interpress.com/app/document/detail/1753402511/2/dd2882c6-70f1-6c24-6bfc-6c402e8fac9e>

<https://web.interpress.com/app/document/detail/1760762315/2/dd2882c6-70f1-6c24-6bfc-6c402e8fac9e>

<https://web.interpress.com/app/document/detail/1780498402/2/dd2882c6-70f1-6c24-6bfc-6c402e8fac9e>

<https://web.interpress.com/app/document/detail/1769069761/2/dd2882c6-70f1-6c24-6bfc-6c402e8fac9e>

<https://web.interpress.com/app/document/detail/1780475443/2/dd2882c6-70f1-6c24-6bfc-6c402e8fac9e>

<https://web.interpress.com/app/document/detail/1780491336/2/dd2882c6-70f1-6c24-6bfc-6c402e8fac9e>

TV: Username:fao / Password:fao8452

<https://web.interpress.com/app/document/detail/1740065720/4/dd2882c6-70f1-6c24-6bfc-6c402e8fac9e>

TWEETS FROM FAO

<https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1480877683999391750>

<https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1598598973899538432>

<https://twitter.com/faoturkiye/status/1574357547615649799>

INTERNET MEDIA LINKS

<https://www.konyayenigun.com/yerel/bizi-besleyen-tarima-sahip-cikmaliyiz-h747044.html>

<https://www.indyturk.com/node/527446/haber/ere%C4%9Fli-orman-fidan%C4%B1%C4%9F%C4%B1nda-sera-kuruldu-80-bin-adet-y%C3%B6re%C3%B6zg%C3%BC-do%C4%9Fal-t%C3%BCr>

<https://www.girisimhaber.com/post/2022/07/04/Kooperatiflesen-Kadin-Girisimcilere-BM-ve-Bakanlik-Destegi.aspx>

<http://www.yenimeram.com.tr/konyali-kadınlar-kadın-muhtarın-onculugunde-kooperatiflesti-bm-ve-bakanlik-destek-verdi-501321.htm>

<https://www.diyadinnet.com/kooperatiflesen-kadınlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi-h51590/>

<https://www.hbrma.com/ekonomi-haberleri/11315324/kooperatiflesen-kadınlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi>

<https://www.haberant.com/kooperatiflesen-kadınlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi/80801/>

<https://www.turkiyeajansi.com/guncel/kooperatiflesen-kadınlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi-324155h>

<https://www.konyayenigun.com/ekonomi/kirsaldaki-konyali-kadınlara-destek-h747234.html>

<https://www.breakingnews.com.tr/haber/kooperatiflesen-kadınlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi-76840>

<https://www.dikgazete.com/haber/kooperatiflesen-kadınlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi-783973.html>

<http://www.ticarihayat.com.tr/haber/Kooperatiflesen-kadınlara-destek/123674>

<https://www.mansetmalatya.com/kooperatiflesen-kadınlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi/>

<https://haberdairesi.com/konya/konyada-kadın-girisimciler-uretiyor-urunler-dijital-platformda-satiliyor-75739h>

<https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/ekonomi/kooperatiflesen-kadınlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi/2629625>

<https://www.belge.com.tr/haber-569809-kooperatiflesen kadınlara bm ve bakanlik destegi.html>

<https://www.mavikocaeli.com.tr/kooperatiflesen-kadınlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi/74621/>

<http://www.gazetebirlik.com/haber/kooperatiflesen-kadınlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi-2459/>

<http://www.yenikonya.com.tr/guncel/kooperatiflesen kadınlara bm ve bakanlik destegi-1800213>

<https://www.konyapostasi.com.tr/haber/kadınlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi-117068>

<https://www.konhaber.com/haber-kooperatiflesen kadınlara bm ve bakanlik destegi-1800213.html>

<https://www.konyaninsesi.com.tr/haber/kooperatiflesen-kadınlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi-4597.html>

https://www.ankaradanhaber.com/genel/kooperatiflesen-kadinlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi-h211065.html https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/yesilhat/yesil-ekonomi/kooperatiflesen-kadinlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi/1816382 http://www.trakyagazetesi.com.tr/genel/kooperatiflesen-kadinlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi-h80221.html http://www.memleketttenhaber.com/genel/kooperatiflesen-kadinlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi-h29353.html https://ogunhaber.com/ekonomi/kooperatiflesen-kadinlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi-2328214h.html https://www.pusulahaber.com.tr/kooperatiflesen-kadinlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi-1668259h.htm http://www.gazetebirlik.com/haber/kooperatiflesen-kadinlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi-1222/ https://www.koykahvesi.com.tr/ekonomi/kooperatiflesen-kadinlara-bm-ve-bakanlik-destegi.html https://www.konyaaktuel.com.tr/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan/358520/ http://www.ngazete.com/oku-130677h.htm http://www.trakyagazetesi.com.tr/genel/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan-h80387.html https://www.konyayenigun.com/ekonomi/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan-h747359.html https://haberdairesi.com/konya/konyanin-iklim-dostu-serasi-bolge-halkinin-gelirini-artiriyor-75861h https://www.mavikocaeli.com.tr/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan/74938/ https://www.konyapostasi.com.tr/haber/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-seradan-117178 https://www.breakingnews.com.tr/haber/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan-77107 https://www.haberant.com/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan/80969/ https://www.pusulahaber.com.tr/iklim-degisikliginin-etkilerine-karsi-dayanikli-kilacak-dogal-turler-bal-1669267h.htm https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/yesilhat/dogal-yasam/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan/1816413 https://www.diyadinnet.com/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan-h51266/ https://www.dikgazete.com/haber/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan-784277.html http://www.yenikonya.com.tr/guncel/bal_ormanlarinin_bitkileri_iklim_dostu_serada-1801476 http://www.yenimeram.com.tr/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan-501406.htm https://www.mansetmalatya.com/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan/ https://www.konhaber.com/haber-bal_ormanlarinin_bitkileri_iklim_dostu_serada-1801476.html http://www.memleketttenhaber.com/genel/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan-h29476.html

	<p> https://www.sondakika.com/haber/haber-bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan-15061860/ https://www.haberler.com/guncel/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan-15061860-haberi/ https://www.mardinlife.com/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan.html https://www.konyaaktuel.com.tr/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan/358530/ https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/ekonomi/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan/2631273 http://www.netmedya.com/?sayfa=haber&id=15061860 http://www.ticarihayat.com.tr/haber/Bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan/123867 https://www.turkiyeajansi.com/guncel/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan-324542h http://yeniurfagazetesi.com/haber-bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan-59523.html https://www.altinovagazete.com/haber/oku-h67988.html https://www.koykahvesi.com.tr/cevre/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan.html https://www.merhabahaber.com/bal-ormanlarinin-bitkileri-iklim-dostu-seradan-1855262h.htm https://www.yenihaberden.com/kucuk-akbaba-mercek-altinda-1740545h.htm https://www.yenihaberden.com/konyayi-izliyorlar-1744059h.htm https://www.karamandauyanis.com/karaman-da-biyolojik-cesitlilik-izleme-calismalari-devam-ediyor/64281/ https://www.yenihaberden.com/konyali-ureticiler-biyogaz-uygulamasini-ogrendi-1748856h.htm https://www.karamandauyanis.com/biyogaz-tesisinin-acilisi-gerceklestirildi/64705/ http://www.yenimeram.com.tr/konya-da-7-yildir-suren-surdurulebilir-arazi-yonetimi-ve-iklim-dostu-tarim-projesi-sona-erdi-507076.htm https://www.belge.com.tr/haber-573514-konyada_7_yildir_suren_surdurulebilir_arazi_yonetimi_ve_iklim_dostu_tarim_projesi_sona_erdi.html https://www.konhaber.com/haber-konya-da-7-yildir-suren-surdurulebilir-arazi-yonetimi-ve-iklim-dostu-tarim-projesi-sona-erdi-1883981.html https://www.pusulahaber.com.tr/surdurulebilir-arazi-yonetimi-ve-iklim-dostu-tarim-projesi-sona-erdi-1706255h.htm https://www.konyapostasi.com.tr/haber/turkiyeye-ornek-oldu-125319 https://www.haberturk.com/ankara-haberleri/29617632-konyada-7-yildir-suren-surdurulebilir-arazi-yonetimi-ve-iklim-dostu-tarim-projesi-sona-erdi </p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>http://www.yenikonya.com.tr/guncel/konyada_7_yildir_suren_surdurulebilir_arazi_yonetimi_ve_iklim_dostu_tarim_projesi_sona_erdi-1883981</p> <p>https://www.konhaber.com/haber-haberi-oku-1883969.html</p> <p>https://www.kayseridebugun.com.tr/konya-da-7-yildir-suren-surdurulebilir-arazi-yonetimi-ve-iklim-dostu-tarim-projesi-sona-erdi/85731/</p> <p>https://www.canligaste.com/konya-da-7-yildir-suren-surdurulebilir-arazi-yonetimi-ve-iklim-dostu-tarim-projesi-sona-erdi/276191/</p> <p>https://haberdaresi.com/konya/turkiyeye-ornekti-konyada-7-yildir-suren-bu-proje-sonlandirildi-85276h</p> <p>https://www.aydinlik.com.tr/haber/enerji-ve-su-tasarrufu-saglandi-iklim-dostu-tarim-projesinde-900-ciftci-egitim-aldi-353731</p> <p>https://www.pusulahaber.com.tr/bu-bir-bitis-degil-baslangic-1706806h.htm</p>
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	<p>FAO TURKIYE WEBSITE</p> <p>https://www.fao.org/turkiye/news/detail-news/en/c/1542624/</p>
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	<p>Safak Toros FAO Türkiye Communication Specialist safak.toros@fao.org</p>

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.

Participatory approach has been implemented during the implementation of the project activities. Local people (farmers) are involved in the project activities with different mechanisms; mainly through FFSs approach of FAO, incentive mechanisms, trainings and workshops. Besides, local people are consulted and informed about the project activities. For example, local people are involved in the planning process of Integrated Forest Management Planning and Forest certification process through meetings, workshops.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁷	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval USD	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023 USD	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Local Government	ÇEM, OGM	Cash & in-kind	10,100,000	27,213,521		
Local Government	TRGM	Cash & in-kind	8,700,000	60,934,034		
Private Sector	Konya Şeker	Cash	1,000,000	1,000,000		
Civil Society Organization	DKM	Cash & in-kind	1,800,000	1,954,913		
GEF Agency	FAO	Cash & in-kind	700,000	924,722		
		TOTAL	22,300,000	92,027,190		

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

The co-financing actualized is almost four times more than what is committed by the project partners in project document signature, since land consolidation activities are ongoing in the project sites also contributes to the high co-financing amount since the cost of land consolidation is high. Besides, project had three no cost extensions, therefore, partners have also continued reporting under co-financing during the no-cost extension periods.

²⁷ Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives)
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits)
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

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