



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review 2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



### 1. Basic Project Data

#### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Europe
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Turkey
<b>Project Title:</b>	Sustainable Land Management and Climate-Friendly Agriculture
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/TUR/055/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	4583
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	BD, LD, CC
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF)
<b>Project Duration:</b>	Six (6) years

#### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	5 March 2013
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	3 November 2014
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	01 January 2015
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) <sup>2</sup></b>	31 December 2018
<b>Actual Implementation End Date<sup>3</sup>:</b>	31 December 2020

#### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	USD 5,750,000
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	USD 22,300,000
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):</b>	USD 3,236,347
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019<sup>5</sup></b>	USD 84,494,578 (as of 31 December 2018).

---

<sup>1</sup> as per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> In case of a project extension.

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

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

## Review and Evaluation

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:</b>	19 March 2019
<b>Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):</b>	N/A
<b>Mid-term review/evaluation actual:</b>	N/A
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	N/A
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	N/A
<b>Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:</b>	N/A
<b>Tracking tools/ Core indicators required<sup>6</sup></b>	N/A

## Ratings

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	MS	
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	MS	
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	Medium	

## Status

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

---

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> 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
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Fatma Güngör, NPC	Fatma.Gungor@fao.org
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Peter Pechacek, Forestry Officer	Peter.Pechacek@fao.org
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Viorel Gutu, SEC-SRC and FAO Representative in Turkey	Viorel.Gutu@fao.org
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division</b>	Hernan Gonzalez, Technical Officer (CBC) Chris Dirkmaat, Executive Officer (CBC)	Hernan.Gonzalez@fao.org Chris.Dirkmaat@fao.org

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Objective(s): 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 farm profitability and forest productivity.</b>						
<b>Outcome 1:</b>	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 1,200 Kg C/ha/year of biomass 30 trees per ha of tree density	30 000 hectares of vegetative cover 1,450 Kg C/ha/year of biomass 40 trees per hectare of tree density	60,000 hectares of vegetative cover 1,600 Kg C/ha/year of biomass 50 trees per ha of tree density	42,883 ha of vegetative cover	S
	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 of degraded forest targeted by the project No arable land under conservation agriculture due to project intervention No degraded rangelands and	10,000 ha of degraded forest rehabilitated, 20-25,000 ha of arable land under conservation agriculture 15,000 of degraded	20,000 ha of degraded forest rehabilitated, capturing 43,000 tons of CO <sub>2</sub> eq per year 40-50,000 ha of arable land under conservation agriculture, avoiding 23,000 tons of CO <sub>2</sub> eq per year 30,000 ha of degraded rangelands and pastures	25,057 ha of degraded forest rehabilitated, capturing 54,727 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq per year 37,589 ha of arable land under conservation agriculture, avoiding 10,854 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq per year	HS

<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> 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)**.

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
		pastures under improved management due to project intervention  No methane capture sites developed due to project intervention	rangelands and pastures under improved management  8-10,000 tCO <sub>2</sub> -eq avoided from methane capture sites	under improved management capturing 25,000 tons of CO <sub>2</sub> eq per year  8-10,000 tCO <sub>2</sub> -eq avoided from methane capture sites	2000 ha (MAF) of degraded rangelands rehabilitated, capturing 6,893 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq per year and 17,826 ha(MAF) respectively of degraded pastures rehabilitated, capturing 61,439 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq per year	
	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 0 million ha pasture lands 0 ha forests	Spatial coverage of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes: 0 million ha agricultural lands 0 million ha pasture lands 0 ha forests	Spatial coverage of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes: 2.2 million ha agricultural lands 1.8 million ha pasture lands 700,000 ha forests	Spatial coverage of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes: 0.36 million ha agricultural lands 0.12 million ha pasture lands 69,147.3 ha forests	MS

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
	Total emission reductions resulting from project related forest and rangeland management improvements	0 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq mitigated as a result of improved range and pastureland management	-	66,000 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq mitigated per year as a result of rehabilitated forests and improved range and pastureland management	61,620 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq	S
	Hectares of rehabilitated forest land sequestering CO <sub>2</sub> as a result of project investments	0 ha of rehabilitated forest land sequestering	10,000 ha of forest land rehabilitated	20,000 hectares of forest land rehabilitated	25,057 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	2,000 ha of degraded rangelands rehabilitated, and 17,826 ha degraded pastures rehabilitated.	MS
	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 Marches (Akgol-6680) and Meke Lake (202ha)	S
<b>Outcome 2:</b>	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	37,589 ha of agricultural land is under CA through raised awareness	MS

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
	Total emissions reduced as a result of project driven conservation agricultural practices	0 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq reduced as a result of project driven conservation agricultural practices	7,000 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq reduced as a result of project driven conservation agricultural practices	23,000 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq reduced as a result of project driven conservation agricultural practices	10,854 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq excluding pasture rehabilitation	MS
	Total amount of GHG emissions reduced as a result of project driven livestock production improvements, including digesters	0 tons CH <sub>4</sub> emissions reduced as a result of project driven livestock production improvements, including digesters	8,000 tons CH <sub>4</sub> emissions reduced as a result of project driven livestock production improvements, including digesters	9,900 tons CH <sub>4</sub> emissions reduced as a result of project driven livestock production improvements, including digesters	Four biogas digesters are operational and in testing period as of March 2019. The digesters have 100 cattle capacity. 263,52 units tCO <sub>2</sub> eq/year emission reduced through the established digesters.	MS
	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/ producers and 2020 head of livestock contributing to digesters	Biogas systems were established in four farms under the project. Since the budget is limited and the medium sized entrepreneurs are common in KCB, the digesters were established at farm level with 100 cattle capacity. Besides, poultry is not common practice in the Basin. Thus, the	S

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					end target is revised as 4 with the capacity of 2020 heads. Please see Annex3.	
Outcome 3:	Number of farm and/or ranch households adopting improved practices that support biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change mitigation	Number of farm and/or ranch households adopting new practices that support biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change	Number of farm and/or ranch households adopting new practices that support biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change mitigation: 150	Number of farm and/or ranch households adopting new practices that support biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change mitigation: 500	1,000 farms have adopted new practices as confirmed by Konya and Karaman Provincial directorates (data is not verified officially yet)	S
	Number of FFS participants	Number of FFS participants: 0 males 0 females	Number of FFS participants: 500 males 250 females	Number of FFS:30 participants: 700 (since the original target is not realistic, it is revised by considering the assessment made in 2017. No target identified for female farmers, however the project will try to integrate female farmers during the implementation.	Number of FFS participants: In total, 442 participants, 382 being males and 60 females (6 FFS in 2016 and 11 in 2017-2018)	MS

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
	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	Please see list of the workshops and trainings (Annex 2).	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 3	The GAP analysis report was Finalized	MS
	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	SLM board has been rejected due to the fact that alternative options are already available ( best practices of SLM are funded by national funds)	MS

**Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating <sup>19</sup>**

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<b>Outcome 1: Degraded forest and rangelands rehabilitated and management practices improved</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project impact monitoring</li> <li>- Rehabilitation activities in demo sites and in other degraded forest lands and rangelands will continue;</li> <li>- Draft biodiversity monitoring concept to enable measurement of global biodiversity benefits;</li> <li>- Determination of carbon emission reductions in forestry sector;</li> <li>- Identification and Quantification of Ecosystem Services;</li> <li>- FSC certification</li> <li>- Development of Integrated Land Management Plan;</li> <li>- Gender Action Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring consultant</li> <li>- Service provider (SP) under contract</li> <li>- Forestry and local units of MAF</li> <li>- National consultant for biodiversity monitoring;</li> <li>- Project consultants</li> <li>- SP under contract;</li> <li>- LoA</li> <li>- Consultancy</li> <li>- LoA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ASAP</li> <li>- By May 2020</li> <li>- By end Project</li> <li>- By June 2020</li> <li>- By end of project</li> <li>- By 30 September 2019</li> <li>- By November 2020</li> <li>- By June 2020</li> <li>- By October 2019</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome 2: Climate-smart agriculture techniques applied across productive landscapes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project impact monitoring</li> <li>- Diversification of CSA activities</li> <li>- Workshops on pasture lands &amp; identification new pasture demo sites</li> <li>- Production of training materials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring consultant</li> <li>- LoA &amp; Contracts</li> <li>- LoA</li> <li>- Project Team + consultants + service providers</li> <li>- Methane consultant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ASAP</li> <li>- By September 2020</li> <li>- By 31 December 2019</li> <li>- By end of project</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Biogas training for farmers &amp; government staff</li> <li>- Irrigation demonstrations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LoA &amp; Tender</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- By end of 2019</li> <li>- By end of 2020</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome 3: Enhanced enabling environment for sustainable land management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Impact Monitoring</li> <li>- Workshops on farmer field schools</li> <li>- Establishment of 14 farmer field Schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring Consultant</li> <li>-</li> <li>- Project Team &amp; service provider</li> <li>- Project Team &amp; service provider &amp; consultancy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ASAP</li> <li>- By end of project</li> <li>- By end of project</li> </ul>

## 2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs <sup>10</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR <sup>12</sup>					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance <sup>13</sup> or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR		
<b>Output 1.1. Degraded range and forest lands rehabilitated using innovative technologies and practices</b>	Q1 Y3	<i>e.g 5 farmer field schools established in 4 pilot sites</i>	<i>5 working farmer field schools and 4 in progress</i>				%	
1. Complete brief implementation strategy refining pilot sites, detailing monitoring priorities, listing primary ecosystem services to be quantified and defining boundaries of land-use plans and FSC certification.	Completed	%10	%90	n/a	n/a	n/a	%100	
2. Prepare strategic rehabilitation plan to identify current rehabilitation and management gaps, and propose targeted	Completed	%10	%90	n/a	n/a	n/a	%100	

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

<sup>12</sup> 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)

<sup>13</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

interventions designed to address root-cause needs; types of interventions to be used, size and location of the areas to be rehabilitated in yearly basis.								
3. Rehabilitate 20,000 ha of degraded forests with innovative techniques according to the strategic rehabilitation plan. 2016 Target: 7000 Ha 2017 Target: 7000 Ha 2018 Target: 6000 Ha"	Completed	%10	%65	%25	n/a	n/a	%100	25,057 ha of degraded forest rehabilitated (data extracted from co-financing report)
4. Support local communities including nomadic people with incentives that prevent relapse into behaviors that originally lead to degradation; and taking precautions for improved living conditions.	Completed	%10	%40	%20	%30	n/a	%100	
5. Rehabilitate 10,000 ha of degraded rangelands that are within the forestlands according to the strategic rehabilitation plan.	by End of the project	%10	%10	n/a	%80	n/a	%100	The figure is 2,000 ha. This area covers the registered pastures adjacent to forests and treeless areas inside the forests, since no rangeland exists inside the forest according to Forestry Law. Therefore, the target was revised as 2,000 ha by considering MTE recommendations. It can be justified by considering forest rehabilitation in terms of project carbon mitigation targets, which is 5,000 ha over the project target as of 31 Dec 2018.

6. Collecting data to monitor the success of the rehabilitation program.	by End of the project	%10	n/a	n/a	%60	n/a	%70	Monitoring approach is in place for demo sites. Needs to be developed to handover to the government after project closure. During project period, the observation and monitoring made by the FRS consultant and reflected in his BTORs
<b>Output 1.2 Decision-making tools for range and forest lands established and delivering SLM, BD, and CC benefits</b>		<i>e.g. baseline study</i>	<i>n/a (or done)</i>				%	
1. Producing <b>soil carbon maps</b> to help project stakeholders to assess and monitor the CC benefits of project interventions.	Completed	%10	%20	%70	n/a	n/a	%100	
2. Preparation of the Ereğli Integrated Forest Management Plan (trial) that is based on an integrated land management approach focusing on maintaining and rehabilitating ecosystem integrity in order to deliver SLM, CC and biodiversity conservation benefits.	Completed	%10	%40	%40	%10	n/a	%100	Completed
3. Generating a replication plan, identifying strategic locations within the KCB that would benefit from a similar planning exercise.	End of project	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	This seems not possible during the project lifetime due to budget limitation.
4. Setting-up FSC certification for forest and rangelands within at least one pilot area which will help public and private sector stakeholders to	End of Project	%10	%10	%20	%10	n/a	%50	LoA signed for this task.

better understand the process, costs and benefits associated with certification.								
5. Developing an ecosystem services centered biodiversity integration system for the SLM focused management of production landscapes with planning and implementation decisions for different sectors including drought impact and vulnerability assessment on ecosystems and mitigation options.	End of Project	%10	%20	%50	%10	n/a	%90	Biodiversity has been integrated into the Ereğli Forest management plan and the plan adopted by the Government. The great bustard action plan is ready. The plan includes recommendations to be integrated in agricultural lands, which is the habitat of the great bustard.
6. Preparing and implementing a comprehensive biodiversity monitoring system that focuses on indicator plant and animal species to ascertain the status of globally significant species.	End of Project	%10	n/a	%20	%10	n/a	%40	Some of the indicator species are identified under the LoA with DKM, TOR for consultancy is in place
7. Ensuring the continuation of biodiversity integration and monitoring programs through preparing a way forward plan.	End of Project	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	This is included in the TORs for the biodiversity monitoring consultant
8. Establishing a biodiversity and hydrology monitoring program and developing an ecological restoration strategy in order to re-establish the quality of wetland habitats and biodiversity values in Ereğli Marshes.	Completed	%10	%10	%30	%50	n/a	%100	Completed under LoA with DKM
9. Assessing the value of ecosystem services to proximate communities in order to describe how	By Sept 2019	%10	%10	%10	%40	n/a	%70	The ecosystem services in the pilot sites have been identified and quantified through first, second and third reports. The contract will be

ecosystem services or lack-thereof impact the quality of life for stakeholders, particularly those reliant upon forest and rangelands for their livelihoods.								ended on 30th September 2019.
10. Development of Ereğli Integrated Land Management Plan.	By end of 2020	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The Plan was first called “ <i>Eregli Integrated Forest Management Plan</i> ” through the contract. Project LTO will prepare the NFF and the plan name will be revised as “ <i>Eregli Integrated Forest Management Plan</i> ” or will be kept as “ <i>Eregli Land Management Plan</i> ” after Government consultation.
Output2.1 Innovative agricultural land rehabilitation technologies produce SLM, CC, and BD benefits							%	
1. Preparing a rehabilitation (investment) strategy to identify and select farms where demonstrations are most likely to show the cumulative restorative impacts.	Completed	%10	%90	n/a	n/a	n/a	%100	
2. Identifying and describing international best practices related to KCB specific restoration challenges with the participation of stakeholders and taking into account local challenges and strategic approaches to be used for above rehabilitation strategy.	Completed	%10	%90	n/a	n/a	n/a	%100	Best practices report is in place
3. Implementing the rehabilitation strategy on 40-	End of project	%10	%50	%10	%20	n/a	%90	The target is likely to be achieved by the end of Project duration since

50,000 ha of arable land (such as windbreaks, irrigation channel shade trees, no till farming practices, crop residue management, mulching, field traffic reduction, crop rotation approaches, drip irrigation, water harvesting, limited irrigation and drought resistant crops). 2016 Target: 10000 ha 2017 Target: 15000 ha 2018 Target: 15000 ha								the project went through a 2 year no-cost extension .The rehabilitation strategy has been implemented over an area of 37,589 ha as of 31 Dec 2018.
"4. Undertaking rehabilitation activities on 20,000 ha of pasturelands [such as wind breaks, reclamation of saline soils (e.g. water leaching, gypsum), planting drought resistant and salt tolerant species (saltbush and kochia), as well as rotational grazing/resting, use of halophyte species]. 2016 Target: 4000 ha 2017 Target: 8000 ha 2018 Target: 8000 ha"	End of project	%10	%50	%10	%20	n/a	%90	The target is likely to be achieved by the end of Project since the project has a 2 year no-cost extension. Rehabilitation activities have covered an area of 17,826 ha as of 31 Dec 2018.
5. Integrating the conservation of endangered Great Bustards into the management of arable lands in Sarayönü - Cihanbeyli pilot site followed by a dissemination strategy.	By Sept. 2020	%10	%30	%30	%10	n/a	%80	The <i>Great Bustard Action Plan</i> is ready. The plan includes recommendations to be integrated in agricultural lands, which is the habitat of the great bustard. During the revision of EIFMP, the action plan can be integrated to EIFMP.
6. Establishing the necessary monitoring structure in order to measure the success of	By end of 2020	%10	n/a	n/a	%10	n/a	%20	Rehabilitation implementations are continuing and progress is being monitored. Future monitoring

rehabilitation implementations (such as wind erosion measurement systems).								options are being evaluated.
7. Undertaking a comprehensive evaluation of pilot demonstrations, reporting the best practices and preparing an up-scaling plan integrated with capacity development programs.	By end of 2020	%10	n/a	n/a	%10	n/a	%20	Demonstrations are continuing and progress is being evaluated by the consultants. Best practices are being developed as a base for future up-scaling plans.
Output2.2 Demonstration of innovative methane capture and agriculture production technologies generate SLM, CC, and BD benefits waste								
1. Investigating current practices and identifying specific opportunities within the project's pilot site area in terms of GHG emissions. This will include identifying participants and completing a comprehensive business plan describing the investment requirements, potential returns, operational approaches, decision-making frameworks, management responsibilities, as well as the intended climate change mitigation benefits.	By end of 2019	n/a	%60	n/a	%30	n/a	%90	Draft business plan for digesters is ready
2. Establishing several digesters aiming at methane capture of 10,000 CO <sub>2</sub> eq with monitoring activities to make certain climate change mitigation levels are being	By end of project	n/a	%30	n/a	%50	n/a	%80	Since the medium sized enterprises are common in KCB and due to limited budget four Digesters with 100 cattle capacity were established and the testing period was started. 263,52 units tCO <sub>2</sub> eq/year emission

reached, accompanied by public outreach activities to make other potential groups of agricultural interests aware of the program and to create pathways for replication.								reduced through the established digesters. The figure is in conformity with the 9900 units tons CH <sub>4</sub> target stated in ProDoc, which is for 6 digesters with 1000 cattle capacity. As an outreach activity a biogas opening ceremony with wide participation is planned. Several visits are planned for Members of FFSs. Through the other events held in project sites, the participants will be taken to the farms. PSC members, FAO representatives, media and press will be invited. The programs will be developed to the digesters.
3. Devising a strategic investment plan to help farmers reduce emissions and alleviate climate change vulnerabilities during design and application of specific interventions in the field by low or negative cost interventions. Possible interventions may include low carbon technologies, residue management, mulching, providing viable alternatives to the practice of burning crop residues, lowering water consumption, improving the efficiency of fertilizer use, reduced tillage, recuperation of degraded land, improved management of manure, adoption of agro-forestry	By April 2020	n/a	%30	n/a	20	n/a	%50	Strategic investment plans are being prepared within different areas of conservation agriculture such as biogas digesters, programmed irrigations, reduced tillage and land rehabilitations. Low carbon technologies, CA activities and rehabilitation interventions are covered by the plans and also demonstrated in the field through the demonstrations established.

practices.								
4. Increasing the ownership of GHG emission reduction techniques through training in Farmer Field Schools.	By May 2020	n/a	%30	n/a	%30	n/a	%60	Training for farm owners and government staff for bio digesters is planned in the PWP. Besides, 7 FFSs were established focusing on CA activities for this planning period.
5. Designing a hand-over strategy with best practices and guidelines for the GoT to disseminate the results.	By June 2020	n/a	n/a	n/a	50	n/a	%50	Best practices are being developed and demonstrated. These will be part of the hand over strategy at the end of the project.
<b>Output3.1 Institutional integrated management capacity building program established for national and local level decision-makers</b>								
1. Elaborating the legislative framework (laws, regulations and guidelines) for SLM practices.	Completed	-	%40	%60	n/a	n/a	%100	GAP analysis report is in place
2. Establishing the IEG body (SLM board) to ensure informed SLM decision-making.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The proposal for establishment of SLM Board was declined by national project partners who recommended focusing on existing bodies.
3. Undertaking a series of awareness raising and technical training activities (best practice guide) targeted at the decision makers in the relevant ministries on SLM.	By March 2020	n/a	%20	%30	%20	n/a	%70	Carried out through the training workshops and on-the-job trainings under project components.
<b>Output3.2 Innovative agricultural land rehabilitation technologies produce SLM, CC, and BD benefits</b>								

1. Conducting several training activities targeting technical staff of provincial and regional directorates of MAF to build appropriate institutional capacity on SLM and CSA (national and pilot area level).	By end of project	-	%50	%10	%10	n/a	%70	Several training workshops were organized, such as the biodiversity training for FFSs, FFSs curriculum and ToT workshops, workshop on FFS coordination meeting, Biodiversity Management Plan Final workshop. The second study tour is planned in 2019 based on the decision made in the fifth PSC.
2. Designing FFS curriculum to teach international best practices based upon a needs assessment and integrating biodiversity conservation specific issues (e.g. women cohort training module) and knowledge building.	By end of project	-	%20	-	%40	n/a	%60	The curriculum framework was developed in FFS curriculum workshop and it was enhanced through the FFS ToT meeting.
4. Establishing and operationalizing Farmer Field Schools as a tool of capacity-building in the region focusing on issues related to ecosystem-based adaptation principles, knowledge of SLM, climate change and biodiversity conservation with global best practices.	By end of project	-	20%	%10	%30	n/a	60%	6 FFSs were established in 2016 and 11 FFSs established in 2017, which are not operational at present. Therefore, an assessment was carried out by the support of the HQ consultant for 2016-2017 in 2018. Besides, the project target in the ProDoc was not realistic which is capacity building of 1,200 farmers through 5 FFSs. Therefore, the target was revised by considering the results of the assessment study through MTE recommendation on revision of the project targets. As a result, 7 FFSs are established for 2019 for summer crops under a LoA. Based on the results of these 7 schools, the new 7 FFSs will be established in 2020.
5. Designing strategy for national upscaling for FFS	By end of project	n/a	n/a	n/a	%50	n/a	%50	Activity is included under FFS LoA

capacity-building, transferring responsibilities and sustainable financing for national upscaling.								
6. Developing and disseminating implementation guidelines (best practices) for SLM, specifically for restoration of degraded lands to be applied by the MAF; for conservation agriculture to be applied by farmers and cooperatives in cooperation with Agriculture departments of MAF; and for range/pasture rehabilitation to be applied by forestry departments of MAF and local authorities.	By Jan 2020	n/a	n/a	n/a	%70	n/a	%70	The Implementation Strategy, Strategic Rehabilitation Plan and Concept Proposal for Ecosystem-Based Rehabilitation and Management of Dryland Forests and Afforested Areas were in place and adopted by the Ministry. The Rehabilitation report for KCB on best CSA management practices and Best Practices Guidelines for Climate Smart Agriculture are in place and cleared by former Project Agriculture officer. The reports will be published in 2020.
7. Designing and implementing awareness-raising program for local beneficiaries on SLM practices (e.g. workshops and other dissemination events such as articles, TV and publications).	By end of project	-	30%	10%	%30	n/a	70%	There is always a turnover in terms of communication consultancy, since it is on a share basis. Therefore, project communication strategy is not implemented properly. Through the project activities, events, workshops and missions conducted to the local site, the project team implements the awareness raising. Promotional materials are also developed through these activities serving awareness raising. One designer involved in the project and a new communication consultant are on board.
<b>Output3.3 Project monitoring and carbon monitoring system based on EX-ACT</b>								

<b>established</b>								
1. Setting up a monitoring system to measure achievement of project indicators for informed decision-making and preparing hand-over strategy by project end.	By end of Project	-	%10	%10	%20	n/a	%40	The M&E consultant was involved in the project from July 2018 to March 2019 on a share basis. During this period, the monitoring data at project level was not produced due to workload of the consultant.
2. Establishing a carbon monitoring system based on EX-ACT in Turkey.	By end of Project	-	10%	20%	%40	n/a	70%	Carbon monitoring reports based on EX-ACT for the years of 2015-2016, 2017 are available and were prepared based on co-financing data for 2018.

## 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 ownership of the executing partners has continued to increase in this reporting period resulting from major deliveries of the project such as establishment of biogas digesters, completion of Ereğli Integrated Forest Management Plan and biodiversity management plan and establishment of apple orchards and irrigation demonstrations. Progress on FFSs, including development of coordination mechanism and curriculum framework, will be done by a local institute. LoA was signed with this local institute for the implementation of FFSs.

These activities are major deliveries of the project under component one and two respectively.

Draft Bio digesters business plan is also prepared.

Cooperation with local and central units of MAF has been further improved. This is attributed to frequent visits of the partners by project staff at both central and local levels, and to increased deliveries of the projects in general. Technical knowledge and engagement of the partners are contributing to increased deliveries as well.

The activities implemented in project pilot sites, the missions to Konya, and the workshops organized have created awareness among the stakeholders and improved ownership. Within this context, the project activities draw an efficient attention to the growing environmental problems resulting from mainly agricultural activities recognized by the stakeholders. There are some progresses in improving visibility of the project at implementation sites. The two visits paid to Governors of the Karaman province and Ayranci district took place in local press. Through the event arranged under the project for 30th year celebration of FAO FFS approach had widespread media coverage for the Project visibility.

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

**Max 200 words:**

Majority of the delay causes were related to re-organization of the former Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs and Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock. Some departments of the former ministries were abolished during the reorganization and high turnover of the staff of project partner institutions at decision making level led to delay in the project processes such as for example feedback provision. Hence, these delays led to late signing of contracts and late processing procurements, which both caused the need to postpone activities with numerous consequences (e.g. need to revise dates, exchange rates, etc.).

Important problem remains lack of communication among departments of the government partners. Prolonged administrative processes for the purpose of transparency and accountability at both FAO and the government institutions side contribute to slowing the progress of project activities.

In terms of FFSs, participation of female farmers in FFSs is a challenge that has been encountered at the field level due to localized cultural and traditional values.

Communication at grass root level needs to be addressed to increase the awareness concerning the project through increased awareness on biodiversity conservation, combatting climate change and SLM in general. However, there was a turnover of communication consultants in this reporting period. Two different communication consultants were involved.

### Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating <sup>14</sup>	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating <sup>15</sup>	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<i>In spite of some challenges, the project made good progress to deliver the major outputs such as Biodiversity Management Plan, which will serve a template for the integration of biodiversity in land use plans and development of integrated forest management plan as an example of integration of biodiversity into forest management. Establishing and testing bio digesters in four farms in the project pilot sites and achievement of the project targets in rehabilitation of degraded lands have contributed to the global targets of the project.</i>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<i>The delivery of major project outputs contributing the global project targets has completed in this reporting period, however there is still some of the project activities which needs to be addressed.</i>
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<i>Project is on track with some delays on various activities</i>

<sup>14</sup> **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.

<sup>15</sup> **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>16</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

<p><b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b></p>	<p><b>MS</b></p>	<p><b>MS</b></p>	<p><b>Development Objective Rating</b>  <i>The project is on track to achieve its overall objective of disseminating/adopting low-carbon technologies to improve agriculture/forest land-use management. The project has achieved and even exceeded its target regarding land cover delivering environmental benefits as well as its target on avoided emissions/carbon sequestration. Nonetheless, a few targets have encountered significant shortcomings. Under Outcome 2 on capacity building to apply CSA techniques, biogas systems have just been established. Under Outcome 3 on strengthening the enabling environment for SLM, data regarding the number of households adopting improved practices is pending verification.</i></p> <p><i>The project has adopted the recommendations from the 2018 Mid Term Review, including stronger focus on gender and national field support. Co-financing has surpassed expectations.</i></p> <p><b>Implementation Progress Rating</b>  <i>A considerable amount of outputs have already been completely delivered or are in a very advanced state of delivery. Every single output is expected to be delivered at the end of project duration. Nonetheless, a few outputs remain underdeveloped. The preparation /implementation of a biodiversity monitoring system is in its early stages. The evaluation of pilot demonstrations and reporting of practices under Output 1.2 seems to advance at a slow pace.</i></p>
---	------------------	------------------	--

### 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 <sup>17</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	N/A

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					
The following table summarizes risks identified in the <b>Project Document</b> and reflects also <b>any new risks</b> 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, <b>as relevant</b> .					

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>18</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>19</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Poor coordination for SLM	Medium	N/A	N/A	

<sup>17</sup> **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.

<sup>18</sup> GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

<sup>19</sup> 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 rating <sup>18</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>19</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
2	Weak capacity of local and national institutions	Medium	N/A	N/A	
3	Low ownership and lack of sustainability of new technologies and techniques	Medium	N/A	N/A	
4	Natural calamities	Low	N/A	N/A	
5	Climate change	Low	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
Medium	Medium	

## 4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months<sup>20</sup>

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<b>Project Outcomes</b>		
<b>Project Outputs</b>	Yes Revisions made by considering MTE recommendation, which is the revision of project targets	<p>Under output 1.1, rehabilitation of rangelands, the target is stated 10000 ha. It is revised as 2000 ha based on the consultancy with project partner (OGM), since there is no rangeland inside the forest according to Forestry Law. OGM rehabilitates treeless areas inside the forests and registered pastures next to the forests. Since the rehabilitation of degraded forests is 5000 ha over the project target, this reduction can be covered at the end of the project.</p> <p>Under output 1.2. The testing of Eregli Integrated Forest Management Plan for one year and revision of the plan based on observation made is not realistic, since the FMPs are revised within ten years in general. Therefore, it is proposed that the plan will be revised through consultancy from SLM perspective.</p> <p>Under the output 1.2. Developing Eregli Integrated Land Use Plan is described as project activity. The name of the plan is stated in the contract as Eregli Integrated Forest Management Plan, therefore the name of the plan will be revised by consulting the government.</p> <p>Under output 3.2. FFS target of the project; 6 FFSs were established in 2016 and 11 in 2017 through consultancy arrangements involving in total 442 farmers. An assessment was carried out with the support of HQ consultant for the FFS activities in 2016-2017 in 2018. This indicated that the project target in prodoc (suggesting capacity building of 1200 farmers through 5 FFSs) was not realistic since each FFS can include only 20-25 farmers. Therefore, the target was revised as 30 by considering the results of assessment study. These assessments also indicated the possible benefits of an institutional support for coordinating the FFSs. As a result, 7 FFSs are established for 2019 for summer crops and pasture</p>

<sup>20</sup> 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.

		under a LoA. Based on the results of these 7 schools, the new 7 FFSs will be established in 2020.
--	--	---

### 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
<b>Project extension</b>	<p>Original NTE: 31 Dec 2018                      Revised NTE: 31 Dec 2020</p> <p>Justification:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Seasonality to allow for sufficient extent of the cropping period and</li> <li>2) Time necessary to allow for 1-year test execution of the Integrated Forest Management Plan as stipulated in the ProDoc (however, even this stipulation might be considered as not realistic and will be subject of upcoming target check).</li> <li>3) One year delay at the beginning of the project</li> </ol>

## 5. Gender Mainstreaming

### Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment? Please briefly indicate the gender differences.

Gender consultant was recruited under the project. Socio-economic questionnaire was prepared by the gender consultant to conduct surveys in the field. Survey will be done through a service provider and TOR for LoA is prepared. The access of women, who lives in project implementation sites, to the benefits provided by the project is insufficient. Besides, the involvement of women in FFSs is also one of the major challenge of the project. These are attributed to the localized cultural and traditional values.

Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? Not available. How is the project tracking gender impacts and results? The project will conduct socio economic surveys from gender perspective and will develop a gender action plan.

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

Two gender consultant involved in the project. The project proposes to work with an institute, which has experience in gender studies, in particular to rural communities.

- If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: The project expects to contribute to;
- closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;
- improving women's participation and decision making; and or
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

**Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)? N/A**

## 6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

If applies, 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

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

List of stakeholders	Category	Engagement mechanism
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (ÇEM and OGM) – General Directorate of Combatting Desertification and GD of Forestry	Government	Partnership, decisions making
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (TRGM) – General Directorate of Agricultural Reform	Government	Partnership, decisions making
General Directorate of Agricultural Research and Policies (TAGEM )	Government	LoA
Nature Conservation Centre (DKM)	NGO	LoA and project partner
Uyum Company	Private Sector	Contract
ANCEO	Private Sector	Contract
Konya Şeker	Private Sector	Project partner
Farmers, shepherds	Private Sector	FFS, incentives provision
Honey producers	Private Sector	Information, incentives provision
Konya Teknokent / Selcuk University Konya	Academia	LoA
Bahri Dagdas International Agricultural Research Institute	Research	LoA

## 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

The project aims to contribute to introduce or promote low carbon technologies for several purposes e.g. to contribute to local climate change adaptation and mitigation efforts while helping to improve livelihoods of the rural populations. Support to herders and smallholder farmers in highlands help directly improvement of the livelihood. Distribution of tents and installation of solar power electricity units have been appreciated by resource limited locals in forest areas. Biodiversity conservation efforts, work on ecosystem services, promotion of water saving techniques and forest and land rehabilitation activities help greatly conservation of natural resources. For the long term impact, establishment of four pilot biogas digesters will help initiation and popularization of the methane capture approaches. Similarly, Farmer Field Schools focusing on conservation agriculture practices and biodiversity conservation will help expansion of conservation agriculture techniques helping to improve soil protection and productivity.

- Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc.

<http://www.fao.org/europe/events/detail-events/en/c/1198740/>

<http://www.fao.org/europe/events/detail-events/fr/c/1201254/>

<https://www.bmdergi.org/language/en/turkey-promoting-low-carbon-technologies-in-konya-closed-basin/>

<https://www.gidahatti.com/faonun-uygulamali-ciftci-okullari-konyada-tanitolacak-127162/>

<https://konya.tarimorman.gov.tr/Haber/592/Ciftci-Tarla-Okullari-Calistayi-Gerceklestirildi>

<http://www.milliyet.com.tr/toy-kusunun-neslinin-korunmasi-icin-konya-yerelhaber-2571340/>

<http://www.karaman.gov.tr/tarim-ve-orman-bakanligi-tarim-reformu-genei-mudurlugu-heyetinden-vali-merale-ziyaret>

<http://www.fao.org/farmer-field-schools/news-events/detail-events/en/c/1200441/>

<http://www.hakimiyet.com/uygulamali-ciftci-okullarinin-30-yil-donumu-1255341h.htm>

<https://www.haberler.com/uygulamali-ciftci-okullarinin-30-yil-donumu-12180748-haberi>

<http://www.konyaolay.com/uygulamali-ciftci-okullarinin-30-yil-donumu-kutlaniyor/78031>

<http://beyazgazete.com/video/webtv/guncel-1/uygulamali-ciftci-okullarinin-30-yil-donumu-konya-haberi-723357.html>

<http://www.memleket.com.tr/uygulamali-ciftci-okullarinin-30-yil-donumu-1788880h.htm>

<http://www.cumrapostasi.com/uygulamali-ciftci-okullarinin-30-yil-donumu>

<http://www.anadoludabugun.com.tr/uygulamali-ciftci-okullarinin-30-yil-donumu-89557>

<http://www.konyaolay.com/uygulamali-ciftci-okullarinin-30-yil-donumu/78031>

<http://www.konyahaber.com/uygulamali-ciftci-okullarinin-30-yil-donumu-461839h.htm>

[https://www.konhaber.com/haber-uygulamali\\_ciftci\\_okullarinin\\_30\\_yil\\_donumu-1013198.html](https://www.konhaber.com/haber-uygulamali_ciftci_okullarinin_30_yil_donumu-1013198.html)

<http://www.yenihaberdem.com/uygulamali-ciftci-okullarinin-30-yil-donumu-1050739h.htm>

<http://www.sivasbulteni.com/uygulamali-ciftci-okullarinin-30-yil-donumu-116435h.htm>

<https://www.pusulahaber.com.tr/uygulamali-ciftci-okullarinin-30-yil-donumu-1143978h.htm>

<https://www.haberler.com/uygulamali-ciftci-okullarinin-30-yil-donumu-12180186-haberi>

<http://www.star.com.tr/yel-haberler/uygulamali-ciftci-okullarinin-30-yil-donumu-3827557>

<http://www.ankaradanhaber.com/genel/uygulamali-ciftci-okullarinin-30-yil-donumu-h98854.html>

<https://www.haber50.com/genel/uygulamali-ciftci-okullarinin-30-yil-donumu-h329372.html>

## 9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>21</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 31 December 2018-	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	26,160,546		
Local Government	TRGM	Cash & in-kind	8,700,000	54,240,882		
Private Sector	Konya Şeker	Cash	1,000,000	1,500,000		
Civil Society Organization	DKM	Cash & in-kind	1,800,000	1,802,570		
GEF Agency	FAO	Cash & in-kind	700,000	790,580		
		<b>TOTAL</b>	22,300,000	84,494,578		

**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 committed by the project partners in project document signature is almost four times more at 31 December 2018, since the partners have implemented co-financing activities according to technics stated in the Prodoc in spite of delay in the project activities/demonstrations. Besides, 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.

<sup>21</sup> 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.

**Annex 2. List of the Workshops (01 July 2018 to 30 June 2019)**

FFS Coordination Mechanism Workshop	17 July 2018	Ankara
Biodiversity Management Plan Final Workshop	29 -30 November 2018	Konya
FFS Curriculum Development Workshop	9 -12 October 2018	Konya
Biodiversity Training in FFS	29 March 2019	Konya
FFS 30 <sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration	25 June 2019	Konya
FFS ToT Workshop	25-26 June 2019	Konya

**Annex 3. List of the farms where biogas digesters were established**

District	Village	Farm Owner Name	Number of Cattles in the Farm
KONYA/EREĞLİ	Aşağıgöndelen	EMİR KAN TARIM ÜRÜNLERİ NAKLİYAT TAAHHÜT İTHALAT İHRACAT SANAYİ VE TİCARET LİMİTED ŞİRKETİ	566
KONYA/KARAPINAR	Gaziosmanpaşa	GÖKCAN TARIM ÜRÜNLERİ HAYVANCILIK NAKLİYECİLİK SAN. VE TİC. LTD.ŞTİ	724
KARAMAN MERKEZ	Demiryurt	DEMİRYURT KOOP. ÇİFTLİĞİ	500
KARAMAN MERKEZ	Göztepe	SERİNLER ÇİFTLİĞİ	230