



Sustainable and Integrated Water Resource Management in Gediz River Basin in Turkey

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10732

Countries

Türkiye

Project Name

Sustainable and Integrated Water Resource Management in Gediz River Basin in Turkey

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

6/10/2022

Review completed by PM

7/25/2022

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

MSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: No.

The project structure and design, in particular the budget proposal is not considered to be fully appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs. The project is designed as a TA with a large consultant component, capacity and equipment. It is unclear how the investment component 2 will be achieved. The project needs to be re-designed to create a balance between necessary TA and the investment component. The project objective is a rather standard INRM type intervention. The large consultant input for this type of intervention is not considered justified.

Also, the PMC co-financing is not proportional to overall co-financing.

07/25/2022: Adequately addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

June 29, 2022

Point taken. Please refer to the updated budget on the GEF Portal and attached agency project document. Table B has also been corrected to be consistent with the new budget. The allocation for consultants have been considerably reduced and the corresponding resources have been transferred for the investment activities of component 2.

PMC Co-financing has also been updated to be proportional to the GEF Grant PMC.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Table D is adequate.

The budget does not demonstrate a cost-efficient approach to meet project objectives (see also comments above).

07/25/2022: Addressed. Budget has been restructured.

HOWEVER, the following inconsistencies need to be addressed:

1. the totals in budget (\$1,121,539) table don't match the totals for the GEF Project Financing in Tables A, B, and D (\$1,143,139). Per Table B, the difference lies in component 3: it should be \$81,000 instead of \$59,400. Please amend.
2. Table B ? Component 3 lists \$187,550 for M&E while the budget table includes \$106,550 for M&E. Please make these two figures consistent.

08/04/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

August 4, 2022

1. Point taken, thank you. The budget has been corrected to match values in Tables A, B and D.
2. Please note that not all entire Component 3 corresponds to M&E as this component includes also the dissemination of good practices, knowledge management, and communication (See Output 3.1.4). Nevertheless, the comment about consistency is taken and the budget has been edited so that the fraction of component 3 that addresses M&E is clearly stated and consistent throughout the project document. See also edits to the M&E plan in section 9.

June 29, 2022

Point taken. Please refer to the updated budget which has been revised to improve consistency with project objectives.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

07/25/2022: INCONSISTENCIAS that need to be addressed:

- Please insert the Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) under core indicator 3 in the core indicator table. There are 764 ha under sub core indicator 3.1 but the total for core indicator 3 is ?0? ha.
- Please correct the target for core indicator 11. The results framework indicates 400 but core indicator table indicates 650 people.

08/04/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

August 4, 2022:

1. The agency has identified a slight change to the project portal in which we must select the type of land targeted under sub-indicator 3.1 (either cropland or rangeland).

Regardless of the type selected, when inserting the target values for CEO Endorsement the total for component 3 is automatically updated. However, when saving progress the portal does not save the values for the total and as a result, the total for component 3 is displayed as zero.

Nevertheless, the Agency has inserted a note in the box with core indicator clarifications indicating that the overall target for Core Indicator 3 is 764 ha corresponding to the target under sub-indicator 3.1.

2. Thank you for the comment. Please note that the Target for Core Indicator 11 in the results framework is divided into the target for Outcome 1.1 (250 people) plus the target for Outcome 2.1 (400 people) for a total of 650 people as in the core indicator table.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Not fully.

The gender section provides only general comments on the issue. Please elaborate further on how gender is being addressed specifically in this project and what are the specific opportunities and challenges. Please also include gender specific indicators in Table B as appropriate.

07/25/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

June 29, 2022

Point taken. The section has been completed to describe the main gender challenges and project activities to address such challenges. The submission now includes a gender action plan for the project and the Table B and Results framework indicators have been revised to clarify gender specific targets and indicators.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Not fully.

The private sector section is not very specific. Please elaborate as appropriate on how and who, exactly, may be engaged into the project and in which specific activities.

07/25/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

June 29, 2022

Point taken. The private sector section has been completed highlighting engagement with the private sector at different levels and the relationship with each of the project activities.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: No.

The endorsement has been submitted with an OFP exception request, however, neither is FAO listed in part I as executing agency nor is this clearly mentioned in this section. It is also noted that no upstream engagement has taken place with GEFSEC to discuss the exception request.

The Program Manager (PM) does not approve the exception request as presented. Please contact PM for upstream discussions.

07/25/2022: Addressed through the following actions: (1) Upstream discussion with PM has been conducted and (2) the coordination arrangement have been re-designed in a way that FAO execution support is not required anymore.

Cleared

Agency Response

June 29, 2022

Thank you for this comment. Please note that the execution arrangements for the project have been revised and the budget has been updated accordingly.

FAO will transfer most of the project resources to National technical partners selected during the first year of project implementation. Further, the PMU and consultants will be placed within the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry or within the provincial governments.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response
Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
06/14/2022: Not fully.

The provided budget table in Annex E does not include a column indicating the responsibility of the individual budget line items. Please add/clarify.

07/25/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

June 29, 2022

Point taken. The budget has been updated to include columns indicating the responsible entities for the execution of each budget line.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a for an MSP

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a for an MSP

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Has been provided

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Has been provided

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/14/2022: No. Please address comments made in this review. Please also contact GEFSEC for discussion of execution arrangements.

07/25/2022: No. Please address the comments made in this review (budget and core indicator inconsistencies). Please kindly be reminded of the cancellation date August 30, 2022.

08/04/2022: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/14/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/25/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/4/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The objective of the project is to promote Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) and mainstream Biodiversity Conservation in the Gediz River Basin (GRB) with a focus on land and water resources to ensure the socio-economic well-being of local communities and the sustainability of natural resources. It focuses on integrated natural resource management interventions to enhance water and land governance at policy and local levels in the agriculture sector, and to mainstream biodiversity protection in priority sectors within the basin. This will ultimately assist in improving socio-economical well being of the local community, and mitigating the impacts of Climate Change. GEF resources will be used to strengthen the enabling environment and showcase strategic practices to induce a change in the way natural resources are currently managed in the GRB. By ensuring local stakeholders are part of the decision-making processes, the project will develop a model that ensures GEF-financed interventions are accepted by project beneficiaries. As project interventions show the benefits of improved management, best practices will be disseminated to ensure the proposed models are upscaled not only to the GRB but to other basins in Turkey, leading to improvements in the status of natural resources in the country. GEBs to be generated are: 14,900 ha of new protected areas, 1,000 ha under improved management, 450 ha restored, thereby sequestering 330,000 ton of CO₂eq. The project will directly reach 400 beneficiaries.

This project will build on the efforts from the Turkish Government to build back better considering that the Water Service has been designed as a key executing agency for post COVID-19 economic recovery activities with the implementation of water management and natural resource protection activities. This project will take the lessons learned from that experience and build on them to promote sustainable practices and business models for the forestry and agriculture sectors.