

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

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10732

**Countries**

Turkey

**Project Name**

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

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

10/23/2020

**Review completed by PM**

6/17/2021

**Program Manager**

Ulrich Apel

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

MSP

**PIF****Part I ? Project Information****Focal area elements**

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/27/2020: No.

The project requests Biodiversity (BD) STAR funding but there is no relation to the GEF-7 BD strategy and nothing in the results framework that indicates any BD outcomes and/or benefits. There are also no BD benefits in terms of indicators being measured, only land degradation indicators. If indeed Land Degradation (LD) focal area objectives are the focus of the project, the proponents may wish to use the marginal flexibility option to allocate BD funding for LD objectives or otherwise, if BD funds are being requested, the project needs to be redesigned to ensure alignments with the BD strategy and that BD benefits are produced commensurate with the resources invested and measured through the core indicators (4.1) and (4.2).

This is a preliminary review. Above issues need to be addressed before we can proceed to review the project. Please also note that the OFP endorsement letter does currently not indicate the use of the marginal flexibility option.

05/21/2021: Has been addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

March 3, 2021:

Please consider this new submission that significantly improves alignment with BD Focal Area.

**Indicative project/program description summary**

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/21/2021: Not fully.

- While content of Table B is sound, please strive for proportionality in the overall co-financing ratio with the ration of PMC co-financing.

06/21/2021: Not fully.

- The results framework outlined in Table B does not allow to assess the achievement of the proposed project objective, which indicates as an overarching objective the goal ?to ensure the socio-economic well-being of local communities and the sustainability of natural resources.? We could not find indicators in Table B that referred to socio-economic well-being. You may consider to rephrase the project objective with a view to make sure the results indicators help measure each part of the project objective statement. Likewise, it would be worthwhile considering including outcome indicators in Table B on bird species, as seems to be planned under section (v) on Global Environment Benefits. This may help measure the sustainability of natural resources.

- Component 1 is clear on the community-based planning principles and policies/decisions to be adopted, but would benefit from more clearly qualifying that those principles will support ?best practices in river basin and biodiversity conservation and management? as indicated in Table 2. Output/Activity matrix for outcome 1.1. This would make the link clearer between the TA contribution of Component 1 to the investment described in Component 2.

08/23/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**August 17, 2021**

1. Point taken, please refer to the new version of the results framework were we have rephrased the project objective as suggested. Additionally, we have edited the Outcome 1.1 and its indicators and added additional indicators at the outcome level to component 2. The target for the increased population of key species will be defined during PPG phase.

2. Thank you for the comment. We have rephrased Outcome 1.1 that now reads: ?Enabling environment to support the implementation of best practices in river basin management and biodiversity conservation aligned with the existent Gediz River Basin Management Plan (RBMP).?

### **June 9, 2021**

Point taken. Please note the distribution of the co-financing on table B has been adjusted.

#### **Co-financing**

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/21/2021: Yes.

06/17/2021: DISCREPANCY FOUND:

Kindly note that the FAO contribution should be categorized as in-kind and not as Grant (as the co-financing letter clearly indicates that this comes in form of technical and admin support by FAO).

08/23/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

### **August 17, 2021**

We have updated the GEF Portal and PIF as required.

We will continue exploring possibilities for co-financing during PPG stage.  
**GEF Resource Availability**

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**Project Preparation Grant**

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Core indicators**

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
05/21/2021: Not fully.

- Please clarify how the (comparably low) number of beneficiaries has been calculated.

- Note that the project is tagged to Rio Marker CCM = "0", however, a CC core indicator is selected. Please adjust Rio Marker.

06/17/2021: Not fully

- The project should state the methodology applied to estimate the target for Core Indicator 6 on GHG emissions mitigated.
- The project should also indicate how it estimated the targets expressed in terms of numbers of hectares across Core Indicators 1, 3 and 4.
- Also note that core indicator target 6 is not mentioned in Table B - it would be useful to reflect it in Table B to confirm it is rooted in the project's logic of intervention.

08/23/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

### Agency Response

#### **August 17, 2021**

1. Point taken Please refer to the text under Table F, where the methodology to estimate mitigated GHG emissions is explained. FAO's Ex-Act tool has been uploaded to the GEF Portal with the details of the estimation.
2. Point taken, a note on the estimation of the targets Under core indicators 1,3 and 4 has been added under Table F
3. Point Taken. We now include Core Indicator 6 under Table F.

#### **June 9, 2021**

- The number of direct beneficiaries has been adjusted from 250 to 400. A paragraph describing how this number is calculated has been included under table F. The number is calculated considering the persons who receive training as a result of the project activities and the farmers and smallholders who receive support on SLM practices. The number will be confirmed and revised during PPG phase.

- Point Taken. CCM Rio Marker has been tagged as 1: the project will address CCM as a significant objective in the portal.

#### **Project/Program taxonomy**

**7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/21/2021: Not fully.

The context section lacks a short assessment of the COVID-19 pandemic situation including risks and opportunities for green recovery.

06/17/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**June 9, 2021**

Point taken. A short description on opportunities for green recovery has been added at the end of the Project Description section. The risk table on section 5 including risks associated to COVID-19 has been complemented.

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion



05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response  
**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response  
**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response  
**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response  
**Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed knowledge management (KM) approach in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/21/2021: 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Part III ? Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/27/2020: No. Comment in box 1 needs to be addressed before the project can be reviewed.

05/21/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

06/17/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

08/23/2021: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO approval.

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

### Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
<b>First Review</b>	10/27/2020	3/3/2021
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	5/21/2021	6/9/2021
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	6/17/2021	8/17/2021
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	8/23/2021	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

### PIF Recommendation to CEO

### Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

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 proposed 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 100,000 ton of CO<sub>2</sub>eq. 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 to be developed during 2021. 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.