



Enhancement of agro-ecological management system through promoting ecosystem-oriented food production

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10819

Countries

Türkiye

Project Name

Enhancement of agro-ecological management system through promoting ecosystem-oriented food production

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

6/30/2022

Review completed by PM

8/24/2022

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Land Degradation

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

09/26/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

7/22/2022:

Yes.

Please see comments below on overall contribution to Turkey's plans for LDN.

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

09/26/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

8/22/2022:

Cleared.

7/22/2022:

a. It is not clear how LDN has been incorporated into Component 1. Please ensure this is explicit in Table B. Please make clear whether or not this strategy aligns with national plans for LDN?

Agency Response

August 19, 2022:

Thank you for the comment. Please note that we have corrected component 1 throughout the CEO Endorsement request to clarify that the suggested Agro-ecosystem approach addresses Land Degradation and will be aligned with the national LDN strategy.

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

09/26/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

8/29/2022:

Please see follow up comment below:

-For the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry 4M - change ?Grant? to ?Public Investment?

7/22/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

September 22, 2022:

Thank you, we have adjusted as requested.

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

8/22/2022:

Cleared.

7/22/2022:

The GEF financing combined with the investment mobilized cofinancing should be sufficient to conduct the project activities.

a. We note that the costs for the Project Manager is spread across components. Given the tasks outlined for the Project Manager it appears that this position will not be directly conducting any of the project activities. Please adjust the budget for the PM so that the costs are shared between the GEF and the grant cofinancing identified for the PMC.

Agency Response

August 19, 2022:

Point taken. The Fraction of the Project Manager Cost has been removed from the components.

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

7/22/2022:

Yes

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

09/26/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

8/29/2022:

Please see follow up comment below.

Please consider re-inserting the expected results value at PIF stage under the Indirect GHG emissions mitigated indicator (6.1), as appropriate, explaining its methodological basis.

8/24/2022:

The portal has a glitch on GEF end and so this comment is cleared.

8/22/2022:

Minor exclusion with the figure for CEO Core Indicator 3. Total of 66ha to be included.

7/22/2022:

-There has been a small increase in the Core Indicator target 3, which is welcome and achievable.

Agency Response

September 22, 2022:

Point taken. Indirect GHG emissions mitigated has been inserted to the Core indicators and Results Framework. The methodological basis for this calculation is now explained on the explanatory section under the Core Indicators section as follows:

Additionally, The project considers 20% additional indirect benefits through scaling up of project activities by the government, community and development partners. More specifically, this will be achieved through co-financing resources within the up-scaling of the National Agroecology Strategy that the Project will implement. With the GEF Grant, direct benefits will be achieved by the implementation of the agroecology strategy within the Bolu province and indirect benefits will be derived from up-scaling the strategy to other regions.

FAO Ex-Act Support Files have been attached under supporting documentation on the GEF Portal

August 24, 2022:

Thanks for the comment. The error is due to a visual glitch in the portal that cannot be corrected from our end. The agency has been notified that a solution to this issue will be deployed soon and that the data is being saved correctly.

August 19, 2022:

Thank you for the comment.

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

8/22/2022:

Cleared.

7/22/2022:

Not fully.

a. At CEO Endorsement stage, we expect a more detailed climate risk screening. Please include.

b. We note the work on value chains under Component 2, however we expect more discussion on the challenges that the project is trying to address with respect to value chains, including as it relates to the private sector. Please include.

Agency Response

August 19, 2022:

a. Please see the response to the comment below. The risk section has been updated with more detailed information about climate risks and mitigation actions.

b. We have included a description of the challenges that the project is trying to address with respect to value chains on the barrier section of the CEO Endorsement Request.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/22/2022:

Yes

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

8/22/2022:

Cleared

7/22/2022:

We note and welcome the additional details provided on the Alternative Scenario, please consider the comments below:

a. The Theory of Change as well as the text under Component 2, still mentions 50 ha for Component 3. Please update with the new figures.

b. Component 1- The barrier 1 ?Insufficient legal and regulatory and institutional framework? is presented as a critical one as it prevents stakeholders from developing and adopting new, more sustainable land management practices. Nevertheless, the project interventions through the component 1, including its budget (which also includes capacity building for at least half the resources allocated to component1), appear very limited to address this barrier. It?s difficult to understand how the expected change in the legal, regulatory and institutional framework can happen including at national level with such limited resources. What is the added value of GEF resources? Will the co-financing assist in these complementary activities?

c. Component 1- in relation with the previous comment, it is unclear how the outcome 1.1 of new policies actually adopted can be achieved through the activities as presented under the outputs 1.1.1 which mainly focus on reviews, mapping, analysis, strateg. Please clarify.

d.. Under the output 1.1.2, the 3rd activity has already been achieved (?internationally successful examples were examined, and capacity building was developed?). Please explain what this activity will be in the context of this project.

e. Although a small investment, we see value in linking the project to the overall LDN agenda of Turkey, in particular to ensure sustainability. Please describe the mechanisms to ensure this is not a stand alone project but will linked to Turkey's overall LDN agenda. This is expected through the activities under Components 1 and 3

f. Component 2- Output 2.1.3 indicates *Identify and support women centric value chains to improve rural livelihoods*. Please describe what this support involves? Which value chains will be targeted?

g. Component 2- We note the activities that will be performed to achieve the 66 ha of rehabilitated land for Core Indicator 3, however Table 4 describes SLM activities on what appears to be productive lands, while the sub-indicator selected is Restoration of natural grass and shrubland. It is also not clear what field based activities will account for the 5000ha of land brought under SLM. Please clarify.

h. Component 2: it is unclear how the demonstration sites will be identified (will there be only the land degradation hot spots?) and what will be the incentives for the producers to adopt new practices, especially for those productions that are already increasing (will it be through the expected improvement in income and if so, how has it been assessed?). Please elaborate further on these aspects.

i. Component 2: The activities are mainly focused on production practices while the weakness of the business enterprises and the markets access is presented among the key barriers. Please clarify how the project will address this issue considering a stronger focus on value chains development.

j. How will cooperatives be involved in the execution of component 2, in particular the work related to the value chains?

k. How will the improvements in the degraded land be tracked and measured and feed into a national system of monitoring for LDN?

Agency Response

August 19, 2022:

- a. a. Thanks. This has been updated throughout the project document accordingly.
- b. Thank you for the comment. Please note that the added value of the GEF Investment is the development of a national agroecological management strategy aligned with national LDN strategy and capacity building. This will be the main vehicle for addressing barrier 1 and Co-financing resources will play a critical role. This is now explained in the CEO Endorsement Request on the alternative scenario section. Still, the budget has been slightly adjusted to increase resources for component 1.

- c. Please note that we have edited the activity list under output 1.1.1 to clarify this comment. Please note that the main role of the GEF investment under this output is the finalization of the National Agroecology Strategy and its adoption by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. Hence its implementation beyond the pilots covered by this project will be covered by ministry co-financing.

- d. Thanks for the comment. This was an editing mistake. We have now corrected the activity in the context of the project.

- e. We have strengthened the link with the country LDN agenda throughout the alternative scenario section.

- f. To address this comment we have added an activity to Output 2.1.3 to clarify the support to women centric value chains.

- g. Thanks for the comment. Please note that the 5,000 ha are targeted under Output 2.1.2 and they are addressed by the Adoption and development of the integrated agroecosystem management plan for Bolu province. On the other hand, the demonstrations under Output 2.1.3 target the remaining 66 ha divided as follows: 50 ha under rangeland rehabilitation (Core Indicator 3.3) and 16 under SLM practices (Now corrected to core indicator 3.1) . This approach has now been clarified on the alternative scenario section.

- h. We have elaborated further on these issues under the component 2 description on the alternative scenario section.

- i. Thanks for the comment. We have taken this comment into account on the new description of component 2: Output 2.1.2 will include capacity development for market access and the demonstrations under output 2.1.3 will also be complemented by such support.

j. Value chain support will be given to cooperatives, particularly those operated by women. This will be done in close consultation with the district directorates of the Ministry. This has now been clarified under the component 2 description.

k. The project will be implemented in close collaboration with the provincial and district directorates and General Directorate of the Ministry (GD for Agricultural Reform). For monitoring of the improvements in degraded lands the ``LDN decision support system o of Turkiye`` will be utilized (<https://projectgeffao.users.earthengine.app/view/ldn-turkey>). This is a tool that has been developed by another GEF-FAO collaborative project. This has now been inserted to the description of component 2.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/22/2022:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/22/2022:

Yes.

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
7/22/2022:

Yes

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

8/22/2022:

Cleared.

7/22/2022:

Not fully.

a. How will the support to the value chains mentioned in Component 2 be maintained.

b. What will incentivize the small farmers to continue the approaches introduced under the project?

Agency Response

August 19, 2022:

a & b. The sustainability section of the CEO Endorsement request has been updated to address these issues.

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

7/22/2022:

Yes

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

8/22/2022:

Cleared.

7/22/2022:

Please provide details on the specific stakeholders that were consulted during the PPG
and the process for consultation.

Agency Response

August 19, 2022:

This information has been added to the GEF Portal entry on the CEO Endorsement
Request.

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

09/26/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

8/29/2022:

Please see follow up comment below:

While gender considerations have been adequately addressed but some of the questions below were not responded to. Please complete the following questions in the portal submission.

-Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; Improving women's participation and decision making (The project description says it will address this, so please respond YES)

-Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? (Please respond YES or NO as appropriate).

7/22/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

September 22, 2022:

Thank you for the comment. we have answered these questions in the portal with a ?Yes? in line with the project description and the results framework.

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

8/22/2022:

Cleared.

7/22/2022:

Not fully.

-Please expand on opportunities for small farmers to access finance in order to facilitate continuation of the approaches introduced under the project.

Agency Response

August 19, 2022:

Thanks for the comments. We have expanded on opportunities for small farmers to access finance under the private sector section of the CEO Endorsement Request.

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

8/22/2022:

Cleared.

7/22/2022:

Not fully

a. Linked to the comment above on the climate risk screening, the climate change associated risks need more analysis. More clarification on threats and impacts, along with their appropriate mitigation measures is needed. Please outline the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location or at country level if not available at local scale (including a time horizon, ideally 2050, if the data is available) and list key potential hazards for the project that are related to the climate scenarios. For further guidance, the Agency may want to refer to STAP guidance available here: <https://www.stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening>

Agency Response

August 19, 2022:

Thank you for this comment. The risks table has been updated with much more detail information regarding climate risks and mitigation actions. In particular, Projections are included and droughts have been highlighted as the main climate risk in the region.

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

7/22/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

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

7/22/2022:

Yes

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

09/26/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

8/29/2022:

Please see follow up comment below:

The proposal should explicitly include a publicly access ?project website? as part of Component 3, and indicate that ?knowledge and lessons generated/compiled during project implementation will be regularly posted and shared on this project website for

outreach, learning and public awareness.? The budget should be adjusted to account for any costs associated with the creation and maintenance of such a website.

8/22/2022:

Cleared.

7/22/2022:

Not fully.

a.It is indicated that past generated knowledge ?will feed into the project preparation process?. Isn?t the project preparation finished? Please clarify.

b. The description should also include plans to learn from ongoing relevant projects and initiatives. Please complete accordingly.

Agency Response

September 22, 2022:

Thank you for the Comment. We have included the project website within the activities of Component 3. This is now explained on the alternative scenario and the Knowledge management section.

The Budget has been updated to account for the Project Website. See line ?Materials for Component 3 (Project Website, Knowledge., communication and Diffusion material)?

August 19, 2022:

- a. This has been corrected on the text. We meant the project implementation process.
- b. Point taken, this has now been added to the text on the Knowledge Management section.

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

09/26/2022: Addressed & Corrected.

Cleared

8/29/2022:

Please see follow up comment below.

It is noted that the overall risk classification of the project has been lowered from moderate at PIF submission to low at CEO Approval. The project has not included any relevant information to explain this change and moreover information provided in table 8 suggests moderate risk. In addition, the project has not included any updated ESS screening/assessment reports to corroborate this changed risk rating. The attached ESS screening report is the same that was submitted at PIF stage in March 2021. Please provide updated ESS documentation, if available, and or provide additional explanation on the assessments carried out during project development, including any measures to address identified risks during implementation.

7/22/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

September 22, 2022:

Thank you for the comment. As well noted, Table 8 indicates that the risk classification of the project is ?Moderate?. The classifier above the table was incorrectly marked as ?Low?. We have corrected this mistake for consistency with the risk description and mitigation actions.

A complete and revised ESS Risk Checklist Screening was developed during project preparation. This Checklist is now attached under supporting Documentation.

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

7/22/2022:

Yes

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

7/22/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/22/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/22/2022:

Yes

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/22/2022:

Yes

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

09/26/2022: Addressed & corrected.

Cleared

8/29/2022:

Please see follow up comments below:

Please clarify what "Trai" activity entailed or is this an error?

7/22/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

September 22, 2022:

Apologies for the error. The activity has been corrected to "Travel for preparation and validation workshops and Baseline collection?"

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/22/2022:

Yes

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

09/26/2022:

Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.

8/29/2022:

Not at this time. Follow up comments to be addressed prior to CEO Endorsement.

8/24/2022:

The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.

8/22/2022:

Not at this time. A minor error to be fixed with core indicator 3.

7/22/2022:

Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review

7/22/2022

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	8/22/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/24/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/29/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/26/2022

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations