

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

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10819

Countries

Turkey

Project Name

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

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

6/2/2021

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple

Focal Area

Land Degradation

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
6/16/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

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
8/31/2021:

Cleared.

6/16/2021:

Not fully.

Land Degradation Neutrality which underpins the LD focal area strategy needs to be better reflected in Table B and throughout the project document. How will the project contribute to Turkey's efforts to set LDN targets or meet LDN targets that have already been set?

Agency Response

August 18, 2021:

Thank you for this comment. We have revised Table B and the alternative scenario section to address this comment. In summary, the proposal consists in the following goals consistent with GEF Core indicators and National LDN targets:

- 5,000 ha of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems (GEF Core Indicator 4.3). This indicator will contribute to achieve national LDN targets with regards to improved productivity in agricultural land.
- 50 ha of natural grassland / shrub land restored (GEF Core Indicator 3.3). This indicator will contribute to achieve national LDN target to improve productivity in pastureland.

We now clarify under table F, that the activities of the project will contribute to meet selected national LDN targets.

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

8/31/2021:

Cleared.

6/16/2021:

-We note that a number of activities are planned, however the GEF financing is quite small. Given the expected \$4,000,000 of investment mobilized, please indicate if this will be actual cash/grant financing solely dedicated to this project?

Agency Response

August 18, 2021:

Point taken. Indeed the investment mobilised will be used to achieve the targets in this project. However, please note that to address this comment we have revised the activities of the project (See alternative scenario section ? Component 2) and reduced them to prioritize in line with national agendas and LDN targets, taking into account the requested funding.

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

6/16/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/16/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/16/2021:

Yes

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
6/16/2021:

Yes

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

10/4/31:

Cleared.

8/31/2021:

Thank you for the additional information.

-The explanation below the Core Indicator table makes reference to Core Indicator 4&5, please correct to avoid confusion.

- At PPG please provide additional details and a clear explanation of the indirect GHG mitigation targets.

6/16/2021:

Not fully.

-However, please provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided.

-Specific to the climate change benefits- The rationale behind the indirect climate benefits and their calculation is unclear. Please explain the source of these benefits and how they are estimated. Please consider post direct benefits (obtained from the project activities after the project ends and until 20 years from the beginning of the project) as direct benefits. Please also provide the methodology used and the calculation for the direct climate benefits.

Agency Response

September 24, 2021.

1. Thank you for the comment. Well noted. We have corrected the description for more clarity explaining the targets to which core indicators 3 and 4 will contribute.

2. Well noted. We will elaborate further during PPG phase.

August 18, 2021:

1. Explanation was added on the relationship of defined targets for the core indicators and Turkey's national LDN Target. In addition, a summary of the methodology for carbon capture calculations was added.

2. The GHG emissions for both direct and indirect benefits were calculated using the EX-ACT tool that are now uploaded in the Portal. Based on the consultations, the project assumes 20% additional indirect (consequential) benefits through scaling up of project activities by the government, community and development partners. Additional information on the methodology has now been added under table F.

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

10/4/2021:

Thank you. Cleared.

8/30/2021:

Thank you for considering this revision, however we do not see any taxonomies related to climate change adaptation included.

6/16/2021:

-We note that the RIO marker for Climate Change Adaptation is '1', please include this in the taxonomy.

Agency Response

September 24, 2021:

Point Taken. Please note that we have now marked Ecosystem-based Adaptation, Mainstreaming adaptation, livelihoods, and climate resilience under Climate change adaptation and Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use under Climate Change mitigation.

August 18, 2021:

Point taken. The Portal and PIF have been updated accordingly.

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

10/4/2021:

Cleared.

8/31/2021:

Thank you for the additional details.

-We do not see where information has been included on the current impacts of COVID on Turkey and the project site. Please include.

-We note in the response that there is currently little information available on Bolu in terms of *levels/extent of degradation faced in Turkey and in the Bolu province including land degradation, forest loss, destruction of ecosystems that support the productive landscapes* , however it is necessary at this stage to provide a rationale/justification for selecting Bolu as the project site. Please clarify and include additional information in the submission.

At PPG we expect further information on:

-Levels/extent of degradation faced in Turkey and in the Bolu province including land degradation, forest loss, destruction of ecosystems that support the productive landscapes.

.6/16/2021:

Not fully.

-Please provide further details on the overall environmental (related to land, biodiversity etc.) and socio-economic context of the targeted project site. We note that some of the socio-economic information is included in the section on the project maps. Please include it under the project context.

-If available, please also include information on the levels/extent of degradation faced in Turkey and in the Bolu province including land degradation, forest loss, destruction of ecosystems that support the productive landscapes.

-Are there additional economic drivers leading to environmental degradation that can be considered-such as over exploitation due to low yields, lack of economic incentive etc? Please clarify the possible socio-economic driver of the environmental degradation.

-At the PIF stage information on climate change impacts and scenarios/projections for Turkey are required. If this information is available for the targeted provide, please also include.

-Please indicate the current context at it relates to COVID 19 impacts on Turkey and the targeted project site.

Agency Response

September 24, 2021:

1. Point taken. Please refer to the section 1a Project description/systems description in the PIF and GEF Portal. Under which we now include the following information:

?The COVID-19 pandemic has affected a diversity of sectors, industries and territories in Turkey. At the national level, travels bans and circulation restrictions have affected the tourism, transportation, construction, retail and manufacturing industries. More specifically, COVID-19 has had negative consequences on agricultural production. The main challenges faced in the agricultural sector relate to limited access to inputs and markets, difficulties in transportation of goods, difficulties accessing labor sources and limitations to extension services. These impacts have affected a variety of agri-food chains including crop production, livestock production and fisheries and aquaculture. On the crop production industry, the most notable impact is the reduction in the demand for a variety of agricultural products, mainly fresh vegetables, due to the closure of restaurants and hotels. On the livestock production industry, and in particular for the poultry sector, the closure of mass consumption points affected the income of poultry producers. Along each value chain, these impacts affect, in particular, small farmers who have limited capacity to cope with crises[1]¹. The Bolu province has experienced these and other similar challenges with the occurrence of the COVID-19 pandemic.

?

[1] <https://www.tr.undp.org/content/turkey/en/home/library/poverty/covid-19-impact-assessment.html>

2. Thank you for the comment. We now include a justification for the selection of Bolu province as the project site on section 1a Project description/systems description. Please refer to pages 9 and 10 of the attached PIF document (documentation) and the corresponding sections in the GEF Portal.

3. Thank you for the comment. We will elaborate further during PPG Phase.

August 18, 2021:

1. Point taken. Please refer to the Project description ? Systems Description Section, where we added additional information about the environmental and socio-economic context.
 2. 2. At the moment the requested information is not available at the provincial level for Bolu. We will look at it during the PPG Stage.
 3. 3. Point taken. Please refer to the Project description ? Systems Description Section, where we added additional information about economic drivers leading to environmental degradation.
 4. 4. The Project description ? System description section has been updated to include a climate baseline including climate scenarios and projections.
 5. Please refer to new information added about COVID-19 and opportunities to mitigate impacts and contribution to green recovery on the alternative scenario section.
- 2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/16/2021:

Yes

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

8/31/2021:

Cleared.

6/16/2021:

Thank you for the details provided on the project components. Please see comments below for consideration.

-Theory of change- please clarify the concepts used for the lack of 'climate smart agriculture' mentioned as a drivers of environmental degradation in the TOC and for the 'agroecology' proposed as a response to solve the problem.

-As indicated under above, please integrate how the project will be working to contribute to LDN in Turkey.

-Component 1- Is training of trainers program being considered to ensure continuity after the project has ended

-Component 2- Output 2.1.2- can you indicate which value chains are being considered?

-Please indicate how the project can assist with green recovery in Turkey. Please refer to the COVID guidance provided by the GEF.

Agency Response

August 18, 2021:

1. The theory of change is aligned with the barriers section. To address this comment, please refer to the updated information on Barrier #3 Minimal experience among key agriculture stakeholders in developing and implementing improved cropland management and climate smart agriculture practices on the ground.

Additionally, the first paragraph of the theory of change has been revised to explain the 'agroecology' concept and how it relates to the project intervention.

2. Many thanks for the comment. We have revised the results framework and the alternative scenario sections to explain better the alignment with LDN focal area. Please see the corresponding changes in the attached PIF and GEF portal

3. Training of trainers will be introduced as part of the provincial training programmes. This has been clarified on the description of the activities on the alternative scenario section.

4. Specific Value Chains will be identified during consultations

5. The project will promote environmentally friendly agro-ecosystem management practices in line with the country's green development agenda and national priorities. We have updated the alternative scenario section to describe these opportunities.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/16/2021:

Yes the project is aligned with the the LD focal area strategy.

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

8/31/2021:

Cleared

6/16/2021:

-Considering the limited resources requested from the GEF compared to the resources the Ministry can mobilize in cash on the same issue, please explain further why GEF support is needed to implement the project and its added value.

Agency Response

August 18, 2021:

Point taken. We have reduced the amount of proposed activities for greater consistency with the new version of the project objective and results framework. Additionally, we have complemented the incremental reasoning section to explain the intended used of the GEF resources. Although the amount of resources requested to the GEF is relatively small, it is considered by the government of Turkey significant for its catalytic role.

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

8/26/2021:

Cleared.

6/16/2021:

Yes.

Given the selection of '1' for the Adaptation RIO marker, please include the specific adaptation benefits in this section.

Agency Response

August 18, 2021:

Climate Change Adaptation is at the Heart of the proposed agroecology strategy. We have now elaborated on the Global Environmental Benefits section to explain further the link between the agroecology approach and Climate Change Adaptation. This link is extensively explained in the FAO publication, that has now been cited on the PIF:

?The Potential of Agroecology to Build Climate-Resilient Livelihoods and Food Systems? available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/cb0438en/CB0438EN.pdf>

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

8/26/2021:

Thank you for the information provided.

At PPG please provide additional information within the project document that focuses on 'how' sustainability and scale up will be facilitated. Specifically:

- Mechanisms (such as incentives, access to finance, knowledge sharing etc.) that will facilitate continued use of the agroecological approach by producers and scale to other areas within Turkey.

6/16/2021:

Yes there is potential. Please provide additional information on how the project can facilitate sustainability and scaling up.

-Please indicate the mechanisms that will be put in place to ensure that the activities at the national level i) such as continued implementation of the new agro- ecosystem strategy and ii) at the field level with continued support to farmers to ensure the SLM practices are maintained. What incentive mechanism will exist after the project so that

the producers continue to adopt agroecology practices. Significant components of the project are focused on planning and training. Is this sufficient to introduce a sustainable change of behavior from the producers and along the value chain?

-Please also indicate how the project would facilitate scale up -noting that there are aspects such as finance and knowledge among others that influence scaling.

Agency Response

September 24, 2021

Thank you for the comment. We will elaborate further on the requested information during PPG Phase.

August 18, 2021:

1 & 2. The strategy will be developed in consultation with the relevant stakeholders and in agreement with the government offices. Thus the provisions will be in line with the national strategies and priorities. These are expected to be taken into account in the subsequent development plans to guarantee the sustainability of the benefits from the project. Communication with the relevant stakeholders will be an essential part of the project activities. In this manner, the active participation of the government will be key to upscale to good practices that result from the implementation of the project. This has now been clarified on the sustainability section of the PIF.

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

6/16/2021:

Yes

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

10/4/2021:

Cleared.

8/31/2021:

Thank you for the information provided.

-Please provide additional details on the specific stakeholders (names of organizations etc.) that were consulted during project identification how they were consulted.

6/16/2021:

Not fully.

Please indicate the categories of stakeholders who were consulted during project identification and please include the proposed plans for future engagement of stakeholders.

Agency Response

September 24, 2021

Thank you for the comment. Well noted. We have now added the information on the Stakeholders section of the PIF and GEF portal. We divide the section in two parts explaining the names of the stakeholders that participated during project identification and the type of stakeholders that will participate on further consultations during project preparation.

August 18, 2021:

Thank you for the comment. We have revised the stakeholders section to include the categories of the stakeholders and the proposed roles for future engagement.

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

6/16/2021:

Yes. At PPG stage please include a gender action plan.

Agency Response

August 18, 2021:

Point taken. We will prepare a gender action plan during PPG stage.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

8/31/2021:

Cleared

6/16/2021:

-Please elaborate further on the profile of the private sector stakeholders involved in the targeted value chains, beyond the small farmers. Are there any plans to engage the finance sector to assist with access to credit for farmers to continue to apply SLM practices?

Agency Response

August 18, 2021:

Please refer to the Private Sector Section of the PIF where additional information about private sector stakeholders has been added.

Additional opportunities for engaging the finance sector will be further explored during PPG.

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

10/4/2021:

Cleared.

8/26/2021:

-Related to the comment above on current COVID impact, please indicate the specific risks to the project that could arise due to COVID.

6/16/2021:

Not fully.

-We note that a climate risk profile has been prepared. Please include some of the information from this document in the risk table- outlining the risks related to climate change and potential mitigation measures.

Agency Response

September 24, 2021

Thank you for the comment. We have completed the information on the Risk section of the PIF in the attached document and GEF portal with further information. We now include:

"As explained in the systems description above, the COVID-19 pandemic has affected agricultural production significantly. The main risks associated to the pandemic are:

Limited access to inputs and markets.

Difficulties in transportation of goods

Difficulties accessing labor sources

Limitations to extension services

Reduction in the demand for agricultural products to to closures.

To mitigate the above mentioned risks, during project preparation, the evolution of the pandemic will be closely monitored to allow a project design resilient to the impacts of this and other similar events. The project will consider the evolution of the pandemic in the design of all its activities. And would take into account risk mitigation measures to address mobility limitations, market restrictions and enhance demand for the agricultural production resulting from the project strategy.

If new variants of COVID-19 prevail, there may be possibility that these risks persist, and that travels, and collective activities suffer from restrictions. In such cases, risks will be mitigated by avoiding as much as possible face-to-face meetings. When necessary, face-to-face meetings and consultations will be held taking into account of all biosecurity measures in line with national and FAOs standards and regulations. Furthermore, more effective use of digital tools will be explored in delivery of trainings and other services. "

August 18, 2021:

Point taken. We have updated the project description section with a climate baseline and we have completed the risk table to consider climate risks.

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

6/16/2021:

Yes.

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
6/16/2021:

Yes.

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
6/16/2021:

Yes

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
6/16/2021:

Yes

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
6/16/2021:

Yes.

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
10/4/2021:

The PIF and PPG request are technically cleared and recommended for approval.

8/31/2021:

Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

6/21/2021:

Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

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
First Review	6/21/2021	8/19/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/31/2021	9/24/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/4/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval