

# Strengthening the capacity of the Republic of Türkiye to comply with the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) for measurement, reporting, and verification (MRV) of climate change actions based on Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC).

Review CEO Approval and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11319

**Countries**

Türkiye

**Project Name**

Strengthening the capacity of the Republic of Türkiye to comply with the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) for measurement, reporting, and verification (MRV) of climate change actions based on Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC).

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

7/30/2024

**Review completed by PM**

11/6/2024

**Program Manager**

Esteban Bermudez Forn

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

**PIF**  
**CEO**

**Part I - General Project Information****1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?****Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

10/27/2024 EBF & WHF: Cleared, in line with the new Letter of Endorsement (LOE), the project will be executed by the CSO Resource, Environment and Climate Association (REC). Cleared.

9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: The Project Information Table is correctly filled. We take note of the request from the government of Türkiye on 7/19/2024 to delegate execution from the Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change (Directorate of Climate Change, DoCC) to FAO. In response, on 8/27/2024, the GEF Sec recommended that the country and the Agency consider a partner other than FAO to execute the project. If there are changes to the executing partner (currently

DoCC), please ensure that you inform them and make the necessary updates in the CEO Approval document.

## Agency Response

### **Agency response - 25 October 2024:**

The Execution Agency will be an NGO- REC. The new Endorsement Letter is attached.

**b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?**

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/27/2024 EBF & WHF:

1. The Rio Marker for Adaptation has been changed to Principal Objective 1. Cleared.

9/9/2024 EBF & WHF:

1. While the Rio Markers section is correctly filled out as Principal Objective 2 for Climate Change Mitigation, kindly edit its Climate Change Adaptation Rio Marker to Principal Objective 1, instead of 2, as it currently stands. This is the correct way to fill out the Rio Markers for all CBIT projects. Please amend accordingly.

## Agency Response

### **Agency response - 25 October 2024:**

1. Thank you for the comment. The Climate Change Adaptation Rio Marker has been changed to 1, Significant Objective.

#### **2. Project Summary.**

**a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?**

**b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?**

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/27/2024 EBF & WHF:

1. The M&E cost has been reduced from \$185k (10.4%) to \$101k (5.7%). Cleared.

9/9/2024 EBF & WHF:

1. The M&E cost is high (\$185,000.00), representing 10.4% of the total GEF Financing (\$1,772,910.00): GEF guidelines recommends the average cost of 5% for projects whose budget is up to USD 5 million. Please review and amend.

#### Agency Response

##### **Agency response - 25 October 2024:**

1. The M&E budget is decreased to \$100,950 (5%), as recommended.

#### **3. Project Description Overview**

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: Cleared.

#### Agency Response

#### **4. Project Outline**

##### **A. Project Rationale**

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/27/2024 EBF & WHF:

1. Cleared.

9/9/2024 EBF & WHF:

1. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan names a number of NGOs to be consulted at the beginning of implementation. It is unclear whether any of these were consulted during project design or what their specific roles and responsibilities are expected to be in relation to project components and outputs. Please provide further detail if possible.

## Agency Response

**Agency response - 25 October 2024:**

1. The Stakeholders' expected roles and how they will be engaged are specified under each of the project components. Information on the consultations that are so far done has been added to the stakeholder consultation plan document.

### **5 B. Project Description**

**5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?**

**b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**

**c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?**

**e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?**

**f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?**

**g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?**

**h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?**

**i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?**

**j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

**k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?**

**l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/27/2024 EBF & WHF:

**General comments:**

1. Cleared.
2. Cleared

**Specific comments:**

1. Cleared
2. Cleared
3. Cleared
4. Cleared
5. Cleared
6. Cleared
7. Cleared
8. Cleared
9. Cleared
10. Cleared
11. Cleared

9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: Please address the following comments:

**General comments:**

1. Please include in the GEF Portal directly and as applicable, information from relevant sections from the Outcomes, Outputs, and activities that this CBIT project aims to cover. The current description of this section in the Portal only makes general references at the Component level. This section will benefit from providing details such as stakeholders involved, sectors covered, type of intervention (i.e.: capacity-building schemes, creation or enhancement of virtual platforms, institutional arrangements to be developed, etc.) up to the activity level, if possible. You can copy and paste relevant sections from Annex E of the Agency Project Document into the GEF Portal and include the relevant details requested under the Specific Comments section below. Please amend accordingly.
2. Please ensure that elements of the Gender Action Plan are linked to the Project components and outputs.

**Specific comments:**

1. Considering the limited funding and based on national priorities, please cite the specific relevant sectors/categories for which methodologies and indicators for tracking NDC and LT-LEDS will be developed as part of Output 1.1.3. The output currently mentions that there will be a particular focus on adaptation, but at this point in the formulation process, the

focus shall be narrowed down. Kindly also briefly cite relevant institutions involved in this output.

2. For Output 1.1.4, the National Transparency Task Force for coordinating MRV and BTR processes mentions that it will be either 'new or existing'. At the CEO Approval Document stage, the project team should decide whether to make use of an existing task force or create a new one for these purposes. Please indicate if the team will use a new or existing institutional arrangement for its creation and the institutions involved and amend the output accordingly.
3. Output 1.1.4 also mentions that various BTR areas will be involved, with a focus on the energy sector. Considering limited funding, kindly specify the BTR areas to be prioritized, considering the country's current gaps and needs, and amend accordingly.
4. For Output 1.2.1, please provide more concise examples of the 'ETF technical language' cited that will be translated into politically relevant terms. Please also include the type of government official (technical or political) as well as the institutions involved that will receive such training and how the project team expects to provide sustainability over time for this Output, considering government staff turnover and changes in public administration. Please ensure that the topics or scope are in addition to other training-related outputs to government officials already taking place as part of this CBIT project. Kindly clarify and amend accordingly.
5. For Output 1.2.2, please identify some of the potential institutions to be involved in the trainings related to climate finance. Please incorporate accordingly.
6. For Output 1.2.3, considering limited funding, aiming to provide a training series to build capacities on GHG inventory, NDC tracking, and Adaptation seems challenging. Kindly consider providing a more detailed scope of work, also considering that the team will be using specific technical training materials such as FAO's Tracking Adaptation in Agricultural Sectors: Climate Change Adaptation Indicators. Please also indicate the institutions that will benefit from this Output. Please revise and amend accordingly.
7. For Output 1.2.4, and also considering limited funding, please indicate if there will be a particular sectorial focus on the GHG mitigation scenario assessment for NDC and LT-LEDS and the institutions involved. Please clarify and amend accordingly.
8. For Output 1.3.1 and adding relevant cross-references to the baseline section, please indicate in this section all existing IT systems and/or modules used for UNFCCC reporting and provide some examples of the potential modules to be developed with this CBIT project. If applicable, kindly elaborate and provide more information in this section.
9. For Outputs 1.3.2 and 1.3.3. Please identify the potential institutions involved in this capacity-building scheme and how it will differentiate from the training of Output 1.2.3, which will also focus on BTR reporting elements of NDC tracking and adaptation. Please clarify and update for both outputs, if applicable.
10. For Output 1.3.4, kindly identify the potential institutions to be involved and provide a concise description on how it is additional to Output 1.2.2, which will focus on capacity-building for government officials on climate finance. Please clarify and update, if applicable.
11. For activities within the M&E component, please indicate if there will be any potential interactions with the Eurasia network of the CBIT-GSP and with the CBIT Forest 2 or the CBIT AFOLU+ global project implemented by FAO.

## Agency Response

**Agency response - 25 October 2024:**

### **General Comments:**

1. Relevant text from the Annex E on Outcomes, Outputs and activities is added to the Project Description section on the Portal.
2. Elements of the Gender Action Plan are linked to the Project components and outputs.

### **Specific Comments:**

1. The Output 1.1.3 has been updated with specific sectors (as mentioned in Paragraph 47), and the list of relevant stakeholders with whom the methodologies and indicators will be discussed is included in Paragraph 48.
2. It is clarified that the project will create a new National Transparency Task Force to coordinate transparency activities among agencies under Output 1.1.4 (please refer to Paragraph 50).
3. The Output 1.1.4 has been revised by specifying BTR areas that will be focused on to clarify relevant roles (please see Paragraph 50).
4. The requested clarifications have been incorporated into Output 1.1.4: the list for ETF technical language for translation is now included (Paragraph 55); the type (political level) of government officials has been identified (Paragraph 55), and the measures to ensure sustainability of the action has been detailed (Paragraph 56).
5. For Output 1.2.2, key potential institutions to be involved in the trainings related to climate finance have been specified in Paragraph 63.
6. The section is now revised with prioritized training scope; the list of institutions benefitting from this Output is incorporated into the Output 1.2.3 (Refer to Paragraph 64).



7. Specific focus will be set on energy sector as main GHG emitter in the country and AFOLU sector (forestry) as sink. The institutions that are intended to participate in these activities have been included accordingly (Paragraph 65).

8. The Output 1.3.1 has been elaborated to include further information on the stakeholders to be involved, the existing IT system and and planned modules ( please refer to Paragraph 66).

9. The institutions to be involved in capacity building activities and the main focus and scope of trainings have been clearly identified for Output 1.3.2 (Paragraph 67) and Output 1.3.3 (Paragraph 68). The difference with Output 1.2.3. trainings is also clarified in these paragraphs.

10. Paragraph 69 now provides a more detailed description of the capacity building activity by explaining the difference between the scopes of Output 1.2.2 and Output 1.3.4, as well as comprising the list of potential institutions. Output 1.3.4. aims to train stakeholders to assess and report the international and bilateral support needed to bridge the financial gaps identified in Türkiye's NDC and LT-LEDS. This will involve building expertise in tracking both domestic and external financial resources, aligning them with national climate goals.

11. The comment has been addressed in Paragraph 88 that the close cooperation with the Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency ? Global Support Programme (CBIT-GSP) and FAO led Global AFOLU CBIT projects will be ensured, leading not only for the project to benefit from the opportunities and resources that are provided by the two global projects, which may be beneficial for reaching effective results under the Türkiye CBIT project's goals; but also to make sure that the outputs such as knowledge products and lessons learned that are derived from the CBIT project are systematized and shared globally for the benefit of all related experts.

As a general comment; we would also like to note that Output 1.2.2 and 1.2.3 will focus on institutions directly responsible for BTR reporting, such as the Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change (MoEUCC), the Directorate of Climate Change (DOCC), and other key governmental bodies. These institutions are central to ensuring compliance with UNFCCC reporting standards. And on the other hand, Outputs 1.3.2, 1.3.3 and 1.3.4 will expand capacity-building to other supporting institutions and stakeholders such as data providers, academia (research), NGOs (community needs), and the private sector, which all contribute valuable data, research, and

sectoral input into the BTR process. This broader focus ensures that the reporting process benefits from diverse perspectives and accurate, sector-specific information.

## **5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project**

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/29/2024 EBF & WHF:

- 4. Cleared

10/27/2024 EBF & WHF:

- 1. Cleared
- 2. Cleared
- 3. Cleared
- 4. We note that the project's executing partner has been modified following the GEF Sec's advice. Please update Figure 5 since it still reflects the previous execution arrangements.



4. Following our comment at the beginning of this review sheet, on 8/27/2024, the GEF Sec recommended that the country and the Agency consider a partner other than FAO to execute the project. Please update this section as appropriate.

## Agency Response

### Agency response - 29 October 2024:

4. The figure is updated. It seems the updated figure was not recorded on the portal in our previous submission. Sorry for the oversight.

### Agency response - 25 October 2024:

1. The NPD will be from Government and will not be financed from Project. This is clarified in the Paragraph 95.
2. A tentative list has been added to the relevant section - Paragraph 97. The Steering Committee members will be finalized during the Inception Meeting.
3. The information on the source of funds is included for each of the projects.
4. The REC is included as the Executing Agency in the section on Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.

#### 5.3 Core indicators

**a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?**

**b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?**

**Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: Cleared. The project team expects 506 people to benefit from this CBIT project (248 male and 258 female), a significant increase of beneficiaries from the PIF stage.

## Agency Response

### Agency response - 25 October 2024:

The project team expects 506 people to benefit from this CBIT project (248 male and 258 female), reflecting a significant increase in beneficiaries from the PIF stage. This updated figure was determined during the PPG phase through extensive stakeholder consultations, where it became evident that there is substantial interest from various institutions and sectors in participating in the project's activities. Stakeholders expressed a strong demand for capacity-building, particularly around

the areas of enhancing transparency, tracking NDC progress, and implementing the Enhanced Transparency Framework requirements. This overwhelming interest and engagement have led to an increase in the projected number of beneficiaries compared to the initial estimates.

#### **5.4 Risks**

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: Cleared.

Provisions of all risks and Overall Risk Rating has been provided and marked as Low in each of them.

#### **Agency Response**

**5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

#### **Agency Response**

#### **6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities**

**6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: Cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

**6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: Cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

**6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

## Agency Response

### **7 D. Policy Requirements**

#### **7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: Cleared.

## Agency Response

#### **7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/27/2024 EBF & WHF:

The Gender Action Plan has been uploaded to the documents section of the project. Cleared.

1. Targets have been updated. Cleared.
2. Cleared.

9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: Although it is part of the Agency Project Document, please upload the Gender Action Plan directly in the GEF Portal and revert accordingly.

In addition, please address the following comments:

1. Please clarify how the current Gender Action Plan with six differentiated Actions includes targets of around 30-40% participation of women, while the Core Indicator 11 expects 51% of participation of women as beneficiaries of the project. Please revise and clarify accordingly.
2. When the Gender Action Plan is uploaded to the Portal, please ensure that it includes a target, monitoring and evaluation, and timeline as part of Action 6. Kindly revert accordingly.

## Agency Response

### **Agency response - 25 October 2024:**

The Gender Action Plan is uploaded separately.

1. The percentage of female participants has been revised to 51% for all actions of the Gender Action Plan.

2. Additional information for Action 6 has been included. Apologies for the omission.

**7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/27/2024 EBF & WHF: The Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been uploaded to the documents section of the project. Cleared.

9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: Although it is part of the Agency Project Document, kindly upload the Stakeholder Engagement Plan directly in the Portal.

Agency Response

**Agency response - 25 October 2024:**

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan is uploaded separately.

**7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: Cleared.

Agency Response

**8 Annexes**

**Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response  
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response  
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response  
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: Cleared.

Agency Response  
Agency response - 29 October 2024:

This comment was relevant for and a continuation of the previous comments for the below section (8.2 Project Preparation Grant - PPG); so our response is provided in the below section response box.

**8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)**

**a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
10/29/2024 EBF & WHF:

1. Cleared. An explanation of the unspent PPG resources is provided in the agency project document. It is copied below as a reference.
2. Cleared.



Status of Utilization of **Project preparation Grant** at ~~Prodoc~~ submission stage:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Hiring of Project Design Specialist	34,800	16,212	
Hiring of ETF Specialist		11,798	
Capacity Assessment Service	0	0	
Inception Workshop (Feb 2024)	10,900	4,341	
General Operating Expenses	4,300	324	
<b>Total</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>32,675</b>	

The uncommitted amount of USD 9,825 will be used to support the preparation activities during the inception period of the project; including the support that may be needed to translate the project documents, additional consultations or work needed for the preparation of the Operating Partnership Arrangements with the Executing Partner and the support for the stakeholder consultations in the lead up to the start of project activities. The "General Operating Expenses" reported above are small scale items that were used and distributed to the participants during the inception workshop, such as Visible Materials (notebooks, pens, etc.). The "ETF specialist" was a consultant who has conducted the assessment of the national structure and place for the ETF reporting, including the identification of capacities, gaps and needs of the national counterparts. "Capacity Assessment Service" is the expense related to the delivery of HACT Assessment of potential executing partners for the project by the independent Auditing [firm](#); which is a requirement for the Operating Partnership Agreement to be able to include the intended executing partner during the project implementation, as well as providing the basis for the risk mitigation plan to ensure compliance of the Executing Partner to the minimum fiduciary standards.

10/27/2024 EBF & WHF:

1. We couldn't find the explanation you are referring to in the agency project document. Please include the additional information you provided in each Annex D row in the portal form.
2. "General operating expenses" and "Capacity Assessment Service" are quite broad categories. Kindly be more specific and ensure all costs are within the scope of the PPG.

# ANNEX D: STATUS OF UTILIZATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)

Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GET/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		A C
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	
Hiring of Project Design Specialist/	26,400.00	16,212.00	0.
Hiring of ETF Specialist	8,400.00	11,798.00	0.
Capacity Assessment Service	0.00	0.00	7,
Inception Workshop (Feb 2024)	10,900.00	4,341.00	
General Operating Expenses	4,300.00	324.00	
Total	50,000.00	32,675.00	7,

9/9/2024 EBF & WHF:

1. According to Annex D, \$22,671 out of \$50,000 have been committed. Please clarify by including a short paragraph after the table in Annex D what will happen with the unspent funds.

As part of this text, please explain what "General Operating Expenses" covers, what the "ETF Specialist" is, and what does the "Capacity Assessment Service" entails.

## ANNEX D: STATUS OF UTILIZATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)

Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GET/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
Hiring of Project Design Specialist/	26,400.00	0.00	15,947.00
Hiring of ETF Specialist	8,400.00	8,463.00	2,974.00
Capacity Assessment Service	0.00	0.00	3,750.00
Inception Workshop (Feb 2024)	10,900.00	4,341.00	
Visible Materials (notebooks, pens, roll-ups)	0.00	296.00	
General Operating Expenses	4,300.00	28.00	
Total	50,000.00	13,128.00	22,671.00

### Agency Response











**Agency response - 29 October 2024:**

We are providing the response to the comment on the information that was asked to be provided on the Secretariat's first review comments. The second round of comments on the PPG fund utilization, have been (probably mistakenly) entered into the box above, under "Focal Area Set-aside" subtitle.

Explanation for the "ETF Specialist", "Capacity Assessment Service" and "General Operating Expenses" have been entered on the Annex D, "Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant" section of the portal form.

## ANNEX D: STATUS OF UTILIZATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG).

Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GET/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)			
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed	
Project Design Specialist	26,400.00	16,212.00	0.00	 
ETF Specialist (expert to conduct assessment of the national structures in place for ETF reporting, including the identification of capacities, gaps and needs of the national counterparts)	8,400.00	11,798.00	0.00	 
Auditing company services to deliver Capacity Assessment of the intended Executing partners of the project	0.00	0.00	7,500.00	 
Inception Workshop (Feb 2024)	10,900.00	4,341.00		 
General Operating Expenses [small scale items that were used and distributed to the participants during the inception workshop, such as Visible Materials (notebooks, pens, roll-ups)]	4,300.00	324.00		 
Total	50,000.00	32,675.00	7,500.00	

[+ Add New](#)

The explanation that is included on the plans for the remaining uncommitted amount of the PPG fund, that was included on the Agency Project Document (on Page 36) is copied below, for your easier convenience and reference:

The uncommitted amount of USD 9,825 will be used to support the preparation activities during the inception period of the project; including the support that may be needed to translate the project document, any additional consultations or work needed for the preparation of the Operating Partnership Arrangements with the Executing Partner and the support for the stakeholder consultations in the lead up to the start of the project activities. The "General Operating Expenses" reported above are small scale items that were used and distributed to the participants during the inception workshop, such as Visible Materials (notebooks, pens, roll-ups). The "ETF specialist" was a consultant who has conducted the assessment of the national structures in place for the ETF reporting, including the identification of capacities, gaps and needs of the national counterparts. "Capacity Assessment Service" is the expense related to the delivery of HACT Assessment of potential executing partners for the project by the independent Auditing firm; which is a requirement for the Operating Partnership Agreement to be able to include the intended executing partner during the project implementation, as well as providing the basis for the risk mitigation plan to ensure compliance of the Executing Partner to the minimum fiduciary standards.

Agency response - 25 October 2024:

Amounts of the utilization of funds have been updated with the data on 25 October 2025. A paragraph is added under the PPG Funds utilization in the Agency Project Document to explain how the uncommitted amounts from the PPG funds will be used in order to support the preparation activities for the launch of the project. Explanations have also been added regarding the expenditures such as "General Operating Expenses", "ETF Specialist" and "Capacity Assessment Service".

### **8.3 Source of Funds**

**Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?**

**Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

**8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

**e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/27/2024 EBF & WHF:

1. Cleared
2. Cleared

EBF/WHC 8/1/2024:

1. The co-finance letter doesn't specify (1) the duration of each contribution to ensure they match with the duration of the CBIT project, nor (2) the type of co-financing that the \$1,011,267 will be (we understand from the portal form that it will be an in-kind contribution. Please specify (1) the duration of each contribution and their type of co-financing by submitting a new co-finance letter.
2. While addressing the previous comment, we noted a mismatch between the co-finance letter and the information reported in the portal form. The co-finance letter from FAO indicates a contribution of USD \$1,011,267, while the portal indicates a contribution of \$1,210,000. Please explain why these amounts differ or correct them in the revised co-finance letter to ensure they match.

### **Agency Response**

**Agency response - 25 October 2024:**

1. The co-finance letter is re-signed, specifying the duration (timeframe) of the source of contribution and the type of the co-financing expense.

2. The FAO contribution is corrected on the co-finance letter as USD 1,210,000.

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:**

**Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

10/27/2024 EBF & WHF: A new LOE was submitted on 10/22/2024 by Mr. Ahmet Ba?ci, OFP of T?rkiye, since 01/19/2024. Cleared.

9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: The LOE was attached during the PIF stage, and it was endorsed by the former OFP of T?rkiye, Mr. Ebubekir Gizligider. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

**b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

10/27/2024 EBF & WHF: Cleared.

9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: Cleared.

**Agency Response**

**c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

10/27/2024 EBF & WHF: Cleared.

9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: Cleared.

**Agency Response**

**Annex C: Project Results Framework**

**8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?**

**b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)**

**c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?**

**d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

**8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/27/2024 EBF & WHF:

1. Cleared

9/9/2024 EBF & WHF:

1. The GeoName IDs do not seem to be available under the format of the <https://www.geonames.org/> platform. Please update as appropriate.

#### Agency Response

**Agency response - 25 October 2024:**

1. The GeoName ID is corrected.

**Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?**

**b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?**

**c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/06/2024:

3. The project will be circulated to avoid cancellation. However, following O&P's comment, please review and update the terms of reference of the National Technical Coordinator once more to ensure this role has clear and concrete technical outputs. Once you have reviewed the terms of reference, please email them to the PM.

11/05/2024:

3. Cleared. The TORs of the NTC, located in the agency's project document, have been revised so this position focuses on technical aspects rather than managerial responsibilities.

11/04/2024:

1. Cleared. Budget table has been uploaded as a Word document.
2. Cleared. Format of the budget table has been simplified to a single responsible entity column.
3. The National Technical Coordinator (NTC) has both managerial and technical aspects. However, based on the terms of reference (TORs) it leans more towards a managerial role with a technical component. Kindly review the TORs to ensure they comply with GEF guidelines.

10/31/2024 [Comments from O&P Division]:

1. Please upload the budget table in Word format under Annex G of the Portal entry. Do not include the Excel inside the Word document because it is unreadable in the automate generated PDF document (which is the document that is circulated to Council and later web posted). We kindly suggest the agency to use the template provided in the [Guidelines on the Project Cycle](#). You can upload the excel version of the budget in the Documents section in Portal.



The screenshot shows a web interface for the Global Environment Facility (GEF). At the top left is the GEF logo with the text 'global environment facility'. Below this is a horizontal green line. The main section is titled 'ANNEX G: BUDGET TABLE' in bold. Below the title is a yellow box with the text 'Please upload the budget table here.' and a file upload icon. Below the icon is the filename 'GCP.TUR.11319.GFF\_Budget.Oct24\_fnl.x'. At the bottom of the yellow box is the text 'Please explain any aspects of the budget as needed here'.

2. Additionally, in the Word format of the budget table please remove the columns: (Unit, No. of units, Unit cost, Total, Year 1, Year 2, Year 3, TOTAL GEF). Also please merge the columns (REC, FAO managed) into a new column named 'Responsible Entity' and



display the name of the entity instead of the amount.

description	<del>Component 1</del>	<del>Component 2</del>	<del>Component 3</del>	<del>Component 4</del>	PMC	TOTAL GET	REC	FAO Manager	<del>Yes</del>	<del>Yes</del>	<del>Yes</del>	<del>TOTAL GET</del>
-------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	-----	-----------	-----	-------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------------

3. A "National Technical Coordinator" is being charged across components. According to the TOR provided in the ProDoc, the responsibilities described reflect those of managerial nature and not of technical outputs. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's management and execution must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Please review and address.

National consultants											
National Technical	months	36	2,000	72,000	19,770	19,770	19,770			475,000	775,000

10/29/2024 EBF & WHF:

4. The \$27,279 for "IT equipment/Software" are meant for IT infrastructure to deliver Component 1. Cleared.

10/27/2024 EBF & WHF:

1. The responsible entities are in line with the new LOE. Cleared.
2. Cleared.
3. Cleared. The agency project document contains the TORs for the National Technical Coordinator (NTC) and the National M&E and KM Officer. If our understanding is correct, the NTC has a broader leadership role and oversight responsibility, while the M&E and KM Officer provides technical and methodological support focused on tracking and documenting project progress.
4. We take note of your explanation. However, per GEF guidelines, please increase the PMC or co-financing contribution to finance "IT equipment/software." Currently, it is only financed by Component 1 of the project. If it is equipment relevant to Component 1, please elaborate so we can assess whether it can be financed by this component instead of PMC.

9/9/2024 EBF & WHF:

1. Following our comment at the beginning of this review sheet, on 8/27/2024, the GEF Sec recommended that the country and the Agency consider a partner other than FAO to execute the project. Please update the budget as appropriate. This includes the entity in charge of managing the budget -- right now, FAO is proposed to manage the entire project budget.

2. Please add a column with the name of the agency responsible of executing each activity in the budget table. We kindly suggest the agency to use the template provided in the [Guidelines on the Project Cycle](#).
3. A National Technical Coordinator and a National M&E and KM Officer have been charged across components and the PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution must be covered by the GEF and the co-financing portions allocated to PMC. When the situation merits (i.e., not enough co-financing funds), the project's staff could be charged to the project's components with clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective component (paragraph 4 ? page 42 of the Guidelines). Looking at the terms of references of these positions, they both seem like managerial positions. Please review and provide clarifications to guarantee that these positions have specific tangible outputs for each technical component they are being charged, in conjunction with the PMC.
4. ?IT equipment/Software? and ?Office furniture and IT accessories? must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Please amend.

6000 Expendable procurement								
IT equipment/Software	lumpsum	1	27,279	27,279	27,279		-	-
Communication and awareness raising materials	lumpsum	1	89,788	89,788	30,128	34,750	24,910	-
Office furniture and IT accessories	lumpsum	1	10,000	10,000	10,000			-
6000 Sub-total expendable procurement				127,067	67,407	34,750	24,910	-
6100 Non-expendable procurement								
Communication equipment (cameras, palmtops, etc.)	lumpsum	1	10,000	10,000		10,000		
Printers & Photocopier	lumpsum	1	10,000	10,000				

## Agency Response

### Agency response - 5 November 2024:

3. The TOR for the National Technical Coordinator (NTC) has been revised to clarify and highlight the technical contributions expected from the position. The latest version of the Agency Project Document, with the updated TOR and the budget also in the GEF requested format in an excel file attached on the document has been uploaded on the Roadmap section as a "public" document.

### Agency response - 4 November 2024:

1. The budget table in word format has been uploaded under Annex G of the Portal entry.
2. The version of the budget included in the Annex G of the portal has been simplified to correspond to the GEF format; through removing the columns that had info on "unit, no. of units, unit costs, Total, Year(s) 1, 2, 3 and Total GEF financing). The columns that had allocations for the two entities (REC and FAO) are also merged in a column titled "Responsible Entity" and the

name of the entity responsible for each of the expense lines have been added in each line under this column.

3. "National Technical Coordinator" is considered to lead the technical work of the project, while only partially supporting the managerial work. The National Technical Coordinator will be expected to provide technical leadership for the implementation of project output and activities, ensuring technical soundness of the implementation; leading and supervising the preparation of various technical outputs, such as the knowledge products, reports and case studies; providing technical support and supervision to the other consultants; assessing their outputs and materials produced; providing technical guidance and support to project meeting and workshops and providing technical support to the assessment of MRV; as mentioned in the TOR. The distribution of the cost for the position between the project outputs and the PMC is arranged according to the weight of the technical work the person is expected to deliver.

#### **Agency response - 29 October 2024:**

4. Component 1 aims to create a strong information management system that meets the reporting needs of the Biennial Transparency Report and tracks progress in key areas like greenhouse gas inventories, climate adaptation, climate finance, and ILT-LEDS strategies. This requires a reliable IT infrastructure for secure data storage, management, and easy access, which is essential for accurately archiving climate data from various sources.

The budget for hardware and software will help establish this information system, ensuring effective data collection, storage, verification, and reporting. This funding specifically supports the tasks outlined in Activity 1.3.1, focusing on data collection and archiving, rather than general project management. This approach will ensure that the system is efficient, secure, and able to meet the required standards for transparency and accuracy in climate reporting.

The budget will be used to:

- Support Data Archiving and Retrieval, allowing stakeholders to access accurate and up-to-date information. This includes a secure database for large datasets and tools to integrate data from various national and sub-national sources.
- Set Up Secure Storage by investing in a dedicated server or cloud infrastructure to securely store data for stakeholders involved in BTR reporting, with backup systems to prevent data loss.
- Purchase High-Performance Computers that can handle data-intensive tasks like validation, archiving, and reporting, specifically for data management under Activity 1.3.1.
- Buy software licenses for security and access management to protect the information management system with features like user authentication, encryption, and access control.

Suggested Budget Breakdown:

Data Management Software 10,000

Server or Cloud Infrastructure 8,000

Computers for Data Processing 6,000

Security and Access Management Licenses 3,279  
Total 27,279

This explanation and further elaboration (and the estimated cost breakdown) is also added on the Agency Project Document, under the description of the Output 1.3.1 in Annex E.

**Agency response - 25 October 2024:**

1. and 2. The Budget is updated with the identified executing partner.
3. Please note that the bulk of the work of the National Technical Coordinator is to contribute to the technical outputs, with only limited work for managerial functions. The distribution of the cost for the position between the project outputs and the PMC is arranged according to the weight of the technical work the person is expected to deliver. The cost of the M&E and KM officer is recategorized to exclusively be under the PMC allocation.
4. The small items that can be categorized under office furniture and IT accessories are recategorized together with printer and photocopier; under the PMC allocation. The IT equipment and the software on the other hand are not for the coordination and management work/support for the project; but to support the information management and virtual platforms that coordinate the data collection, verification and accessibility that the project components are trying to establish. It should also be noted that the Ministry will be providing equipment, furniture, accessories and access to its systems for the project's work as an in-kind contribution for the personnel working to deliver the project's outcomes. The costs included in the project budget are partial contribution for the needs of the project's delivery.

**Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.**

**b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.**

**c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

**Agency Response**

**Additional Annexes**

**9. GEFSEC DECISION**

**9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the project recommended for approval**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/04/2024 EBF & WHF: The PM recommends further processing of this project. The outstanding comments from the O&P Division of the GEF Sec have been addressed.

11/04/2024 EBF & WHF: Please address the comment related to the National Technical Coordinator (NTC) in the budget table section. Kindly upload the latest and clean version of the agency project document as "public" for its eventual circulation.

10/31/2024 EBF & WHF: Please address the comments from the O&P Division of the GEF related to the budget table. Kindly upload the latest and clean version of the agency project document as "public" for its eventual circulation.

10/27/2024 EBF & WHF: Please address the comments on institutional arrangements (Figure 6), PPG (Annex D), and the project budget table. Kindly remove all highlights from the portal form and the agency project document. Also, please upload the latest and clean version of the agency project document as "public" for its eventual circulation.

9/9/2024 EBF & WHF: Please address the comments in the review sheet and highlight any changes in the portal form and the agency's project document **in yellow** for ease of review.

## 9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

### 9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>	<b>9/9/2024</b>	<b>10/25/2024</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/27/2024</b>	<b>10/29/2024</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/29/2024</b>	<b>11/4/2024</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/31/2024</b>	<b>11/5/2024</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/6/2024</b>	