

Integrated Natural Resource Management in Very Humid Climatic Regions of Eastern Black Sea Region in Turkey

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10987

Countries

Türkiye

Project Name

Integrated Natural Resource Management in Very Humid Climatic Regions of Eastern Black Sea Region in Turkey

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

7/14/2023

Review completed by PM

9/14/2023

Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple

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

9/14/2023:

Cleared.

9/12/2023:

Thank you. The comment on the taxonomoy remains outstanding. We note the appropriate key words have been selected in the project document, but not in the portal submission.

The responses provided are not clear, for example Annex G in the portal template is for NGI proejects only and there doesn't seem to be An Annex G in the prodoc.

8/9/2023:

Yes and LDN has been well incorporated to the project and will align with Turkey's overall framework and portfolio of GEF projects.

However please include keywords related to the LD focal area in the Taxonomy, such as land degradation neutrality, sustainable land management, INRM etc.

Agency Response

UNDP, 13 September 2023

Thank you for the comment. We revised the taxonomy section in the portal accordingly.

As for Annex G: please note that in our previous response we were referring to the Annex G of the CEO ER Word document only (not the Portal Annex G; UNDP ProDoc doesn't include Annex on taxonomy)

UNDP, 12 September 2023

Table A now includes specific focus on programs related to SLM and LDN as well as throughout the document (highlighted)

Refer Table A and entirety of Sections 3 and 4 (page 22-37), table 2 (page 37) and Annex G of GEF CEO ER

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

9/12/2023:

Cleared.

8/9/2023:

Yes, however with two comments below for consideration.

a) Indicator v) under Component 2 is not complete.

b) Component 3, Output 3.1 is quite broad and is more of an outcome. Please consider unpacking and include tangible outputs.

Agency Response

UNDP, 12 September 2023

(a) Indicator (v) of Component 2 is now complete. Refer Table B of GEF CEO ER

(b) Output 3.1 This is now accordingly revised to provide tangible outputs. Refer Table B and Output 3.1 on page 36 of GEF CEO ER

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

9/12/2023:

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/12/2023:

This is noted and cleared.

8/21/2023:

Field Coordinator is charged to project components. Per Guidelines, project staff must be changes to PMC (GEF and co-financing portion) ? the co-financing resources allocated to PMC are 1.1 million, and 2.5 million of co-financing are represented in grants. Please revise.

Agency Response

UNDP, 12 September 2023

Thank you for the comment. This was an omission on our part which is now rectified. Almost all the co-financing is either in-kind or for programs that are already committed for specific activities and hence is not available for supporting the FC position. Given the financial situation in the country, where significant amount of government resources are re-directed to post-earthquake re-construction and job creation, the government is not in a situation to allocate any additional funds for new staffing positions. As a consequence, we have adjusted the budget to include significant amount of funding for the FC from the PMC budget. The government and UNDP have agreed that given the small size of the project a full time finance and administrative officer may not be required. A part-time finance and administrative officer would support UNDP in provision of financial oversight to the project.

The Field Officer (FO) will be stationed in the field (in Rize province) and be fully responsible for all technical activities at the ground level in terms of mapping of the Kirechane micro-basin mapping, consultation with local communities in planning investments and INRM planning and implementation, demonstration activities, livelihood support actions and extension etc. However, there are other activities that need to be technically supported beyond the micro-catchment level to complement the work of the Field Officer, in particular to support the broader technical aspects related to coordination of the work of the technical coordination committee, support regulatory aspects related to INRM, risk assessment, ensure monitoring of gender, safeguards and stakeholder engagement and preparation of PIRs and supporting the annual and terminal monitoring of the project. These tasks are further elaborated in Annex 7 of UNDP Project Document. In this respect, 50% of the time of the FC will focus on technical aspects and 50% of the time on project management aspects and the costs are charged between PMC and technical component.

Refer Section IX (Total Budget and Work Plan) of UNDP Project Document for revised budget table and Annex 1. Annex 7 of UNDP Project Document now provides the updated TORs for the Field Coordinator that clearly spells out the technical aspects under the responsibility of the Field Coordinator

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

8/9/2023:

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

9/12/2023:

Cleared.

8/9/2023:

Yes, there are changes.

-We note SLM sub-indicator 4.3 has been removed, please clarify. We recommend that the GEBs under this indicator are reinserted given the intended interventions on SLM on agricultural lands and the investment from the LD focal area.

-Please describe the benefits to biodiversity associated with indicator 4.1

-I am unable to locate Annex H where the portal document indicates the section on CHnages to the PIF has been included.

Agency Response

UNDP, 12 September 2023

Thank you for the comment.

-Indicator 4.3 is now added and GEBs for CI 4.3 is provided. Refer Table F of GEF CEO ER (pages 5-6)

-GEBs provided for CI 4.3 . Refer Table F of GEFCEO ER (pages 5-6)

-Annex H is added to portal

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

8/9/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/9/2023:

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

8/9/2023:

Yes. The project description adequately describes the interventions and addresses all the queries raised at the PIF stage.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/9/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/9/2023:

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

8/9/2023:

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

8/9/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/9/2023:

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

8/9/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/9/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

8/9/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

8/9/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/9/2023:

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

8/9/2023:

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
9/12/2023:

Cleared.

8/21/2023:

Please provide a timeline for the implementation of key KM&L and communications activities. This info can be added to Table 7 that is provided in the KM section of project document.

Agency Response
UNDP, 12 September 2023

The timeline for implementation of key KM&L and communication activities is now provided. Refer Table 7 of GEF CEO ER

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
9/12/2023:

Yes

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/12/2023:

Cleared.

8/21/2023:

M&E budget (7.3%) is above the recommended threshold of 5% for projects up to 5 million ?
please revise.

Agency Response
UNDP, 12 September 2023

This is revised to 5% . Refer Table 9 of GEFCEO ER and Section IX (Total Budget and Work Plan) of UNDP Project Document

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
8/10/2023:

Yes

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/10/2023

Yes

Agency Response
Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/12/2023:

Cleared.

8/9/2023:

We note that there are targets mentioned in the results framework, which have not been included in the CI Table (example targets for sub-indicator 4.3). Please ensure the two sections of the submission align.

Agency Response
UNDP, 12 September 2023

Thank you for the comment. The CI table has been revised to align with the RFA. Refer Annex A and F and Table E of GEF CEO ER

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8/9/2023:

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

10/5/2023:

Cleared.

9/26/2023:

Please see follow up comments below.

Status of utilization of PPG: still amount spent + amount committed don't match the budgeted amount. The submission notes that the unspent balance is currently US\$12,594.06 as of September 5, 2023, but this amount may change at the time of operational closure? ? however, PPG funds have to be utilized by month 12 after CEO Approval, not by the end of

operational closure ? also, PPG funds can only be utilized in preparation activities ? therefore, at this juncture the Agency must know which preparation activities are missed, so they can be included in the table, and the funds included under ?amount committed? ? this has been the way all other PPG reports have been presented. Please amend.

9/14/2023:

Cleared.

9/12/2023:

Only partially addressed. Please provide budget line items/expenditures instead of activities in the PPG table. Example- consultants, travel etc.

8/21/2023:

Please provide details of the eligible expenditures (instead of outputs) as presented in Table 1 of Annex 1 in Guidelines. Also, revise the calculations so amount spent + amount committed equals the budgeted amount.

Agency Response

UNDP, 26 September 2023

Thank you for the comment. We have revised the PPG table as per instructions. Therefore, amount spent + commitments amount equals the budgeted amount now.

UNDP, 13 September 2023

We included budget line items/expenditures in the PPG table now, as per instructions.

UNDP, 12 September 2023

The figures in Annex C of GEF CEO ER are updated now.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/9/2023:

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

10/5/2023:

The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.

9/26/2023:

Please address the outstanding comments on the PPG table .

9/14/2023:

The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.

9/12/2023:

Please address the outstanding comments on the PPG table and the Taxonomy.

8/21/2023:

The project is not yet technically cleared. There are minor comments to be addressed.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/21/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/12/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/14/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/26/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/5/2023	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations