

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

Review PIF 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**

4/13/2022

**Review completed by PM**

6/15/2022

**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

6/16/2022:

The executing partner has been corrected. Cleared.

6/15/2022:

Executing Partner in Portal (?Nature Conservation Centre?) is different from the one in Letter of Endorsement (?General Directorate of Combating Desertification and Erosion of the Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change?) ? please either (i) obtain a new LoE / an email from the OFP (that needs to be appended to the documents? tab); or (ii) include in the Project Information *and* in Section 6 (Coordination) the Executing Partner endorsed by the OFP (this could change during the preparation phase).

1.

6/14/2022:

Cleared.

4/19/2022:

Please consider extending the project timeline to at least 3 years. Given the length of time typically needed for project start up, we anticipate more time will be needed.

Agency Response 4/19/2022 - Agency Response:

Thank you for the comment. The project timeline was increased to three years or 36 months.

**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

6/16/2022:

The Co-financing PMC contribution has been changed to \$1,060,000.00. This is acceptable at this stage and is cleared.

6/15/2022:

On the PMC Proportionality: there is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 10%, for a co-financing of \$10,066,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,066,000 instead of \$1,000,000, which is 9.3%. As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion. A more definitive estimation of PMC can be presented and adjusted at CEO Approval stage.

1.

6/14/2022:

Cleared

4/19/2022:

a. Linkages to LDN are limited, please incorporate the linkages to Turkey's LDN framework (inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms, regional or national level policy or planning, monitoring and meeting LDN targets) with a view to ensuring efforts are coordinated and to prevent duplication of effort.

b. Component 2: Please include a GEB target that is linked to Output 2.2.

c. Output 2.4- beyond studies, please also consider additional tangible outputs for this activity linked to improvements in the value chains and results for the beneficiaries.

-Please provide indicators and indicative targets in Table B for all of the Components. The indicators listed under Component 1 are actually targets, please include indicators here as well. Please include Targets for Components 2 & 3.

-Please increase the proportionality of the PMC contribution between the GEF portion (currently at 9%) and the co-financing portion (currently at 2.3%).

### Agency Response

4/19/2022 - Agency Response:

Thank you for the comments.

a. Outcome 1 was modified and now includes a reference to the national LDN framework. During PPG relevant LDN indicators will also be incorporated in the project's results framework under Outcome 1 in line with the national LDN targets and monitoring mechanism.

An indicator for the Outcome 1 has been modified to provide a linkage to LDN, the National LDN Committee in particular:

- Inter-sectoral coordination mechanism for SLM is operational and in coordination with the National LDN Committee

b. Tables under Section B and F include a GEB target linked to Output 2.2, mainly:

- 10,430 ha of improved agro ecosystem and forest ecosystem services

c. In addition to value chain studies focusing on tea and hazelnut production in the EBSC region, under Activity 2.4.2 the project in consultations with local stakeholders will identify viable agri-food value chains that avoid and/or reduce land degradation and are also climate-resilient and support lands users/owners in implementing those. Also, an indicator related to Output 2.4 has been revised to include a tangible end of project output, i.e. *the number of market and value chain initiatives* for income generating models identified and implemented.

- Indicators for Component 1 have been included as well as indicative targets for Components 2&3. Please see section B of the PIF.

- The PMC co-financing has been reapportioned and increased to 9.38%.

### 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  
4/19/2022:

Yes

Agency Response  
**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  
4/19/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
4/19/2022:

Yes

Agency Response  
**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
4/19/2022:

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

4/19/2022:

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

6/14/2022:

We note the change to Core Indicator 4 only for a total of 10430 ha. Cleared.

4/19/2022:

Please explore increasing the SLM targets where possible.

#### Agency Response

4/19/2022 - Agency Response:

Thank you for the comment. Two additional SLM targets were added to the table F and relevant places in Table B: 10,000 ha of indirect agricultural impact area covering tea orchards in the target region and approx. 75,000 ha of indirect forest impact area representing the area of the local forest management unit in the Rize province.

**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

4/19/2022:

Yes.

#### Agency Response

#### **Part II ? Project Justification**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/14/2022:

Cleared.

4/19/2022:

- a. Please include the climate risk screening and projections with referenced material.
- b. Please include a brief summary of the current context as it relates to COVID 19 and it's impact on the region.
- c. Please include a brief context as it relates to the private sector and the challenges related to the targeted value chains.

d. Additional information on the environmental context of the targeted region should be included.

## Agency Response

4/19/2022 - Agency Response:

Thank you for the comments.

a. A reference to "Enhancing Adaptation Action in Turkey, (2021). Climate-Adaptation Platforms In The European Union And The Member States And Recommendations For Turkey?", [https://iklimeuyum.org/documents/Climate\\_Adaptation\\_Platforms.pdf](https://iklimeuyum.org/documents/Climate_Adaptation_Platforms.pdf), is included in the text.

b. A paragraph is added to the "Part II: Project Justification: Target Landscape and basic economic, environmental, social and climatic context" Part:  
"Social distancing restrictions and health and economic driven demand shifts associated with Covid-19 are expected to shutter many small businesses and entrepreneurial ventures, but there is very little early evidence on impacts. However, it is known that since early spring 2022 the region is in recovery in terms of socio-economic impacts and the impacted supply chain."

c. A brief context as it relates to the private sector and the tea and hazelnut production value-chains related challenges were incorporated in several sections of the PIF including climate risks related considerations in the private sector business planning. In particular:

Under PART II, Section 1, sub-section 7) Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up?:

- The outcome of the risk analysis study will be presented to the major private sector actors and their associations with a perspective that it can be incorporated into their business plans.

- As project will be informing and technically supporting the private sector on climate risks, adaptation measures through land management practices and the means of consideration of these issues in their business plans this will be another line of contribution of the project to the socioeconomic sustainability.

Under PART II, Section 2, Sub-section 4, Private sector engagement. Will there be private sector engagement in the project??:

- Informing them on climate risks and the means of inclusion issues such as ecosystem services, nature-based solutions in their business plans

A paragraph is added to the "Part II: Project Justification: Target Landscape and basic economic, environmental, social and climatic context" Part.

- As tea and hazelnut are very well-established products and major sectors for the region identification of alternative products could be challenging. Global and regional mechanisms for the sustainability can open a window for the greater market within country and in abroad. Such as adaptation to the Green Deal protocols of the EU, certificated products by Gold Standard and others, integration with the SDGs and promotion of non-financial reporting system among the private sector.



d. A detailed information of the target landscape is presented in Annex D including its environmental context.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/19/2022:

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

6/16/2022:

ToC diagram uploaded. Cleared.

6/14/2022:

Cleared.

Please check the upload of the ToC diagram.

4/19/2022:

a. Thank you for including a comprehensive Theory of Change. To make the pathways more explicit please indicate which components will be addressing the specific barriers outlined.

b. As indicated in the comments under Table B, please make explicit (at Output level) linkages to the overall LDN framework of Turkey and how the project will support Turkey's efforts to achieve LDN targets.

c. Component 3: It would also be useful to share experiences with WOCAT.

d. Please also describe how the project will utilize the interventions outlined to assist with COVID 19 green recovery.

Agency Response

4/19/2022 - Agency Response:

Thank you for the comments.

a. The ToC diagram has been updated to show more explicitly which components address specific barriers as outlined in the PIF.

b. Linkages to the LDN framework of Turkey are integrated to project outputs (marked yellow) and relevant changes were made to Table B as indicated in responses under Table B above.

c. Added to Component 3: ?The experiences will be shared with WOCAT for further dissemination?.

d. The project's specific interventions and solutions related to COVID 19 green recovery are included and highlighted under ?Assistance to COVID 19 green recovery?

UN agencies in Turkey have been assessing the impacts of the COVID-19 crisis in Turkey and adjusting their programming to respond to extra demands and emerging needs due to the Covid-19 crisis. The UN Country Team, which is composed of all UN agencies active in Turkey, has established a Task Team to assess the economic and social impacts of the pandemic and to prepare a short to medium-term response offer to support the efforts of the Government of Turkey in its efforts to contain and reverse the negative consequences of the Covid-19 crisis along with the national development priorities outlined in the 11th Development Plan and in line with UN agency mandates and priorities, as well as pave the way for a better recovery, which is inclusive, gender-equal, fair and green.

The Offer is structured under five pillars: (i) Health First; (ii) Protecting People; (iii) Economic Response and Recovery; (iv) Macroeconomic Response and Multilateral Cooperation; and (v) Social Cohesion and Community Resilience. The proposed responses identified under each pillar respond to the specific challenges and needs created by the pandemic in the context of Turkey. In all, the UN in Turkey has identified 27 focus areas under the five pillars.

The project is aligned with the offer mainly by not only directly responding to *Pillar III ?Economic Response and Recovery?: Item 2. Rural interventions to increase the resilience of producers and improve supply chains in the agrifood system* (Output 2.4. Resilience-building and income-generating models for sustainable value chains for the main products of the EBSC Region are identified and implemented) and *Item 6. Protection of natural habitats* (Output 1.3. An INRM Plan prepared for a pilot sub-basin covering an area of 430 ha that is based on SLM principles), but also to indirectly supporting *Item 1. Job retention and job creation for vulnerable groups* and *Item 5. Effective public sector response for an economy resilient to shocks and hazards*. The project also will serve to the *Item 6 of Pillar II-Protecting People* by helping enhance the skills and resilience of young people against Covid-19 and future shocks.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/19/2022:

Yes

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

4/19/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/16/2022:

CLeared

4/19/2022:

Please complete Section F on GEBs and adaptation benefits.

Agency Response

4/19/2022 - Agency Response:

Thank you for the comment. The followings have been updated with GEBs and adaptation benefits: Table F with GEF Core Indicators, a table under sub-section 5 (p. 25) ***Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing*** 6) ***Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF***

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/14/2022:

CLeared.

4/19/2022:

a. We note a number of measures that are mentioned here to demonstrate innovation and sustainability. However do not see these outline in Table B or the Alternative Scenario. Please clarify. These measures include:

*'The project is turning the LDN concept into practice in Eastern Blacksea Region of Turkey and will generate innovative approaches to multi-sector land use planning based on remote sensing data in mapping and geospatial analysis, testing and implementation of LDN compatible land use planning in Eastern Blacksea provinces.'*

*Environmental sustainability will be enhanced by LDN compatible land use planning in selected municipalities, guiding the implementation of concrete SLM measures resulting in improved land and biodiversity condition. The financial sustainability will be ensured through the innovative programs that will encourage SLM by the local development institutions and local administrations.*

b. Please also clarify what innovative programs are being referred to here- '*The financial sustainability will be ensured through the innovative programs that will encourage SLM by the local development institutions and local administrations.*'

#### Agency Response

4/19/2022 - Agency Response:

Thank you for the comments.

a. References to specific project outputs/activities are added to the above cited text under sub-section 7) Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up as ?Output 1.2?, ?Output 2.1 - Activity 2.1.4?, and ?Output 1.3-Activity 1.3.5?.

b. Reference to specific project output is added to the above cited text under sub-section 7) Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up as ?Output 2.1-Activity 2.1.3?. The local development agencies and administrations as well as provincial administrations within EBSC are anticipated to develop their own innovative SLM programs in line with their mandates (such as SLM and tourism, SLM for apiculture, etc.) under their investment plans and programs to further support SLM initiatives throughout the region. The project will be fulfilling the capacity need under Component 3.

#### 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

4/19/2022:

Please include in Annex A.

#### Agency Response

4/19/2022 - Agency Response:

Geo-references to the project's area?Eastern Black Sea Coastal Region?and proposed pilot area?Salarha/Kire?hane MicroBasin (430 hectares at 40,962? N and 40,508? E)?are included in Annex A.

#### 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

4/19/2022:

Yes

#### Agency Response

##### Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/16/2022:

The gender inclusions have been made in the project description. Cleared.

6/15/2022:

Please address the follow up comments below.

The project document has clearly articulated that SLM has important gender equality dimensions. It is noted that gender considerations will be fully mainstreamed into project implementation and that a gender action plan will be prepared at the PPG stage. As a good mainstreaming practice, please reflect gender equality considerations / gender perspectives in the project components, in particular, in Output 1.2 - Evidenced-based documentation, Output 2.3 - Training activities, Output 2.4 - Resilience-building and income-generating models.

4/19/2022:

Yes

Agency Response  
**Private Sector Engagement**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/14/2022:

Cleared.

4/19/2022:

-Thank you providing information the Tea Enterprises General Directorate on the public economic enterprise- which does not appear to be wholly private sector. Please expand on the role of private sector companies in implementation of the project in particular in the value chain activities.

Agency Response

4/19/2022 - Agency Response:

Thank you for the comment. Private sector companies such as Lipton, Do'u?, Karali, Salarha tea enterprises are seen as key stakeholders for traditional LDN neutral land use practices (to be reviewed and proposed by the project) for integration in planning & production (Output 2.1 - Activity 2.1.3); and the private companies will contribute to the analysis of market and value chains of key products (Output 2.4).

**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

4/19/2022:

Yes

Agency Response  
**Coordination**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
4/19/2022:

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  
4/19/2022:

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  
4/19/2022:

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  
4/19/2022:

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  
4/19/2022:

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



6/16/2022:

All follow up comments have been addressed. The project is technically cleared.

6/15/2022:

Follow up comments need to be addressed.

6/14/2022:

The project is technically cleared and recommended for PIF approval.

4/19/2022:

Not at this time. Please address the comments above prior to technical clearance.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

-Please continue to ensure that LDN is fully incorporated in the project during the PPG phase.

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>4/19/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/14/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

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