

# Strengthening the Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Management of Forest Landscapes in Turkey's Kazda?lari Region

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10369

**Countries**

Turkey

**Project Name**

Strengthening the Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Management of Forest Landscapes in Turkey's Kazda?lari Region

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

1/31/2022

**Review completed by PM**

4/8/2022

**Program Manager**

Ulrich Apel

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

**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  
02/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**17 March 2022**

No response required

**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  
02/02/2022: Not fully.

Table B lacks indicators and include vague statements such as "all or some" (output 2.1.2). Please revise Table B presenting more concrete deliverables, and include indicators in line with what is presented in the core indicator table. Further, please make the presentation consistent with the Project Logframe in this regard.

03/31/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6 April 2022**

No response required

**17 March 2022**

Table has been edited to include indicators and to make it consistent with project Logframe

**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 n/a

**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

02/02/2022: Yes.

03/31/2022: ADDITIONAL REQUEST:

FAO 1.5M grant / Investment mobilized ? change to ?In-kind? and ?Recurrent expenditures?. Based on the co-financing letter, these 5 parallel projects implemented by FAO are in parallel and independently from the GEF project. Outcome of the projects or some of the activities of these projects will support the GEF project components. In this case, in-kind / recurrent expenditures would be more appropriate.

04/08/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**20 April 2022**

No response required

**6 April 2022**

Noted. These have been reclassified as in-kind/recurrent expenditure

In addition, the following text was removed from the explanation under Table C (Confirmed cofinancing):

*Investment mobilized from FAO corresponds to several projects and regular programme activities implemented by FAO Turkey, FAO Technical Cooperation Programme, and other donors' trust funds, as indicated below;*

? *FAO Regular Program on Land and Water in Central Asia (USD 500,000)*

? *TCP : Enhancement of soil and fertilizer management in Turkey, TCP/TUR/38 (USD50,000)*

? *FAO Turkey Partnership Program (FTPP) Leaving no one behind: empowerment of rural women, GCP /SEC/018/TUR (USD 250,000)*

? *FAO Turkey Forest Partnership Program (FTFP) Boosting Restoration, Income,*

? *Development, Generating Ecosystem Services GCP /INT/340/TUR (USD 500,000)*

? *FAO Turkey Partnership Program (FTPP) - Improving efficiency of small ruminants production for reduction of the GHG emission intensity GCP /SEC/014/TUR (USD200,000)*

**17 March 2022**

No response required

**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

02/02/2022: Resources are available, Table D is adequate.

Comments on the budget / cost effectiveness:

- Budget is difficult to assess as it is not presented following the GEF budget template. In particular, the division between FAO and the executing partner cannot be assessed. Please provide the budget table in line with the GEF template, which includes a column that indicates which institution is responsible for each budget line. We don't need the breakdown by year in this table.

03/31/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6 April 2022**

No response required

**17 March 2022**

Noted. Budget has been updated.

**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

02/02/2022: Yes.

03/31/2022: ADDITIONAL REQUEST: Please provide details on what was paid with the (a) preparatory technical studies and reviews, and (b) formulation of Project Document, CEO ER and Mandatory annexes listed in the Table in Annex C.

04/08/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**20 April 2022**

No response required

**6 April 2022**

Noted. The following text was added to the table.

*PPG funds were used to pay:*

**Technical studies:**

- *Gender assessment and Gender Action Plan*

- *Socioeconomic survey and assessment*

- *Forest restoration strategy*

- *Income generation assessment*

**Project Formulation**

- *International Project design expert (lead writer)*

- *Google Earth Engine Application design, data collection (layers), and its use for the site selection*

**17 March 2022**

No response required

**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

02/02/2022: Yes.

However, if a CC-M target is set for the project, the Rio Marker for CC-M in part 1 should be set to "1".

03/31/2022: Rio Marker addressed. In ADDITION:

- Four protected area WDPA ID remains blank under core indicator 1.2. Please add those, as these are mandatory at CEO Endorsement stage.

- Please insert the Core Indicators used in Annex A (Project Logframe) as well. This will help ensure internal consistency in the project document, highlight that Core Indicators are part of the logical framework.

04/08/2022: Not fully addressed.

Please note that the value reported on core indicator table is 2,318,452 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq but below core indicator table in explanation box, the agency is reporting 909,454 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq sequestered (Core indicator 6.1). please revise to be consistent and also include this value in the annex A.

Currently, in the Project Logframe in Annex A there is no Indicator on tCO<sub>2</sub>eq.

05/04/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**4 May 2022**

Noted. The correct number is 2.32 million tCO<sub>2</sub>eq. This has been updated (i) in the logframe in Table B, (ii) in section 1.a(6) GEBS, and (iii) in the Results Framework in Annex A under Outcome 2.2.

**6 April 2022**

-Please note that none of the PAs in Turkey have IUCN ID (WDPA ID) because the country has not uploaded them into the World Database. The proposed project will have a crucial role to engage Turkey with the IUCN/World Database and register their PAs.

-Noted. These have been included to ensure consistency.

**17 March 2022**

Noted and corrected in the 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

02/02/2022: Not fully.

Please briefly elaborate on root causes or barriers that the project is trying to address.

03/31/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6 April 2022**

No response required

**17 March 2022**

Noted. Please refer to paragraphs 14-17

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

02/02/2022: Not fully.

- Given the plan to work towards some of Turkey's LDN targets, the baseline has very little information on the current context in terms of the LDN framework at the national level and the ability to monitor progress towards LDN targets.

- 

- 03/31/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6 April 2022**

No response required

**17 March 2022**

Noted. Please refer to paragraphs 30-31 and the table summarizing national LDN targets that the project will contribute to.

**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

02/02/2022: Clarification request:

? Alternative Scenario: Outcome 1.2 - Please specify the international certification program that will be targeted

03/31/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6 April 2022**

No response required

**17 March 2022**

Noted. Outcome 2.1.2 has been revised. Rather than certification (text dropped as it was misleading), the project will apply the model forest approach. Please see paragraphs 64-66

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

02/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**17 March 2022**

No response required

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

02/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**17 March 2022**

No response required

**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

02/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**17 March 2022**

No response required

**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

02/02/2022: Clarification question:

The maintenance and ongoing success of the livelihood opportunities in the buffer areas is key to maintaining the integrity of the PAs. How is the support for these activities going to be sustained? What institutional mechanisms will be put in place to ensure this?

03/31/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6 April 2022**

No response required

**17 March 2022**

The proposed project will work closely with cooperatives, associations, private sector and other small scale businesses that represent the local people, including significant effort to target women led cooperatives. The project will support initiatives to build their technical, economic and organizational capacity. A sustainability strategy will be prepared with these key partners. The strategy will include guidance and resources to support them from a financial, organizational, capacity, production and marketing point of view. Project stakeholders will benefit both from national funds available and project financing opportunities, as well as development and entrepreneurship opportunities. Integration with national and international markets will be supported, as well as initiatives for e-commerce will be evaluated.

**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  
10/18/2019 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response  
**31 March 2022**

No response required

**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  
**31 March 2022**

No response required

**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  
02/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response  
**31 March 2022**

No response required

## **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

02/02/2022: Not fully.

- While gender analysis has been described, Gender could be better incorporated in the actual project activities under the Alternative scenario as well as the Outputs and Indicators of Table B and the Project Results Framework.

- 

- 03/31/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6 April 2022**

No response required

**31 March 2022**

Point taken. Gender-focused activities have been included in the alternative scenario, particularly under Component 2 in the context of value chain activities. This is also reflected in the outputs and indicators

**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

02/02/2022: Not fully.

This section as presented seems to be more of a mapping of the private sector landscape and does not really provided information on how the private sector will be engaged in

particular in relation to the value chain aspects of the project and potential opportunities for sustainable finance of the PAs.

03/31/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6 April 2022**

No response required

**March 31, 2022**

Noted. The section has been edited to better describe private sector engagement. The following text has been added:

129. The project will cooperate closely with the private sector, especially in supporting income generating activities. The project will seek the engagement of small and medium scale actors (mostly local): local producers, manufacturers, trade, small-scale industry, food processing, and service sector as described below. There are companies that process non- wood forest products in particular medicinal and aromatic plants and wild mushrooms in the project region as well as those processing agricultural products grown organically /according to good agricultural practices. Local tourism agencies will be also key stakeholders to be collaborated for promoting livelihoods through for ecotourism.

130. In this context, the mechanisms that will contribute to the development of income opportunities of the local communities in the project area have been developed in the project document, which will enable the participation of private sector actors in the interventions on organic agriculture, ecotourism, non-wood forest products and the protection and development of biological diversity as referred to in 2.1.1. Accordingly stakeholder forums will be established for each forest district (FDSFs) in which villages will be targeted for livelihood improvements (Output 2.2.2 Improved livelihood opportunities piloted)

131. In addition, it was desirable for the private sector to take part in the project by providing financial support. However, during the formulation phase of the project, it was decided that the private sector could participate as a stakeholder, but that studies could be carried out that could contribute financially to support some activities of the project during the implementation process. Therefore, private sector entrepreneurs in the project area will take place as stakeholders at the beginning of the project. In the next stage, cooperation with the local people will be ensured, especially in supporting capacity building and local income generating activities. It will contribute financially to support joint income generating activities with the local people. That is, it will not directly support the project, but indirectly increase the effectiveness of the project

#### **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

02/02/2022: Not fully.

COVID-19 risks and mitigation measures are described in a very superficial way. Please elaborate. Further, please discuss opportunities for green recovery, as appropriate.

The statement in paragraph 123 on mining is inconclusive. Please clarify if that refers to a risk and how it may be addressed.

03/31/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6 April 2022**

No response required

**31 March 2022**

Noted. A subsection on COVID has been added to section 5.

Regarding mining, the following text has been added to clarify that while mining is allowed by law in the project region, the proposed project will strengthen conservation activities and regional strategies which may limit the establishment of new mines in the project area.

138. Mining is a sensitive issue given its potential to affect negatively the local and global environment. In addition, if not managed adequately, projects implemented in areas where mining activities are carried out could have the potential to suffer from reputational risks even if they are not directly link to these activities. During 2019, grassroots organizations in the Cannakale province organized protests against the Canadian company Alamos Gold Inc. which is seeking to produce gold near the town of Kirazli, approximately 20 kilometers from the project site. While these activities are happening outside of the proposed GEF project site, it has the potential to affect it.

139. While there are mining activities going on the project area, these are already under operation and produce mainly (i) lead-zinc, (ii) Kaolin, (iii) limestone, (iv) Feldspar, and (v) Marble. Please refer to the maps in the Annex below to identify the proposed project site, the location of mining activities, and their extent relative to the project area.

140. Within this context, the objective of the project is to improve biodiversity conservation and forest management in the proposed project site. The site contains globally important biodiversity, including seed stands and gene protection forests. The proposed project will provide the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and local partners with tools to strengthen their conservation efforts. In addition, the project will work with local communities to allow them to sustainably use the services provided by this area. The project will not support mining activities, or will attempt to address environmental issues due to existing mines as these fall outside of its scope. Instead, it will provide the government with conservation tools to reduce the potential to allocate new areas for mining activities.

#### **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

02/02/2022: Not fully.

- Please provide adequate justification for the OFP request for execution support by FAO.

- Overall the project involves a significant number of activities in particular for Component 2 with the work on value chains. It is not clear from the project coordination/institutional arrangements section how all of this work will be undertaken. Noting that the budget only includes one Livelihoods Consultant and financing for Eco-tourism, one of 4 identified areas of focus for the value chains.

- On Coordination with GEF projects: The project summaries are included, but information is missing on how coordination will happen.

03/31/2022: Clarification and justification provided. Program Manager approves the request and seeks Manager's clearance.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

**6 April 2022**

No response required

#### **March 31, 2022**

There are two main reasons why the government made this request. First, given that the project brings together two Directorates within Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry that normally work separately (namely the Directorate of Forestry and the Directorate of Nature Protection), the government of Turkey feels that FAO will act as a neutral broker and provide technical advice that will result in a fair distribution of resources across the departments. Second, because of the COVID emergency, MAF has limited capacity to manage large GEF projects both from a spending and reporting point of view. Therefore they are interested in FAO's support to administer the funds and support reporting to the GEF Secretariat

As per the budget, approximately \$2.8m will be transferred to partners via letters of agreement (FAO does not charge the project for this) ensuring national ownership in the implementation of project activities. Additionally, around \$0.4m in funds correspond to expendable procurement for field activities (we normally also transfer this to partners as part of the LOAs). Therefore roughly \$3.2m out of the \$4.6m will be transferred to 3rd

parties. The balance is consultants, travel, meetings and expendable procurement that would be procured/hired by FAO at the request of the government.

ii. Please note that the project includes funding for consultants working on value chains issues (NC4-Expert on Livelihood Opportunities, NC6-Capacity Building Expert) as well as funds destined to field activities. This includes \$650,000 for livelihood activities through the GDF (budget line 38) and \$360,000 for ecotourism activities (budget line 40). Field investments (including value chain investments) will build on the integrated, participatory forestry management plans under budget lines 41-43 (approx. \$500k).

Specifically, please note that the project will carry out the following activities:

- ? Detailed market and value chain analysis will be carried out for key NWFPs. The following candidate products would be included in market and value chain analysis for further development of chain incomes for the benefit of local people: Thyme, Sage, Wild mushrooms, Stone pine, Oregano
- ? For the promotion of local people's share in value chain, involvement of existing forestry cooperatives in harvesting, processing and marketing of NWFPs will be encouraged. For that purpose, the project will provide necessary advisory and technical support to local people
- ? In addition the project will (i) hire experts for specific topics, (ii) contract restoration works, and (iii) implement project studies to support project activities including income generating activities. This includes, among others, expertise on especially entrepreneurship, branding and marketing specialist, value chain specialist, organic agriculture specialist will be supported under this title and will especially serve the local people. The issues to be covered under the contracted expertise can be give as follows
  - o Organic farming: Organic farming, Good Agricultural Practices (GAP), Integrated Pest Management (IPM) certification, training.
  - o Marketing, Branding: Creation of local brands, marketing and entrepreneurship, training
  - o Ecotourism: Ecotourism routes and products, training, ecotourism strategy
  - o Forest ecologist: Conservation of biodiversity in production forests
  - o Valuation expert: Valuation of forest ecosystem goods and services from Kazdaglar? forests

- o NWFPs : Sustainable management of NWFPs in particular medicinal and aromatic plants and wild mushrooms

•Participatory mechanisms will be established that include key private sector actors for ensuring conservation, sustainable use and management of Kazdaglar? project region. Forest District Stakeholder Forums will be set up under the aegis of the respective regional directorates for Forest-Village Relations, which are responsible for coordinating all contributions to improve the livelihoods of forest villages in the region. Membership will include key stakeholders

iii. Noted. The section has been revised.

#### **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

02/02/2022: Not fully.

•Please specify which LDN targets the project is working towards.

•

•03/31/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6 April 2022**

No response required

**31 March 2022**

Noted. Additional text has been included related to support LDN targets

#### **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

02/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**31 March 2022**

No response required

**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

02/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**31 March 2022**

No response required

**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

02/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**31 March 2022**

No response required

**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

02/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**31 March 2022**

No response required

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

02/02/2022: Not fully.

Please provide budget in form of GEF budget template, including the column with responsible institutions. No annual info is required.

03/31/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6 April 2022**

No response required

**31 March 2022**

Noted. Budget has been uploaded again.

## **Project Results Framework**

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

02/02/2022: Has been provided. Please note comment on Table B and bring Logframe results in line with the indicators/targets to be included in Table B.

03/31/2022: Please insert the Core Indicators used in Annex A as well.

04/08/2022: Currently, in the Project Logframe in Annex A there is no Indicator on tCO<sub>2</sub>eq. Please include.

05/04/2022: Remaining issues addressed.

Cleared

### Agency Response

**5 May 2022**

Noted. Core Indicator 6 (tCO<sub>2</sub>eq) is included in Annex A under Outcome 2.2.

**6 April 2022**

Noted. Core indicators are now in Annex A

**31 March 2022**

Noted and addressed

### **GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

### Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

02/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**31 March 2022**

No response required

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

02/02/2022: No.

Reviewer could not locate the responses to the STAP screen. Please provide.

03/31/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6 April 2022**

No response required

**31 March 2022**

Response to STAP comments (and an updated climate screening) has been uploaded

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

**31 March 2022**

No response required

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

**31 March 2022**

No response required

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

**31 March 2022**

No response required

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

02/01/2022: Has been provided.

03/31/2022: Please provide details on what was paid with the (a) preparatory technical studies and reviews, and (b) formulation of Project Document, CEO ER and Mandatory annexes.

04/08/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**20 April 2022**

No response required

**6 April 2022**

PPG funds were used to pay:

Technical studies:

- Gender assessment and Gender Action Plan
- Socioeconomic survey and assessment
- Forest restoration strategy
- Income generation assessment

#### Project Formulation

- International Project design expert (lead writer)
- Google Earth Engine Application and data collection (layers) and its use for the site selection

#### **31 March 2022**

No response required

#### **Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 02/01/2022: Have been provided.

#### Agency Response

#### **31 March 2022**

No response required

**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

#### **31 March 2022**

No response required

**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

**31 March 2022**

No response required

**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

**31 March 2022**

No response required

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

02/02/2022: No. Please address comments made in this review.

03/31/2022: No. Please address comments made in this review.

04/08/2022: No. Please address comments made in this review.

05/04/2022: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement****Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>2/2/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/31/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/8/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/4/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	

**CEO Recommendation****Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The project has the objective to improve biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest management in the Kazdaglari region for environmental and socio-economic benefits and to develop better governance models for different categories of protected areas in Turkey. In order to reverse biodiversity loss and its associated problems, the project will strengthen the national protected area system by improving its governance and monitoring framework, and by developing a financing strategy. In the long run, this will result in a consolidated protected area system that is planned from a landscape perspective and integrates all relevant sectors. The project will test the principles developed in the Kazdaglari region in order to prepare the ground for future upscaling to the entire national protected area system. Thereby, this project will improve biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest management in the Kazdaglari region and beyond for environmental and socio-economic benefits. It will result in 21,000 ha of terrestrial protected areas under improved management, 6,000 ha of degraded forests restored, 156,000 ha of landscapes under improved management practices, carbon benefits of 2,300,000 ton of CO<sub>2</sub>eq, and directly benefit 2,800 project participants.

The project will take the lessons learned from the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic into account. Measures could include, for example, the support with digital transformation processes or the provision of financial support to increase liquidity among smallholders, but this will be discussed with the Project Steering Committee and the project advisory teams. Similarly, all capacity building activities will be carried out following guidance

provided under the UN Turkey Covid-19 Socio-Economic Response Offer and updated FAO guidelines.

Green investments are the one of the measures prioritized by the government of Turkey and partners to decrease the negative effects of COVID-19. The project prioritizes green investments to reduce the risks of biodiversity loss, land degradation and climate change effects via implementing landscape restoration and decrease land degradation that support sustainable environmental dimensions. It will build resilience to future pandemics to reduce the risks presented by climate change and biodiversity loss. Sustainable forest production methods and applications will also support this process.