

Strengthening the Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Management of Forest Landscapes in Turkey's Kazdağlari Region

Review PIF 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 Kazdağlari Region

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

10/10/2019

Review completed by PM

3/4/2020

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

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

10/18/2019 UA: Not fully.

The project proposes to works on SFM and Forest landscape restoration, therefore LD-1-2 and LD-1-3 objectives should be selected from the drop down menu in table A.

Please also reconsider the selection of Rio marker "0" for CC-mitigation. The project will potentially create carbon benefits.

11/07/2019 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Nov 2019

Agreed. Tables and Rio Marker have been updated. Greenhouse gas emissions reduction estimates have been provided.

In addition, after further discussion with the government, the project duration has been extended to 5 years (60 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

10/18/2019 UA: Not fully.

Please clarify output 2.2.2: what are the new criteria that will make it necessary to revise park boundaries and how does it affect the park?

11/07/2019 UA:

Has been clarified.

02/07/2020 UA: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- Please clarify if below response has been incorporated into the PIF text so that the question will not arise for other readers.
- Table B has editing issues: (i) Component 2 appears three times, (ii) livelihood options: be clear which ones "all or some" can have different interpretations.
- Further, later in the PIF, the description of the components needs to be improved. It sometimes follows table B sequence, but some important outputs are not mentioned at all (e.g. livelihoods). The text also refers to "this component" while it is unclear which one.
- Further, the project component description is unclear with regard to which activities will actually be implemented on the ground and will benefit local communities, users, and beneficiaries. This is especially unclear in the case of livelihood opportunities (outcome 2.3.3). Is component 2 only technical assistance or will investments be made on the ground?

03/04/2020 UA:

Adequately addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Feb 2020 (ADDITIONAL COMMENTS)

- Yes, the text has been included in paragraphs 43-45
- Table B has been corrected in the portal. Livelihoods opportunities will be discussed with project beneficiaries during the PPG phase. All options listed in the log-frame will be considered, but stakeholders will be free to select the option that makes more sense for them (as part of the analysis we will do following RuralInvest guidance.
- Point taken. Section 1.(iii) "Alternative Scenario" has been edited to improve its quality and to match the sequence of the log-frame.

- This has been clarified in the revised text. Component 2 is mostly “Investment” activities, therefore it has been labelled as such in the portal. There will be some capacity building and development of plans under this component, but these are to ensure that the planning/business plan development are aligned with sound investments.

Jan 2020

No response required

Nov 2019

The Law 2873 on National Parks Law sets the rules for the designation of national parks with national and international value to ensure their conservation, sustainable development and management without compromising from their ecological quality. The National Parks By-Law established the technical details for the implementation of the law, which include field research and observation and required detailed baseline surveys. Unfortunately, baseline surveys were not develop for Kazdaglari was defined.

In this context, the project will revise the borders of the protected area in full accordance with the National Park Law and By-Law. The borders will be updated according to representative habitats and associated ecosystems, and will consider the adequate size to ensure their long-term viability and to maintain biological and genetic diversity. The expectation is that the area of the PA will increase.

Project activities includes the collection of detailed baseline surveys and additional information such as location of settlements and villages and current land uses. The project expects that local stakeholders will participate in the data collection and in the delineation of the PA borders.

The park will be positively effected as the new demarcation will:

- o include the most critical needs,

- o build partnerships with local stakeholders in the demarcation process,
- o assess the relationship between governance and management entities and cultivate positive working relationships early on.
- o utilise existing legislation first, but also ensure that other options are clearly understood by those working to develop new legislation or regulations,
- o characterise the biophysical and social science aspects of the site,
- o support a systematic demarcation and adaptive management practices.
- o pay attention to the participation of key stakeholders and listen carefully to those whose livelihoods, cultural practices and heritage are associated with the protected area, and
- o will be supportive in developing relationship and collaborative management for the protected area, as the messages initially offered to the public will likely be permanent.

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

10/18/2019 UA: Yes.

Agency Response No response required

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

10/18/2019 UA: Yes.

Agency Response No response required

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 UA: Yes.

Agency Response No response required

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 UA: Yes.

Agency Response No response required

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response No response required

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response No response required

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response No response required

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response No response required

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

10/18/2019 UA: Yes.

Agency Response No response required

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 UA: Yes.

However, please provide target for beneficiaries.

Please also provide a carbon benefit estimate for the work on restoration and forest management.

11/07/2019 UA:

Addressed.

02/07/2020 UA: INCONSISTENCIES FOUND:

With regard to the core indicators, the numbers in the text and in the indicators table appear to be inconsistent.

- Core indicator 1 is 25,000 ha. Text mentions 22,000 ha of protected area (PA). Is the difference of 3,000 ha the PA that will be newly established? (there is also no indication in the PIF where the new PA is located, its name size and whether it is a KBA. Also note that figures 1a and 1b are not visible in the portal - please upload again.

- Core indicator 4: only 2,500 ha are listed. Text has two different figures: 25,000 ha buffer zones and 50,000 ha improved management (para 51). Please bring core indicator table in line with GEBs listed in para 51 and also with other text in the PIF. It would seem reasonable to have a larger target than the current 2,500 ha based on the project outputs on work in the bufferzone, SLM activities for livelihoods, and avoidance of deforestation, potentially of HC VF?

03/04/2020 UA:

Adequately addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Feb 2020 (INCONSISTENCIES FOUND)

Inconsistencies have been addressed and targets are now aligned (i) in the project logframe, (ii) the Core Indicators section, and (iii) the GEBs section. The project's GEBs now read:

§ 25,000 ha of terrestrial PAs (Kaz mountains, Core indicator 1.2) under improved management

§ 7,500 ha of degraded forests restored (Core indicator 3.2), including 2,000 ha subjected to soil erosion prevention techniques.

§ 50,000 ha of landscapes under improved management practices, comprising 25,000 ha of new buffer zones established around Kazdağları National Park (Core indicator 4.3) and 25,000 ha of forest under integrated management (Core indicator 4.1).

§ 909,454 tCO₂eq sequestered (Core indicator 6.1)

§ Strengthened protection measures for endemic and threatened species within target PAs (details to be confirmed during PPG).

§ At least 1,500 direct beneficiaries of project activities (Core indicator 11, with a target of 50% women beneficiaries)

Jan 2020

No response required

Nov 2019

Point taken.

1500 (some 500 government staff and 1,000 other local stakeholders). At least 50% women.

Carbon calculations have been provided using EX-ACT.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 UA: Yes.

Agency Response No response required

Part II – Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 UA: Not fully.

While the proposal describes well the general problems, and especially the problems/barriers pertaining to the protected area system, the description of problems/barriers in the wider productive landscape and buffer zone of the Kaz Dagleri area should be further elaborated on.

11/07/2019 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Nov 2019

The following text has been added as paragraphs 29 and 30:

Turkey is highly vulnerable to desertification and drought due to its climate and soil characteristics. Water erosion is one of the primary issues of concern as almost half of the land in Turkey has a slope inclination of 40% or higher. Despite significant efforts by the government, erosion remains a significant issue as inadequate cultivation practices in sloping agricultural land continue to be a risk for erosion and floods.

Besides erosion, degradation of agricultural lands and pastures and the destruction of forests and natural ecosystems are key components of land degradation in Turkey. Land degradation leads farmer to lower productivity levels and revenue losses, pushing them in the short term towards unsustainable methods, including the need of additional inputs to compensate the losses in efficiency.

Agriculture in the buffer zones around Kazdaglari is dominated by fruit production, namely olives and nuts as well as vegetables (tomatoes, peppers, eggplants, among others), the collection of medicinal plants and animal husbandry (approximately 500,000 and 1,000,000 heads of cattle and small ruminants in the province, respectively). Beekeeping is also an important source of income in the region. The main drivers of land degradation in the region include (i) inappropriate production practices in high slopes and marginal regions, (ii) drought risk and irregular precipitation regime, (iii) inappropriate irrigation systems, (iv) inadequate use of fertilizers and pesticides, among others.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 UA: Yes.

Agency Response No response required

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 UA: Not fully.

Please clarify how the project will ensure strengthening / establishment of buffers beyond PA boundaries and restore ecological connectivity using a sustainable landscape approach. Please also provide more information on the "common vision" for the Kaz Dagleri region "generated by its stakeholders".

11/07/2019 UA:

Addressed.

02/07/2020 UA: ADDITIONAL COMMENT:

Please include one concise paragraph on the Theory of Change. Paragraphs 37 and 38 (in section describing the alternative scenario) have elements of a Theory of Change. Please specifically describe it by explaining how the projects outputs and outcomes will lead to the envisaged change and in what sequence.

Please clarify whether below response provided with details on the common vision has been incorporated into the PIF text. The information is very useful and should be included in the PIF, also as part of the stakeholder engagement section.

03/04/2020 UA:

Adequately addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Feb 2020 (ADDITIONAL COMMENT)

- Paragraph 40 containing a brief description of the TOC has been added to the text. In addition, a figure summarizing the project's TOC has been uploaded into the portal.

- Yes, the text below was included in paragraphs 38-39 ("Alternative scenario" section) and the Stakeholder's section (i.e. the paragraphs on the "Common vision for Kazdaglari" resulting from the stakeholder assessment).

Jan 2020

No response required

Nov 2019

Maintenance of eco-system diversity is often carried out by establishing protected areas such as national parks, wildlife reserves and others. While the protected areas focused on strict conservation of the values, buffer zone may give opportunity for optimizing the political, economic, social, cultural, ecological and intrinsic value of resources. The buffer zone is usually adaptive management and participative, with fairness to all groups, allowing for changing values over time.

In the project, the landscape approach will be a tool for buffer zone design because of its strategic approach to avoid the loss of habitats and preserve large areas for the establishment of the buffer zone in the project area.

Since buffer zones are generally private property and have multiple land use purposes, collaborative management and a landscape management approach will be essential to stimulate land uses compatible with biodiversity conservation. On the one hand, the project will provide a collaborative management structure and a governance model for the management of the buffer zone in close cooperation with key stakeholders. On the other hand, it will increase the livelihood opportunity and alternative income generation opportunities together with capacity building and awareness activities. To achieve this, the project will create guidance documents and tools for management of the buffer zone as well.

The "common vision" for the Kazdaglari region, as proposed by participants during the stakeholder meetings is outlined below. Stakeholders feel the project should:

- o Identify important and priority areas (hot spots) in terms of biological diversity and natural resource values; carry out in-depth and detailed inventory studies in areas determined to be important in terms of biodiversity and genetic resources,
- o revise the management and visitor management plan of Kazdağı National Park and provide recommendations for (i) genetic resources conservation, (ii) support alternative income generating activities, (iii) define cooperation mechanisms with different stakeholders and (iv) interventions of species protection action plans and programs,
- o Strengthen the participation of non-governmental organizations in field management and decision-making processes
- o Study plant sociology in the project area, revealing the relationship between ecosystem and species,
- o Revise management plans with an innovative and holistic approach under the supervision of 2 and/or 4 establishments whose management plan has expired. During the planning process, there is a need to integrate production systems and biodiversity, as well as to identify the potential of non-wood forest products, including proposals for their production and processing. In addition to the traditional use of these products, potential utilization areas and utilization opportunities should be investigated, as well as raising awareness of both local people, managers and the parties involved in awareness raising activities,
- o Develop production and marketing opportunities for NWFPs (Non-Wood Forest products) in the rural areas
- o Demonstrate sustainable rural tourism strategies in the project area and undertake a rural tourism / ecotourism plan for the area in this context, and implementing minimum visitor services and facilities such as trails, guidance and information
- o Identify and plan alternative income-generating activities such as beekeeping, and support their pilot implementation
- o Strengthen cooperation with relevant stakeholders,
- o Identify traditional use of medicinal and aromatic plants in the project area and development of cultivation opportunities in villages in project areas,
- o Conduct feasibility studies for building thematic museums at different points reflecting the source values of the area within the national park and the pilot project area

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 UA: Not fully.

The proposal lacks an alignment with the LDN concept and approach of the UNCCD. Please clarify on whether this project contributes to the implementation of national voluntary LDN targets and in what way.

11/07/2019 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Nov 2019

Paragraph 31 has been added to describe the link with LDN concept. In addition the “Checklist for LDN transformative projects and programmes” has been filled out as an appendix describing how the project aligns with each criteria.

Also, the following text has been added to section 8.

The project will contribute to Turkey’s LDN strategy as follows:

LDN Targets in agriculture (Pg 16 of LDN report):

- Promotion and supporting soil conservation farming (including building farmer capacity)
- Enforcing all relevant articles of Soil Law No. 5403, which sets the rules and principles for determining land and soil resources and their classification, preparing land utilization plans, preventing non-purpose utilization, and defining the tasks and obligations to ensure land and soil preservation.

- Expand irrigated area from 6.3m ha to 8.5m ha. Mainstream pressurised irrigation systems
- Support and upscale soil and fertilizer analysis, and ensure controlled applications

LDN Targets in Forestry

- o Reduce the decline in forest areas, in particular support national targets of afforestation and rehabilitation of mine sites
- o Reduce the declining productivity in forest lands by rehabilitating forest lands, decreasing the number of Forest Crimes, and reducing the area affected by fires.

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

10/18/2019 UA: Not fully.

The incremental reasoning as described in paragraphs 43, 44, and 45 is rather generic and very difficult to link with the baseline activities and incremental activities. Please elaborate by providing more concrete incremental reasoning specific to the context of the proposed project.

11/07/2019 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Nov 2019

The section has been edited in the PIF. A table summarizing the incremental reasoning has been included.

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

10/18/2019 UA: Yes, however. Please note comment above to include a target for carbon sequestration/avoided emissions and for direct beneficiaries.

11/07/2019 UA:

Has been included.

02/07/2020 UA: Note comments on core indicators above.

Agency Response

Feb 2020

Noted. Core Indicators have been addressed above.

Jan 2020

No response required

Nov 2019

Point taken. The project will target 1,500 beneficiaries (see comment above)

Greenhouse gas emissions have been calculated using EX-ACT (EX-ACT calculations have been uploaded in the system).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 UA: Yes.

02/07/2020 UA: ADDITIONAL COMMENT.

The PIF text only mentions capacity building to achieve sustainability Please elaborate on the point of sustainability in view of how all project results will be made durable. There is a recent STAP guidance on how GEF projects should address the issue of durability. Please refer to the STAP guidance and elaborate in the respective PIF section.

<http://www.stapgef.org/achieving-enduring-outcomes-gef-investment>

03/04/2020 UA:

Adequately addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Feb 2020 (ADDITIONAL COMMENT)

The section has been edited following STAP guidance and now reads as follows:

The project includes components to guarantee sustainability in the institutional, environmental, economic and social dimensions. First, the capacity building component on sustainable landscape management that considers the involvement of different stakeholders allows all the actors to work coordinated to achieve and maintain the project outcomes. Moreover, the active participation of the government, the alignment of the project with national goals and the creation of a new governance model, favors a political and institutional environment for the project implementation. In terms of environmental sustainability, the project works across different objectives for the management of protected areas, including restoration of ecosystems and improvement of governance. In addition, the work in the buffer zones reduces the risks of negative actions occurring in protected areas by providing alternatives of activities that allow local communities to meet and improve their livelihoods. The project also contemplates a platform for the monitoring and evaluation of the

ecological status of the landscapes that allows to assess progress in the accomplishment of objectives. Together, all these actions constitute a set of interventions that enable the sustainable management of landscapes in the project region.

The new national level strategy on buffer zone management and piloting of formalized buffer zone management under this project, would together provide the policy directive and on the ground experience facilitating the scaling up of improved buffer zone management throughout the country. The activities in the context of forest carbon management and MRV would be in synergy with other similar projects (e.g. UNDP/GEF project and the adoption of the MRV system developed under that project), this would enable the easy scaling up of piloting activities undertaken. Also, at the national level, there is a clear articulation of need to conduct valuation of ecosystem services in productive forests (specifically biodiversity), and to develop integrated management systems (including improved NWFP value chain development for enhanced livelihoods); piloting activities under this project would provide a blueprint for GDF to scale up the piloted activities throughout the country under their regular programmatic efforts in productive forests.

Jan 2020

No response required

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

10/18/2019 UA: Yes.

Agency Response No response required

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 UA: Not fully.

While the proposal provides information of which stakeholders it will engage in the PPG phase, it does not provide information on the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase, in what way, and with which results.

11/07/2019 UA:

Addressed.

02/07/2020 UA:

Please check stakeholder section for typos and unedited sentences.

03/04/2020 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Feb 2020

Stakeholder section has been edited.

Jan 2020

No response required

Nov 2019

The following text has been added to the Stakeholder Section in the PIF:

The proposal is a complex and multi-dimensional. Thus, the issue of stakeholder analysis and inclusion was critical to the project identification phase and will be critical to the project preparation? implementation phase as well. A core project team has been established by the ministry partners (GDF and GDNCNP) during the PIF proposal, with all relevant departments assignment representatives to this project team with the inclusion of an FAO member.

Several meetings of this project team were held during the project identification process, as well as one-to-one meetings and field visits. This project team will continue to support the development of the project during the PPG.

The key stakeholders were listed and grouped according to their interests, their profile and their interests in? effects of the proposed project site. Engagement with stakeholders to date has included the following:

- Official letters were delivered to government stakeholders to solicit their inputs on the proposal. A detailed needs assessment was drafted based on information provided by local stakeholders.
 - The FAO representative participated in a regional meeting and workshop, during which locally based stakeholders, especially NGOs and academicians, were informed about the project.
 - Threats and responses to them were obtained from locally based, private and NGO representatives as well as government institutions.
- o A large participatory workshop was organized to obtain the opinions and feedbacks of the key stakeholders and a field visit carried out with local level stakeholders. Additionally, face-to-face meetings and round table meetings were held to solicit further feedback from these stakeholders.
- Regional, provincial, and district directorates of relevant ministries have participated to the planning of this PIF.

The above initiatives have enabled a detailed stakeholder list to be compiled, elaborated and analyzed by ministry partners and the FAO representative, along with the project concept development team.

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

10/18/2019 UA: Yes.

Agency Response No response required

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 UA: Not fully.

The private sector engagement section would benefit from further elaboration and more detail on how, exactly, the private sector players mentioned will be involved and what the potential outcomes of this involvement would be.

11/07/2019 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Nov 2019

This section has been amended to highlight the intention to consult in more detailed and tangible ways with the private sector during the PPG
Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 UA: Not fully.

The proposal does not mention the risk of the current gold mining activities that are taking place in the Kaz Dagleri region. Please assess the risk of the mining activities with regard to environmental impact and reputational risk for GEF involvement.

Please assess all risks with low, medium high, etc.; "unknown" is not a risk assessment category.

11/07/2019 UA:

As per map provided in Annex 1, the mining areas in the Kaz Dagleri region are well within the proposed project boundaries. It is also unclear on how the risk has been assessed and based on what information the risk level is considered "low".

In this context, please consult the updated GEF safeguards policy <http://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/updated-policy-environmental-and-social-safeguards> and appropriately screen the project for environmental and social risks and potential impacts and document the results of this process.

04/06/2020 UA:

Earlier comments have been adequately addressed. The risk has been included in the risk assessment matrix and also triggers 2 safeguards that will be given due process and consideration during PPG. However, it is mentioned that some level of ESS screening has been done, but the ESS screening report/assessment has not been provided. Considering the potential risk with regards to the projects "association" to mining activity in the area it is important that FAO provides their assessment including, if available, (1) the overall, preliminary, overall environmental and social risks category of the project; (2) information on the types and levels of risk identified; and (3) measures to address any identified risks. (see Guidelines on GEF's Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards (page 4, para 6, Box.2). Alternatively, please attach or provide a link to the completed risk template for the project.

If no ESS information is available, please explain why it is not available at this stage and indicate a schedule to conduct environmental and social screening and assessment prior to CEO Endorsement.

04/10/2020 UA:

Addressed. ESS screening uploaded and overall risk assessed as medium.

Cleared

Agency Response

April 2020

The ESS Screening and climate screening have been uploaded into the Portal--Project was determined to be **medium** risk. During PPG, the project team will carry out a detailed environmental and social assessment (as per FAO's ESS).

Jan 2020

Following guidance from the GEF Safeguards Policy and FAO's Environmental and Social Standards (<http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4413e.pdf>), the proposed GEF project has been assigned a "**Medium**" level of risk. In particular, the proposed project will trigger the following safeguards:

- * ESS2 - Sustainably manage the ecosystems in order to maintain the services and benefits they provide.
- * ESS3 - Prevent actions resulting in loss of PGRFA diversity by promoting their effective conservation (in situ and ex situ);

While there are mining activities going on the project area these are either abandoned or already under operation, and produce mainly (i) lead-zinc, (ii) Kaolin, (iii) limestone, (iv) Feldspar, and (v) Marble. Mining Activities in the project site cover approximately 116 ha. Please refer to the map below to identify the proposed project site, the location of mining activities, and their extent relative to the project area. These maps have been uploaded into the GEF portal.

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 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 the development of new mining activities. Instead, it will provide the government with tools to avoid the establishment of new mines in the area.

Nov 2019

Point taken. The risk of mining has been included into the risk matrix. The risk of mining is considered low as the project site, given its geological structure (metamorphic texture and structure), is not common to contain mines. Nonetheless, there are some small abandoned mine sites that will be rehabilitated with forests.

Please note that the recent demonstrations regarding gold mining activities by the Canadian firm Alamo are far away from the project site (see picture below; distance from mine to project site is approximately 40 kilometer as the crows flies).

MG has addressed/inserted this in the PIF document – but suggest Map goes into an Annex.

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

10/18/2019 UA: Yes.

Agency Response No response required

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

10/18/2019 UA: Not fully.

The project proposal is not adequately aligned with UNCCD's LDN concept.

11/07/2019 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Nov 2019

The section has been amended to include the following paragraphs:

Finally, the project is contribute to Turkey LDN strategy as follows:

LDN Targets in agriculture (Pg 16 of LDN report):

- Promotion and supporting soil conservation farming (including building farmer capacity)
- Enforcing all relevant articles of Soil Law No. 5403, which sets the rules and principles for determining land and soil resources and their classification, preparing land utilization plans, preventing non-purpose utilization, and defining the tasks and obligations to ensure land and soil preservation.
- Expand irrigated area from 6.3m ha to 8.5m ha. Mainstream pressurised irrigation systems
- Support and upscale soil and fertilizer analysis, and ensure controlled applications

LDN Targets in Forestry

- Reduce the decline in forest areas, in particular support national targets of afforestation and rehabilitation of mine sites
- Reduce the declining productivity in forest lands by rehabilitating forest lands, decreasing the number of Forest Crimes, and reducing the area affected by fires.

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

10/18/2019 UA: Yes.

04/06/2020 UA: ADDITIONAL COMMENT:

Please elaborate on how this project concept has learned from and utilized existing best practice, scientific and technical knowledge and lessons learned from similar projects/initiatives in Turkey and/or around the world by the GEF, FAO and/or other institutions. This is a requirement at PIF stage, please describe how the PIF design has benefited from existing best practice, lessons learned, research, etc. to ensure that it builds on existing knowledge.

04/10/2020 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

April 2020

Additional text as requested has been added as the last paragraph of the KM section

October 2019

No response required

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

10/18/2019 UA: Yes.

Agency Response No response required

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

No response required

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 UA: No. Please address comments made in this review.

11/07/2019 UA: No. Please address comments made in this review.

02/07/2020 UA: No. Please address comments made in this review.

(please also note that figures 1a and 1b are not visible).

03/04/2020 UA: No. Please address additional comments to enable technical clearance.

04/10/2020 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Turkey. Strengthening the Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Management of Forest Landscapes in Turkey’s Kazdağlari Region (GEF ID 10369); Agency: FAO; GEF Project Financing: \$4,657,534; Co-financing: \$25,000,000. In order to reverse biodiversity loss and its associated problems, the project will strengthen Turkey’s national protected area (PA) system by improving its governance and monitoring framework, and by developing a financing strategy. In the long run, this will result in a consolidated PA system that is planned from a landscape perspective and integrates all relevant sectors. The project will test the principles developed in Component 1 in the Kazdaglari region in order to prepare the ground for future upscaling to the whole system. Thereby, this project will improve biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest management in the Kaz Daglari region for environmental and socio-economic benefits. It will result in 25,000 ha of terrestrial PAs under improved management, 7,500 ha of degraded forests restored, 50,000 ha of landscapes under improved management practices, carbon benefits of 900,000 t of CO2 eq, and directly benefit 1,500 project participants.