Integrating good agricultural practices to ameliorate agricultural eco-systems in earthquake-affected region in T?rkiye

Review CEO Approval and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12300
Countries
T?rkiye
Project Name
Integrating good agricultural practices to ameliorate agricultural eco-systems in earthquake-affected region in T?rkiye
Agencies
FAO
Date received by PM
3/9/2026
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Alla Ljungman
Focal Area
Land Degradation
Project Type
MSP

CEO Approval Request

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2026

Addressed. Cleared. The new LoE is attached.

March 30, 2026

(1) We note that the Nature Conservation Center (DKM) is listed as the executing partner. We trust that DKM has successfully passed the required assessment to manage day-to-day project execution, including financial management, procurement, and monitoring. Please either provide an updated Letter of Endorsement (LoE) clearly confirming that the project will be executed by DKM, or list the General Directorate of Plant Production, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry as the executing partner in the General Project Information and all other relevant sections of the document as it is stated in the attached LOE.

As this is a one-step MSP project, the executing partner indicated in the PIF must be consistent with the entity specified in the LoE.

If approved, the proposal will be supported by and the project executed by the General Directorate
Production, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry with relevant partners. I request the FAO to provid

Agency Response

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

The updated LoE has been attached to the CEO endorsement package. The DKM has been confirmed as the executing partner by the OFP.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2026

Addressed. Cleared.

April 21, 2026

Yes, land degradation is correctly identified as a principal objective. However, the project?s contributions to biodiversity (BD) and climate change mitigation (CCM) objectives appear to be limited.

Agency Response

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

Land Degradation remains the "Principal objective". Biodiversity and Climate Change Mitigation are retained as co-benefits generated through SLM, restoration, and improved ecosystem functions; and the BD and CCM have been removed from the Rio markers. Accordingly, the Financial tables under Annex A of the CEO endorsement document have been updated.

2. Project Summary.
a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?
b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project, is well written and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2026

a)-b) Yes. Cleared.

April 21, 2026

a) - b) Yes, however, please see if paragraph 1, 2 and 3 can be combined to minimize duplication (e.g. earthquake impacts) and shorten the summary to 250 words.

Agency Response

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

a-b) The Project Summary has been revised to combine the relevant paragraphs, remove duplication, and streamline the text. The summary has also been shortened to approximately 250 words while maintaining key information.

3. Project Description Overview
a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?
b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and appropriately funded?
d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10%? If above 10%, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2026

Cleared. All comments have been addressed.

April 21, 2026

a) - b)

The project?s activities, outputs, outcomes, and overall results appear to be well aligned with the LD-1 objective. Please make full use of the flexibility in programming funds and adjust the Focal Area Element financial annex table accordingly. Biodiversity (BD) and Climate Change Mitigation (CCM) components can still be retained as co-benefits.

Please ensure that Sustainable Land Management (SLM) practices and the country?s Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) targets are fully mainstreamed across the project?s objectives, components, and outcomes.

In addition, please clarify whether the Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) to be applied are consistent with those supported under the GEF-8 programming directions. There seems to be some ambiguity, particularly regarding practices that may not be considered nature-positive. It would also be helpful to confirm whether the proposed GAP framework incorporates land-use planning and a landscape-level approach.

Also, in Output 3.1.1, please capture best practices and lessons learned in advancing gender equality and women's empowerment, and ensure wide dissemination.

The targets for CI 3 and CI 4.3 are rather small, even when considering that the project investment is modest. Please consider increasing these targets.

c) Gender and knowledge management aspects are adequately incorporated and supported across activities under each component. However, there is limited information on how traditional knowledge will be utilized. Please clarify the envisaged avenues for integrating traditional knowledge and how it will inform the definition and application of ?new? SLM, nature-positive, and NbS practices. The M&E framework appears to be appropriately designed and financed.

Under Monitoring and Evaluation, please regularly report on gender equality results and progress in the implementation of the Gender Action Plan. The M&E component seems overestimated. The average budget amount of the GEF funded part for the M&E component for projects up to USD 5 million is around 5% but for this project it is slightly higher, at 5.5%. Please revise down.

d) Yes.

e) PMC is below 10%.

Agency Response

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

a-b) The project has been revised to strengthen its alignment with the Land Degradation (LD) focal area, with Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) fully mainstreamed across the project objective, rationale, components, and outcomes. The project objective and description have been updated accordingly.

Good Agricultural Practices have been clearly defined as a nature-positive and SLM-consistent approach, explicitly incorporating soil health, land restoration, and ecosystem-based practices, while excluding those that may contribute to land degradation. In addition, a landscape-level approach has been integrated to ensure that farm-level interventions contribute to broader restoration and LDN outcomes.

The project?s core indicator targets have been revisited: Indicator 3.1 (area of degraded agricultural land under restoration) has been increased from 300 ha to 450 ha, and Indicator 4.3 (area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems) has been scaled up from 1,700 ha to 5,000 ha. All revisions have been integrated into the CEO Endorsement package.

Output 3.1.1 has been revised to address the comment.

c) Traditional and local knowledge has been explicitly integrated into the project design (Paragraph 60, 67 and 80). The revised approach ensures that local and indigenous knowledge is systematically identified through farmer consultations and incorporated into training activities (Farmer Field Schools), demonstration practices, and knowledge management processes. The project adopts a co-creation approach, combining traditional practices with scientific and innovative solutions to ensure that Sustainable Land Management, nature-positive, and Nature-based Solutions practices are locally adapted, culturally appropriate, and scalable. These updates have been reflected under Component 2 (training and demonstrations) and Component 3 (knowledge management).

M&E Section has also been revised to ensure the regular reporting on the GAP indicators. The allocation for the M&E has been reduced to the threshold.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?

b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2026

Cleared. All comments have been addressed.

April 21, 2026

a) The rationale adequately describes the earthquake's agricultural impacts and pre-existing land degradation drivers. However, the systems perspective is incomplete - linkages between land-use pressures, climate vulnerability and biodiversity loss across the 11 targeted provinces need to be more explicitly articulated and integrated into the project design logic.

b) Please describe how the project will implement a landscape approach involving a broad array of stakeholders and foster a multi-sectoral approach across government ministries. Currently the multi-sectoral approach is not obvious in the stakeholder?s consultation. It is not clear how different ministries and administrations, civil society organizations, private sector will be involved. The private sector is positioned primarily as a stakeholder rather than a financier - its engagement in market incentives and supply chain transformation is referenced but underdeveloped. Clarification is needed on how private sector actors will tangibly contribute to GEBs.

c) N/A

Agency Response

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

a) The Project Rationale (paragraph 10) has been strengthened to reflect a more comprehensive systems perspective, explicitly articulating the interlinkages between land degradation, unsustainable land-use practices, climate variability, and biodiversity loss across the targeted provinces. The revised text further clarifies how these challenges are addressed through integrated Sustainable Land Management interventions, while also recognizing the earthquakes as a compounding factor that has intensified these interconnected pressures and reinforced the need for integrated, landscape-level responses within the project design.

b) The project description has been strengthened (under Stakeholder section - starting at Paragraph 88) to clearly reflect a multi-sectoral and landscape-level approach, with well-defined roles for relevant ministries, local administrations, civil society organizations, and research institutions.

Stakeholder engagement has been reinforced through explicit reference to the extensive consultations conducted during project preparation, including multi-stakeholder workshops across the 11 targeted provinces.

The role of the private sector has been further clarified and operationalized, including its contributions through input provision, certification systems, advisory services, and market linkages that support the delivery of Global Environmental Benefits. While not a primary financing partner, its catalytic role in scaling up sustainable land management practices has been emphasized. Please refer to Paragraphs 97-99 for the updates.

5 B. Project Description

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2026

Cleared.

April 21, 2026

a) A theory of change narrative is present and the causal logic is broadly coherent, moving from policy reform to on-farm adoption to knowledge systematization.

b) The prodoc references relevant prior investments in T?rkiye (Bolu Agroecology, Kazda?lar?, Upper Sakarya/LDN projects) and draws methodological lessons, particularly around Farmer

Field Schools. The linkage to GEF-funded predecessor projects could be made more explicit. Please briefly describe how this project's design was directly shaped by those lessons and whether any co-financing leverages ongoing programs.

c) The three substantive components (enabling environment, farmer support, knowledge management) are logically structured and reasonably described. However, the rationale for selecting this approach over alternatives is not discussed. Please justify why this approach was preferred and to elaborate on risk mitigation for the policy adoption assumption/government willingness to adopt recommendations.

d) The baseline and GEF alternative are described, with GEF funds catalyzing a shift from standard disaster recovery to LDN, SLM and nature-positive agricultural rehabilitation.

e) BD and CCM related benefits are identified.

f) The financing structure (GEF: USD 1.59M; co-financing: USD 10.5M) reflects a strong leverage ratio from the Government of T?rkiye and FAO.

g) The project incorporates a gender-responsive M&E system and mid-term and terminal evaluations.

h) FAO, MoAF, and the Nature Conservation Centre (DKM) as executing agency are identified and their roles are described. Private sector engagement (with input suppliers and processing facilities) is mentioned but not operationalized within specific components. Please clarify how the private sector will be engaged beyond consultation, particularly in Component 2.

i) The gender analysis identifies relevant barriers: time, poverty, low land ownership, social norms and proposes concrete mitigation measures including a 40% women's participation quota, childcare provision during training, and women-only focus groups, which is adequate for the proposed scope. Please (1) in Output 3.1.1 capture best practices and lessons learned in advancing gender equality and women's empowerment, and ensure wide dissemination. (2) Under Monitoring and Evaluation, please regularly report on gender equality results and progress in the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

j) Knowledge dissemination is proposed through establishment of a digital e-learning platform and through workshops, field days, and success stories. The approach is conventional. Please describe how knowledge products will reach policymakers and decision-makers beyond the farming community, and whether any peer-reviewed or formal policy communication outputs are planned.

k) The project aligns with T?rkiye's 12th Development Plan and the EU Green Deal's Farm to Fork Strategy and includes a legislative review under Component 1. However, the document does not identify specific policies, subsidies, or regulations that could counteract project outcomes. Please include identification of any harmful agricultural subsidies or conflicting regulations in T?rkiye.

l) The project introduces nature-positive agriculture and AI-based tools in an earthquake recovery context are novel.

Agency Response

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

b) The linkage with previous GEF-funded projects has been strengthened. Additional text has been included to clarify how lessons learned (e.g. Farmer Field Schools, landscape approaches, and institutional coordination) have directly informed the project design, as well as alignment with ongoing national programmes and co-financing.

c) The project description has been strengthened under Paragraph 30, to clearly justify the selected integrated approach, demonstrating why the combined focus on enabling environment, farmer-level interventions, and knowledge management is more effective than stand-alone approaches. Risk mitigation measures have been further elaborated, particularly with regard to the adoption of policy recommendations.

h) The role of the private sector has been further clarified and strengthened within the project components, particularly under Component 2 (Project Description section). The revised text specifies how private sector actors, including input suppliers, certification bodies, and agri-food enterprises, will actively support the adoption and scaling of Good Agricultural Practices and Sustainable Land Management through advisory services, certification, processing, and value chain linkages.

i) 1 - Under Output 3.1.1, additional text has been included to ensure the systematic capture and dissemination of best practices and lessons learned related to gender equality and women?s empowerment through targeted knowledge products and the e-learning platform.

2 - In addition, the Monitoring and Evaluation section has been updated to include regular tracking and reporting of gender equality results and progress in the implementation of the Gender Action Plan, including the use of gender-disaggregated indicators in periodic project reporting.

j) Additional text on knowledge management has been included to address this comment.

k) The project description section has been strengthened to reflect T?rkiye?s strong policy framework supporting sustainable agriculture, while also identifying areas where further alignment with sustainable land management objectives can be enhanced. Under Component 1, it is now described how the project will review relevant policies and support mechanisms and develop recommendations to further strengthen policy coherence and alignment with LDN objectives.

l) The project?s transformative and scaling-up aspects have been further elaborated.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 13, 2026

Addressed. Cleared.

May 13, 2025.

Not cleared. Please revise the section to clearly state that FAO will not hold a vote on the PSC.

May 11, 2026

Institutional Arrangements *(previous comment not addressed):* Pursuant to the interim CEO's letter to Agency coordinators on 19 March 2026, please confirm in the CEO Approval document that FAO will participate in the Project Steering Committee (PSC) but will not be a voting member. The section ?**Institutional Arrangement and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives**

and Project? states that FAO is a full member of the Project Steering Committee, but there is no indication that it lacks voting rights. **Please revise the section to clearly state that FAO will not hold a vote on the PSC.**

May 5, 2026

Cleared.

April 21, 2026

a) The institutional structure is clearly described, with FAO as the GEF Implementing Agency, the Nature Conservation Centre (DKM) as the Operational Partner/executing entity, and MoAF as the Lead Government Agency chairing the Project Steering Committee. Roles at national and local levels, including 11 provincial directorates and a Project Advisory Board, are adequately outlined. It would be beneficial to add organogram/funds flow diagram that will help to navigate a complex governance for the project implementation. Please note that the new LoE is required confirming that DKM is an executing partner for this project.

b) The project document explicitly states that FAO will not play an execution role; execution is fully delegated to DKM as Operational Partner. No exception to the standard execution support arrangements is being requested. Please note that the new LoE is required confirming that DKM is an executing partner for this project.

c) Coordination with relevant ongoing initiatives is described and demonstrates reasonable effort to avoid duplication. Synergies are identified with three GEF-funded projects (Kazda?lar? Biodiversity, NBS Agriculture in Kahramanmara?, and LDN Target Setting) as well as national programs including MoAF's GAP Dissemination Project and the EU-funded IPARD Program. Please specify the coordination mechanisms (e.g., joint steering, information sharing protocols, harmonized field activities) and clarify how duplication of farmer-level support will be actively avoided.

Agency Response

Agency response - 13 May 2026:

Addressed under paragraphs of 123 and 125.

Agency response - 13 May 2026:

Comment addressed. The institutional arrangements section has been revised under Paragraph 123 to clarify the composition of the PSC. FAO?s role has been clarified as serving in a support function to the PSC, providing background information and documentation to facilitate the PSC's deliberations and decision-making.

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

a-b) The updated LoE has been uploaded to the portal. The organogram has been added.
c) This comment been addressed under Paragraphs 36-38.

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project?s targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2026.

Cleared. It is noted that the targets are now higher.

April 21, 2026

a) Yes.

b) The targets for CI 3 and CI 4.3 are rather small, even when considering that the project investment is modest. Please consider increasing these targets.

Agency Response

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

b) The project?s CIs have been revisited, and as a result, Indicator 3.1 (area of degraded agricultural land under restoration) has been increased from 300 ha to 450 ha, and Indicator 4.3 (area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems) has been significantly scaled up from 1,700 ha to 5,000 ha.
Targets are considered achievable based on revised adoption assumptions and project design. All revisions have been consistently integrated into the Project document sections.

5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2026

Cleared. It is noted that that the Environmental and Social risk in the Key Risk table. The risk rating is now consistent with the E&S Screening Template.

April 21, 2026

a) The risk assessment covers the main categories ? climate change, environmental and social, and gender-related ? with broadly appropriate mitigation measures identified for each. Gender risks are particularly well-articulated, with concrete mitigation actions including childcare provision, scheduling flexibility, quotas, and women-only consultations.

b) The overall residual risk rating of Moderate appears well identified given the technical assistance and small-scale investment within existing productive land parcels.

c) We note that FAO has attached Environmental and Social Safeguard Screening document. An overall ESS risk is classified as Moderate. Both FAO?s Environmental and Social (E&S) Management Plan and Environmental and Social Safeguards in Annex D. Policy requirements (page 44) said E&S risks as Moderate, which appears consistent with the nature of interventions. However, the environmental and social risk in the Key Risks table (page 35) said Low risk. Please make this consistent with Environmental and Social (E&S) Screening Template. The rating under the Environmental and Social risk category (currently low) should be the same as the rating under Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) risk, as per the GEF risk appetite GEF/C.66/13.

Agency Response

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

c) The key risk table has been revised as commented.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2026

Cleared.

April 21, 2026

Yes, the project is aligned with LDFA, specifically with LD-1 and, to a lesser extent, with LD-2. Please adjust Focal Area Elements alignment in the financial annex table.

Agency Response

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

The financial tables, as well as the Alignment section have been revised accordingly to more clearly highlight the project?s contribution to the Land Degradation focal area. Additional text has been included to explicitly reflect alignment with LD-1 and LD-2 objectives, including sustainable land management, land restoration, and land degradation neutrality.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 21, 2026

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2026

Cleared.

April 21, 2026

The project appears to be predominantly aligned with the LD focal area. While BD and CCM co-benefits may be generated, given the size of the investment, the transaction costs associated with tracking these co-benefits are likely to be disproportionately high.

Agency Response

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

The Alignment section has been further clarified to emphasize that the project primarily contributes to the Land Degradation focal area (LD-1 and LD-2), while biodiversity and climate change mitigation benefits are treated as co-benefits in line with the scale and focus of the project.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 21, 2026

Yes.

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 21, 2026

Yes.

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2026

Cleared.

April 21, 2026

It is well noted that agency has provided a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP, annex J). However the SEP should elaborate further on the different roles of stakeholder related to project components and activities, including additional details on the specific NGOs, community-based organizations, farmer and women groups, and project means and resources to engage and consult these in project implementation.

Agency Response

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

To address this comment, the roles of key stakeholder groups, including farmer organizations, women groups, civil society organizations, private sector actors, certification bodies, and public institutions have been specified in the CEO endorsement document.

Updates have been introduced in the Project Rationale and Project description sections to reflect consultation outcomes and clarify stakeholder roles in implementation, capacity building, and knowledge dissemination. Component 2 has also been revised to better describe how stakeholders, including local communities and private sector actors, will be actively engaged through mechanisms such as Farmer Field Schools, training programmes, advisory services, and digital platforms.

These revisions build on an extensive consultation process, including field-based current situation analyses conducted in selected provinces and documented through technical reports, as well as a multi-stakeholder Project Preparation Workshop held in Diyarbak?r with participation from 11 provinces. These processes enabled the systematic identification of stakeholder roles, local priorities, and engagement approaches, which are now reflected in the revised project design.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 21, 2026

Yes.

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 21, 2026

Yes, the remaining STAR under LDFA, BDFA and CCMFA are utilised.

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response
8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)
a) Is PPG reimbursement requested and if so, is it within the eligible cap of USD 50,000?
b) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2026

Cleared.

April 21, 2026

a) Yes, the PPG reimbursement is requested and it is under the cap of $50,000.

b) No. Please include the details of the activities implemented during the PPG phase to better assess the validity of each.

Agency Response

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

The PPG activities, along with the associated budget costs are detailed.
8.3 Source of Funds
Does the sources of funds table match with the OFP?s LOE? Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country?s STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 21, 2026

Yes,

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines? e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 21, 2026

Yes.

Agency Response

Annex B: Endorsements

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2026

Cleared. The LoE has been updated, signed by the current OFP.

April 21, 2026

Yes, However, the LoE need to be updated to reflect the correct executing entity.

Please obtain a new LOE signed from T?rkiye?s current OFP - we must review the financial tables *vis-a-vis* the new LoE.

Additionally, the template utilized for this project by the OFP removed the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: ?Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate?. Per the email sent back in March when we were aiming to constitute June 2023 Work Program, Agencies were informed that LoEs ?with modifications cannot be accepted and will be returned?. While the removal of the footnote seems to be trivial, it is not: this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project.

Agency Response

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

The updated LoE has been uploaded to the package.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2026

Cleared. The LoE has been updated.

April 21, 2026

Yes, However, the LoE need to be updated to reflect the correct executing entity.

Agency Response

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

The updated LoE has been uploaded to the package.
c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 21, 2026

Yes.

Agency Response
8.6 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project before the PIF submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response
Annex C: Project Results Framework
8.7 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?
b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of the budget (too high? Too low?)
c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?
d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2025

Cleared. b) It is noted that the targets have been revised upwards.

April 21, 2026

a) Yes.

b) the targets under the CI3 and 4.3 seem on the lower side.

c) Yes.

d) Yes.

Agency Response

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

b) RF has been revised with the updated CIs.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates
8.8 Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the project interventions will take place ?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 21, 2026

Yes.

Agency Response

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Screen and Rating
8.9 Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2026

Cleared. The updates on consultation process are noted.

April 21, 2026

We note that FAO has attached Environmental and Social Safeguard Screening document. An overall ESS risk is classified as Moderate.

1. Please clarify how FAO had consultations with local communities, particularly the vulnerable groups including small scale farmers to define priority and needs of the project, and environmental and social risks screening, and how the results of consultations were integrated into the project design.
2. Please consider local communities not only as beneficiaries, but also as project partners throughout the project implementation.
3. Please also consider respecting local governance and local knowledge and supporting local communities? capacity building as a part of the project.

Agency Response

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

The project description has been updated under Paragraph 75 and 91 to further clarify the consultation process, including the active involvement of local communities and vulnerable groups such as small-scale farmers and women through field visits, stakeholder workshops, and participatory meetings. These consultations were conducted through structured preparatory activities, including a field-based current situation analysis in selected provinces and a multi-stakeholder project preparation workshop involving representatives from 11 provinces, where key challenges, needs, and priorities were jointly identified and documented.

These updates have been incorporated in the Project Rationale and Description - Stakeholder Engagement sections, where additional text has been added to reflect the consultation process and its contribution to the identification of priorities and risks.

Furthermore, the project components have been updated to reflect the role of local communities in implementation, including their engagement as active partners and the integration of local knowledge and capacity-building activities.

In addition, the project has been strengthened to explicitly recognize local communities as active partners throughout implementation. The role of local governance structures, particularly provincial and district Directorates of Agriculture and Forestry, has been further emphasized, along with the integration of local knowledge and targeted capacity-building activities to ensure sustainability.

Annex G: GEF Budget template

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 13,2026

Addressed. Cleared.

May 13, 2026

Budget table: 1.' terminal report' budget items still appear in the budget table under "Contractual Services" section of the budget. Please note, that terminal report cost should be recovered from the Agency fee.

2-4 Cleared.

May 11, 2026

Budget Table: Please note that the budget line ?Terminal Report? is an ineligible cost. Any project closing documents are the responsibility of the Agency; costs are to be recovered from the Agency fee and not the project budget. Please remove this cost.

1. Please consolidate ?Other Operating Costs? into one section; it is currently divided in two.

3. Please re-categorize the line ?Agricultural Production Inputs (including demonstrations) (2.2.1)? as this is not the appropriate Expenditure Category. Depending on what inputs are envisioned, it may be suitable under ?Goods,? which may include Equipment, or ?Works?. Please also add more detail for this line; it represents some 37% of the total project cost.
4. Please re-categorize the costs related to vehicle rental to the ?Vehicles? category.

May 5, 2026

Cleared. All comments have been addressed.

April 21, 2026

a) No. Please use the template included in Annex 7 of the Guidelines (accessible here) ? the categories formatting including subtotals must be exactly followed.

b) Please avoid generic wording (etc) and provide concrete, itemized details.

Office operation (stationeries, internet, office transportation costs, & other utilities, etc.) for the project					34,868	34,868	DKM
6300 Sub-total GOE budget	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**34,868**	**34,868**	

c) Yes.

Agency Response

Agency response - 13 May 2026:

Comment addressed in the revised budget.

Agency response - 13 May 2026:

1. Preparation of the Project Terminal Report is a part of the project's monitoring, reporting, knowledge management and dissemination work. This is separate from the closing documents that FAO prepares to submit to GEF which is covered through the Agency fee. The Project Terminal Report is a consolidated document that highlights the achievements, lessons learned, follow-up actions for the stakeholders and is used as a communication/outreach document in trying to ensure the sustainability and upscaling of projects' results.

The associated budget allocation covers the processing, finalization and dissemination of the terminal report that is among FAO's quality assurance activities that are included in the project's budget; similar to quality assurance activities to ensure the compliance and proper performance of executive functions, such as audit and spot-check costs.

2. The comment has been addressed by consolidating the mentioned lines under "Other operating costs" budget line. Please see the updated budget.
3. The "Agricultural Production Input" budget line has been detailed and recategorized under "Goods" budget category, as per the comment. This budget line reflects the costs of pilot demonstrations and field-level applications which constitute the core implementation mechanism of the project. The successful achievement of the project objectives, particularly the adoption and scaling-up of GAP-compliant and sustainable land management practices by smallholder farmers, is highly dependent on these practical interventions and demonstration activities.
4. The rental vehicle related costs are categorized under "Vehicles" line.

Agency response - 01 May 2026:

a-b) The budget has been revised to address both comments.
Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes
8.11 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.
b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.
c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Additional Annexes
9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 13, 2026

All comments have been addressed. Cleared.

May 13, 2026

1. Not cleared. Please revise the section to clearly state that FAO will not hold a vote on the PSC.

2. Budget table: 1. 'Terminal report/ budget items still appear in the budget table under "Contractual Services" section of the budget. Please note, that terminal evaluation cost should be recovered from the Agency fee. 2-4 Cleared.

May 11, 2026

1. Institutional Arrangements *(previous comment not addressed):* Pursuant to the interim CEO's letter to Agency coordinators on 19 March 2026, please confirm in the CEO Approval document that FAO will participate in the Project Steering Committee (PSC) but will not be a voting member. The section ?Coordination with other initiatives? states that FAO is a full member of the Project Steering Committee, but there is no indication that it lacks voting rights. Please revise the section to clearly state that FAO will not hold a vote on the PSC.

2. Budget Table:

    1. Please note that the budget line ?Terminal Report? is an ineligible cost. Any project closing documents are the responsibility of the Agency; costs are to be recovered from the Agency fee and not the project budget. Please remove this cost.
    2. Please consolidate ?Other Operating Costs? into one section; it is currently divided in two.

    3. Please re-categorize the line ?Agricultural Production Inputs (including demonstrations) (2.2.1)? as this is not the appropriate Expenditure Category. Depending on what inputs are envisioned, it may be suitable under ?Goods,? which may include Equipment, or ?Works?. Please also add more detail for this line; it represents some 37% of the total project cost.
    4. Please re-categorize the costs related to vehicle rental to the ?Vehicles? category.

May 5, 2026

PM recommends CEO Approval.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/21/2026	5/1/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)		5/13/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)		5/13/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		