



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5657		
Country/Region:	Turkey		
Project Title:	Conservation and Sustainable Management of the Steppe Ecosystems		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$91,324	Project Grant:	\$2,328,767
Co-financing:	\$8,730,000	Total Project Cost:	\$11,150,091
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	March 03, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Ekrem Yazici

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	12-19-13 Yes. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	12-19-13 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP for \$2.65M. The letter is not dated. Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	12-19-13 Yes. The project is for \$2.6M and the BD Balance in GEF-5 is \$2.9M. Cleared	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	12-19-13 Yes. The project is for \$2.6M and the BD Balance in GEF-5 is \$2.9M. Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	12-19-13 Yes. Aichi Target 1. Also 4,14,19 Cleared	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	12-19-13 Yes. The NBSAP of 2007, the NCSA, and the National and Rural Development Plans. Cleared	
	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	12-19-13 Please elaborate on the baseline projects in support of Component 2. The baseline projects are those that will take place whether or not the GEF grant is approved. Are there any Government plans to streamline biodiversity into the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>agricultural sector in the study area or do the plans go against the objective of this GEF project (i.e. investments in agri-business at large scale)?</p> <p>A bit more focus on the baseline projects in support of Component 1 would be also desirable. Are there any Government Plans to support the creation and management of the protected areas targeted by this GEF project? If not, please concentrate on the more generic support provided by the Government, which is already included in the PIF.</p> <p>1-28-14 Cleared</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>12-19-13</p> <p>Component 2. The outputs need to relate to the specific activities to streamline biodiversity into the productive sectors. Please refer the productive sectors that operate in the future buffer zones and craft outputs that are sector-specific. According to the PIF the main productive activity is agriculture. As currently presented, these outputs could be used for any other project on mainstreaming.</p> <p>Component 3. The outcome and outputs are too wide, especially considering the financial resources. It is very unlikely that with \$600K from GEF resources, the project will result in improved management of more than 2 million ha of steppe ecosystem and increased capacity of 750 staff. Please consider narrowing the geographic and/or thematic scope of</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		the component. 1-28-14 Cleared	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	12-19-13 Cleared	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	12-19-13 Cleared	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	12-19-13 Please consider and elaborate on the risk of not being able to provide benefits and opportunities for the communities around the proposed new protected area and in the buffer zones of the new and existing protected area to be targeted by the project. What are the proposed alternatives for those engaged in agricultural development? 1-28-14 Cleared	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country	12-19-13 Coordination is fine. For Item B.3 in the PIF template, please	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	or in the region?	make specific reference to FAO's track record in the creation and management of Protected Areas at the country, regional or global levels. 1-28-14 Cleared	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	12-19-13 Regarding sustainability. Is the Government willing to absorb the recurrent costs for the management of the PA? is there additional physical space and willingness to increase the PA state in this ecosystem(replication)? 1-28-14 Cleared	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes	12-19-13 Yes Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	and outputs?		
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	12-19-13 Co-financing provided by the two Ministries executing the project and the GEF Agency. Cleared	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	12-19-13 Yes. It is less than 5%. Cleared	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	12-19-13 Cleared	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	No. Please address outstanding issues under items 6,7,11,12 and 13. Thanks. 1-28-14 Yes. This PIF is recommended for approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	December 19, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 28, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.