



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	5434		
Country/Region:	Turkey		
Project Title:	Alignment of National Action Programs with the UNCCD 10-year Strategy and Reporting Process		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$136,986
Co-financing:	\$146,000	Total Project Cost:	\$282,986
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Ekrem Yazici

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?*	Yes. Letter dated 25.12.2012, signed by GEF OFP Turkey, Dr. Akca.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	Yes.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?*	Yes.
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	n/a
	• the focal area allocation?	n/a
	• focal area set-aside?	Yes. This is an enabling activity.
	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	Yes.

Project Consistency		
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	LD-4
	8. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes.
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes.
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Question: Expected Output 2.2 refers to the second leg of the forth reporting and review process - is this still the case considering that its already May 2013? June 12, 2013 UA: Addressed. Cleared
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	No. Please include gender considerations in the proposal. June 12, 2013 UA: Has been included. Cleared
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes. Within stakeholder consultations.
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes.
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes.
	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?	No. Please clearly specify "other items" in Table D.

Project Financing		Other items have been specified as "operational and administrative expenses". While this is not very specific, it is considered justified in view of the small amount that is being requested (\$7.700).
	16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes.
	17. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes.
	18. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	Yes.
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	Yes.
	20. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for financial management and procurement assessment.	
Agency Responses	21. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	• STAP?	n/a
	• Convention Secretariat?	n/a
	• Other GEF Agencies?	n/a

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	22. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	21 May 2013 UA: Not yet. Please respond to questions raised in the review and resubmit. 12 June 2013 UA: Yes. The Enabling Activity project is recommended for CEO approval.
Review Date (s)	First review**	May 21, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 12, 2013
	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.**