



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9586		
Country/Region:	Turkey		
Project Title:	Contributing to Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) Target Setting by Demonstrating the LDN Approach in the Upper Sakarya Basin for Scaling up at National Level		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-3 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,388,584
Co-financing:	\$13,600,000	Total Project Cost:	\$15,988,584
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2017
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Peter Pechacek,

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	08/26/2016 UA: Yes. Aligned with LD-3, Program 4.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	08/26/2016 UA: Yes. Fully consistent with latest COP decisions on the LDN concept and LDN target 15.3 as well as the "Ankara Initiative".	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental	08/26/2016 UA: Yes.	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	08/26/2016 UA: Yes. The project is based on a solid and varied baseline with regard to Turkey's efforts to combating land degradation.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	08/26/2016 UA: Yes.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	08/26/2016 UA: Yes.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	08/26/2016 UA: Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	08/26/2016 UA: Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	08/26/2016 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO clearance.	
Review Date	Review	August 26, 2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)		