



# REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

**PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT**

**TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND**

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Sustainable Land Management and Climate-Friendly Agriculture</b>		
<b>Country:</b>	<b>Turkey</b>	<b>GEF Project ID:</b>	4583
<b>GEF Agency:</b>	<b>FAO</b>	<b>GEF Agency Project ID:</b>	613134
<b>Other Executing Partner(s):</b>	Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs (MFWA) and Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (MFAL)	<b>Submission Date:</b>	October 03, 2014
<b>GEF Focal Area (s):</b>	Multi Focal Area	<b>Project Duration (months):</b>	48
<b>Name of parent program (if applicable):</b> ➤ For SFM <input type="checkbox"/>		<b>Agency Fee:</b>	575,000

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>1</sup>

<b>Focal Area Objectives</b>	<b>Expected FA Outcomes</b>	<b>Expected FA Outputs</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Grant Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Co-financing (\$)</b>
<b>LD-1</b>	<b>Outcome 1.1:</b> An enhanced enabling environment within the agricultural sector	<b>Output 1.1:</b> National policies that guarantee smallholder and community tenure security <b>Output 1.2:</b> Types of Innovative SL/WM practices introduced at field level <b>Output 1.3:</b> Suitable SL/WM interventions to increase vegetative cover in agro-ecosystems <b>Output 1.5:</b> Information on SLM technologies and good practice guidelines disseminated	GEFTF	1,083,000	3,000,000
	<b>Outcome 1.2:</b> Improved agricultural management			1,624,500	5,150,000
<b>CCM-1</b>	<b>Outcome 1.1:</b> Technologies successfully demonstrated, deployed, and transferred	<b>Output 1.1:</b> Innovative low-carbon technologies successfully demonstrated	GEFTF	969,432	4,370,000
<b>CCM-5</b>	<b>Outcome 5.1:</b> Good management practices in LULUCF adopted both within the forest land and in the wider landscape <b>Outcome 5.2:</b> Restoration and enhancement of carbon stocks in forests and non-forest lands	<b>Output 5.1:</b> Carbon stock monitoring system established  <b>Output 5.2:</b> Forests and non-forest lands under good management practices		484,716	2,120,000
				484,716	2,120,000
<b>BD-2</b>	<b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Increase in sustainably managed landscapes that integrate biodiversity conservation	<b>Output 2.2</b> National and sub-national land-use plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation	GEFTF	816,136	3,340,000
<b>Sub total</b>				<b>5,462,500</b>	<b>20,100,000</b>
<b>Project Management Costs</b>				<b>287,500</b>	<b>2,200,000</b>
<b>Total project costs</b>				<b>5,750,000</b>	<b>22,300,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

## B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

<b>Project Objective: To improve agriculture and forest land use management through the diffusion and adoption of low-carbon technologies with win-win benefits in land degradation, climate change, and biodiversity conservation and increased farm profitability and forest productivity.</b>						
<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Grant Type</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>Expected Outputs</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Grant Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Confirmed Co-financing (\$)</b>
Component 1: Rehabilitation of degraded forest and rangeland	TA/ INV	<p>Outcome 1: Degraded forest and rangelands rehabilitated and management practices improved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 78-105,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq mitigated</li> <li>- 20,000 hectares of rehabilitated forest land sequestering 50,000 tons of CO<sub>2</sub></li> <li>- 6,680 hectares of protected habitat managed under ecological restoration plan</li> </ul>	<p>Output 1.1: Innovative rehabilitation technologies and practices introduced.</p> <p>Output 1.2: Decision-making tools for range and forest lands established and delivering SLM, BD, and CC benefits</p>	GEFTF	2,171,500	10,300,000
Component 2: Climate Smart Agriculture	TA/ INV	<p>Outcome 2: Capacities built to apply climate smart agriculture techniques across productive landscapes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 40-50,000 ha under conservation agriculture practices</li> <li>- 18-22,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq reduced</li> <li>- 9,900 tons CH<sub>4</sub> emissions reduced</li> <li>- 50 livestock/poultry producers and 10,000 head of livestock contributing to digesters</li> </ul>	<p>Output 2.1: Innovative agricultural land rehabilitation technologies introduced</p> <p>Output 2.2: Innovative methane capture and agriculture production technologies demonstrated</p>	GEFTF	2,372,500	9,300,000
Component 3: Enabling legal, policy and institutional environment for sustainable land management	TA	<p>Outcome 3: Enabling legal, policy and institutional environment for sustainable land management strengthened</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 500 farm and/or ranch households adopting new practices that support biodiversity conservation, SLM and climate change mitigation</li> </ul>	<p>Output 3.1: Institutional integrated management capacity building programme established for national and local level decision-makers</p> <p>Output 3.2: Comprehensive SLM and CSA extension and awareness programme emplaced</p> <p>Output 3.3: Project monitoring and carbon monitoring system</p>	GEFTF	881,000	500,000

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1250 FFS members (750 males and 500 females)</li> <li>- Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management score of 2</li> <li>- Forest policy enhancement score of 3</li> <li>- Agriculture policy enhancement score of 3</li> <li>- 1 pilot site level policy framework operationalized to integrate SLM, BD and CC based land use planning across productive landscapes</li> <li>- 1 national monitoring program for CC, BC and SLM</li> </ul>	based on EX-ACT established			
Subtotal					5,425,000	20,100,000
Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>2</sup>				GEFTF	325,000	2,200,000
<b>Total project costs</b>					<b>5,750,000</b>	<b>22,300,000</b>

### C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Sources of Co-financing for baseline project	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
Turkish Government	MFWA	In-kind	1,000,000
Turkish Government	MFWA	Cash	9,100,000
Turkish Government	MFAL	In-kind	1,000,000
Turkish Government	MFAL	Cash	7,700,000
GEF IA	FAO	Cash	500,000
GEF IA	FAO	In-kind	200,000
Private Sector	Konya Sugar	Cash	1,000,000
Civil Society	Nature Conservation Centre	Cash	1,600,000

<sup>2</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below

Civil Society	Nature Conservation Centre	In-kind	200,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>22,300,000</b>

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>**

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Funds	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Project amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c=a+b
FAO	GEF	CC	Turkey	2,040,909	204,091	2,245,000
FAO	GEF	BD	Turkey	859,091	85,909	945,000
FAO	GEF	LD	Turkey	2,850,000	285,000	3,135,000
<b>Total GEF Resources (excluding project preparation)</b>				<b>5,750,000</b>	<b>575,000</b>	<b>6,325,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

**F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	55,000	0	55,000
National/Local Consultants	454,000	0	454,000

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? N/A**

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### **A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>3</sup>**

- A.1. National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc

No change

- A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

No change.

- A.3. The GEF Agency's comparative advantage.

No change.

- A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address.

The attached Project Document at Section 1 provides substantially more detailed analysis than covered in the PIF. However, there are no significant changes. Primary threats identified include land degradation, climate change, and biodiversity loss due to unsustainable practices related to cultivation, water use, agricultural waste management, grazing, and forest management. (See Project Document, Section 1.1, (B)) Substantial investment in forestry and agriculture occurs under the baseline. However, almost none of this investment addresses the pressing issues related to LD, BD, and CC. There are no examples of integrated approaches designed to maintain ecosystem-integrity and deliver climate change benefits. There three barriers that contribute to the persistence of these challenges. Barrier #1: Minimal experience with participatory and integrated land use planning and implementation approaches on the ground. Barrier #2: Famers under-exposed to new innovative low carbon technologies for farming and farm waste management. Barrier #3: Inadequate enabling environment (legal, regulatory and institutional framework) and capacity for sustainable land management. (See Project Document, Section 1.1.1 (B)). Each of these barriers will be addressed with the proposed investment.

- A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project.

No change. The relatively small GEF contribution will catalyze a new era for production that is fully aligned to identify and address SLM, BD, and CC concerns. The final result will deliver immediate and measureable improvements for GHG, species conservation, and land/water degradation. The final result will be a new way of doing business. This new business model will create a holistic approach to agriculture and forest management. Stakeholders at all levels will have the tools and the decision-making pathways required to understand, measure, and regulate the productive landscape as a system rather than disenfranchised sectors. Stakeholders will be capable of strategically determining the long and short-term impacts of natural resource use decisions upon the vitality of overall ecosystem integrity. By project end,

---

<sup>3</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question

the new business model established at the site level will be leveraged to deliver local, regional and national change.

Measureable impacts by outcome include:

Outcome 1: Degraded forest and rangelands rehabilitated and management practices improved

- 20,000 ha of rehabilitated forest lands sequestering 43,000 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>eq per year
- 30,000 ha of range and pastureland rehabilitated 25,000 tCO<sub>2</sub> per year
- 6,680 hectares of protected habitat managed sustainably

Outcome 2. Climate-smart agriculture techniques applied across productive landscapes

- A total of 40-50,000 ha of arable land using conservation agriculture practices
- 23,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq reduced from CA
- 9,900 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq tons CH<sub>4</sub> emissions reduced
- 50 livestock/poultry producers and 10,000 head of livestock contributing to digesters
- Average annual income from crop and livestock production increased from USD \$ 1 073 to \$ 1 341.
- Sustained productivity score of 2

Outcome 3. Enhanced enabling environment for sustainable land management

- 500 farm and/or ranch households adopting new practices that support biodiversity conservation, SLM and climate change mitigation
- 1250 FFS members (750 males and 500 females)
- Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management score of 2
- Forest policy enhancement score of 3
- Agriculture policy enhancement score of 3
- 1 pilot site level policy framework operationalized to integrate SLM, BD and CC based land use planning across productive landscapes
- 1 national monitoring program for CC, BC and SLM

- A.6. Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks.

Several risks – including climate change – were identified and addressed during project design. The primary concern is the potential for a lack of ownership and subsequent lack of sustainability of new technologies and approaches established under the project. This will be mitigated through a very innovative capacity building program and a targeted awareness campaign. The project will apply participatory, empowerment and incentive tools that clearly demonstrate the economic and social benefits of adopting approaches designed to maintain, rather than degrade, ecosystem-integrity.

- A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

The Project Document at 4.1(c) identifies all pending GEF projects and details coordination measures. Through the joint efforts of FAO, the Government of Turkey, and the development team, the project design was fully coordinated with a host of on-going GEF activities. This will be continued through project implementation. The project design emphasizes the capture and dissemination of lessons learned. This

includes making certain that this project appropriately benefits from and contributes to other GEF initiatives.

## **B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

### **B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.**

The preparatory phase of the project placed strong emphasis on stakeholder participation. The project has benefitted from the support of the highest government levels. This includes substantial input, direction and full endorsement from the leaders of each of the germane government agencies at the national and local level. Consultations and group discussions were held with most stakeholders, including national and regional government agencies, NGOs, donors and local stakeholders/resource users in the pilot areas. The final project document was designed with stakeholders' full involvement and thorough vetting by representatives of key organizations. The PPG phase included briefing key government officials regarding project design and urgency. A results framework workshop generated in-depth discussions and agreement regarding project strategy.

This same inclusive approach will be carried forward and amplified during project implementation. Stakeholder involvement is critical to the effective achievement of each project outcome. This will be achieved through the project steering committee (board) that enjoys representation from all major stakeholder organizations. The project will also benefit from local level consultative committees designed specifically to encourage and facilitate more broad-based stakeholder involvement with decision-making. Under each of the Project's components, specific measures will be taken to more fully include resource users impacted by proposed actions within the decision-making process.

For a complete stakeholder involvement plan and extended summary of the institutional context, please see the Project Document at 1.1.3 (Participants and other Stakeholders) and Appendix 8 (policy, regulatory and institutional context).

### **B.2. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):**

This project will deliver substantial national and local level benefits. The number one economic and social risk to this region and many others in Turkey is the unsustainable use of natural resources, particularly soil and water. The rapid advance of resource development unaccompanied by commensurate safeguards is generating a very high level of ecological, social and economic risk. This project has been designed to alleviate all three of these risks. The project will take an ecosystem-based approach that will alleviate business risks (e.g., soil degradation, water loss, deteriorating productivity) while delivering SLM, CC, and biodiversity conservation benefits.

Component 1 will set in place a much more strategic and integrated approach to forest and pastureland management that is based upon holistic ecosystem management principles and practices. The land use planning process set in place under Component 1 will, for the first time, address the issues of range and forest management informed by a cohesive SLM, CC, and biodiversity monitoring program. This will improve forest health, water resources management, and grazing. Each of these represents substantial economic benefits for local stakeholders.

Component 2 will promote dramatic improvements in the agriculture sector that will address CC challenges and drive improvements for SLM and biodiversity. The project will catalyze the creation

a methane digesters that help small and medium sized agro-businesses achieve economies of scale that would otherwise not be possible. This integrated approach will deliver global benefits, lower the cost of business, reduce the financial risks associated with unsustainable agricultural approaches, and increase long-term production.

Component 3 will improve regulatory and institutional frameworks so that these benefit from internationally and nationally proven best principles and practices related to the management of the productive landscape. This approach will promote, rather than degrade, ecosystem integrity and deliver global benefits. The Farmer Field Schools will result in organized extension approaches better organized to deliver lessons to drive conservation and production improvements. Fitting the Farmer Field Schools within each of the project components and using the various activities and outputs to build the short and long-term capacity of both government extension officers and farmer field school participants represents a major innovation. These activities will also clearly enhance the stability and productivity of private farming operations.

Issues of gender are critical, particularly since this project will be taking place in rural areas where women are highly involved in contributing labor that is often under-valued. The project has dedicated special attention to gender, including establishing special women cohort components within the farmer field schools to be established, building the capacities of extension workers to identify and alleviate challenges related to gender, and the design of decision-making structures that will be fully gender neutral.

### B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

During project design, several alternative scenarios were considered from the point of view of cost-effectiveness. These included extensive purchase of hardware and other tactical equipment, construction of major facilities for administration and agriculture and expensive international training programs. Stakeholders eventually abandoned these options after carefully considering conservation priorities relevant to a limited budget. In the end, the highly precise and, therefore, cost-effective investment rested on a number of principles, each integrated within the activities and expenditures of this proposed project. The relatively small investment is targeted to catalyze a substantial course change. This project represents a total GEF investment of approximately US\$ 5.7 million. The well-crafted and targeted GEF investment will re-align nearly the entire baseline to strategically support the achievement of ecosystem-based conservation objectives. The result is a relatively small amount of financing potentially will leverage the long-term conservation of critical landscapes and associated global benefits. Paramount was the desire to build the regulatory, management and financial capacity required for Turkey to independently maintain effective conservation efforts. For instance, the project's limited investment will help to create capacity and decision-making pathways that enable local governments to use revenues to make pro-conservation investments rather than ill-advised and unsustainable short-term investments. This catalytic effect coupled with the objective of sustainability makes the GEF investment highly cost-effective.

## **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:**

### Oversight and monitoring responsibilities

Monitoring and evaluation of progress in achieving project results and objectives will be done based on the targets and indicators established in the Project Results Framework. Monitoring and



evaluation activities will follow FAO and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines. The project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan has been budgeted at USD \$182,000 (see Table below).

At the initiation of implementation of the GEF Project, the NPIU will set up a project progress monitoring system. Participatory mechanisms and methodologies for systematic data collection and recording will be developed in support of outcome and output indicator monitoring and evaluation. During the inception workshop M&E related tasks to be addressed will include: (i) presentation and clarification (if needed) of the project's Results framework with all project stakeholders; (ii) review of the M&E indicators and their baseline; (iii) drafting the required clauses to include in consultants' contracts to ensure they complete their M&E reporting functions (if relevant); and (iv) clarification of the respective M&E tasks among the Project's different stakeholders. One of the main outputs of the workshop will be a detailed monitoring plan agreed to by all stakeholders based on the monitoring and evaluation plan summary.

The day-to-day monitoring of the Project implementation will be the responsibility of the PMO driven by the preparation and implementation of an AWP/B followed up through six-monthly PPRs. The preparation of the AWP/B and six-monthly PPRs will represent the product of a unified planning process between main project partners. As tools for results-based-management (RBM), the AWP/B will identify the actions proposed for the coming project year and provide the necessary details on output targets to be achieved, and the PPRs will report on the monitoring of the implementation of actions and the achievement of output targets. NR-specific inputs to the AWP/B and the PPRs will be prepared based on participatory planning and progress review with local stakeholders and coordinated through the PMO and facilitated through project planning and progress review workshops. An annual project progress review and planning meeting should be held. Subsequently the AWP/B and PPRs are submitted to the PSC for approval (AWP/B) and Review (PPRs) and to FAO for approval. The AWP/B will be developed in a manner consistent with the project's Results Framework to ensure adequate fulfillment and monitoring of project outputs and outcomes.

Following the approval of the Project, the project's first year AWP/B will be adjusted (either reduced or expanded in time) to synchronize it with an annual reporting calendar. In subsequent years, the FSP work plan and budget will follow an annual preparation and reporting cycle.

#### Indicators and information sources

To monitor project outputs and outcomes including contributions to global environmental benefits specific indicators have been established in the Results Framework. The framework's indicators and means of verification will be applied to monitor both project performance and impact. Following FAO's monitoring procedures and progress reporting formats data collected will be of sufficient detail to be able to track specific outputs and outcomes and flag project risks early on. Output target indicators will be monitored on a six-monthly basis and outcome target indicators will be monitored on an annual basis if possible or as part of the mid-term and final evaluations. The project output and outcome indicators have been designed to monitor on-the-ground impacts and progress in building and consolidating capacities.

The main sources of information to support the M&E program will be: (i) participative progress monitoring and workshops with beneficiaries; (ii) on-site monitoring of implementation; (iii) project progress reports prepared by the PMO; (iv) consultants reports; (v) participants training tests and evaluations; (vi) mid-term and final evaluations completed by independent consultants; (vii) financial reports and budget revisions; (viii) Project Implementation Reviews prepared by the FAO Lead

Technical Officer supported by the Project Task Manager in the FAO Office in Ankara and the PMO; (viii) FAO supervision mission reports; and (ix) post project impact and evaluation studies.

## Reports and their schedule

Specific reports that will be prepared under the M&E program are: (i) Project inception report; (ii) project implementation strategy; (iii) Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B); (iv) Project Progress Reports (PPRs); (v) annual Project Implementation Review (PIR); (vi) Technical Reports; (vii) co-financing Reports; and (viii) Terminal Report. In addition, assessment of the GEF Monitoring Evaluation Tracking Tools (METTs) against the baseline (completed during project preparation) will be required at midterm and final project evaluation.

**Project Inception Report.** After FAO approval of the project and signature of the GCP agreement between FAO and Turkey, an inception workshop will be held. Immediately after the workshop, PMO will prepare a project inception report in consultation with the FAO Project Task Manager and other project partners. The report will include a narrative on the institutional roles and responsibilities and coordinating action of project partners, progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may affect project implementation. It will also include a detailed first year AWP/B, a detailed project monitoring plan based on the monitoring and evaluation plan summary presented in section 4.5.4 below, and a progress and completion report on all actions agreed in the mitigation plan of fiduciary risks (as referred to in section 3.2.2). The draft inception report will be circulated to FAO and the PSC for review and comments before its finalization, no later than three months after project start-up. The report should be cleared by the FAO Ankara, LTO, LTU and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit and uploaded in FPMIS by the LTO.

**Project Implementation Workplan:** Immediately following the inception workshop, the project will be tasked with generating a strategic workplan. The workplan will outline the general timeframe for completion of key project outputs and achievement of outcomes. The workplan will map and help guide project activity from inception to completion. To ensure smooth transition between project design and inception, the inception workshop and work planning process will benefit from the input of parties responsible for the design of the original project, including as appropriate relevant technical advisors.

**Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B).** PMO will submit to the FAO Representation in Turkey a draft Annual Work Plan and Budget no later than 10 January. The AWP/B should include detailed activities to be implemented by project outputs and divided into monthly timeframes and targets and milestone dates for output indicators to be achieved during the year. A detailed project budget for the activities to be implemented during the year should also be included together with all monitoring and supervision activities required during the year. The draft AWP/B is circulated to and reviewed by the FAO Project Task Force, DWP/PMO incorporates eventual comments and the final AWP/B is sent to the PSC for approval and to the FAO for final no-objection and upload in FPMIS by the GEF Coordination Unit. (See AWP/B format in Execution Agreement Annex 4.B)

**Project Progress Reports (PPR):** PMO will prepare six-monthly PPRs and submit them to the FAO Representation in Turkey no later than July 15 (covering the period January through June) and 15 January (covering the period July through December). The 1st semester six months report should be accompanied by the updated AWP/B, for review and no-objection by FAO. The PPR are used to identify constraints, problems or bottlenecks that impede timely implementation and take appropriate remedial action. PPRs will be prepared based on the systematic monitoring of output and outcome

indicators identified in the project's Results Framework Appendix 1). The FAO Project Task Manager will review the progress reports and collect and consolidate eventual FAO comments from the LTO, LTU, the GEF Coordination Unit, and the Budget Holder Office and provide these comments to the DWP/PMO. When comments have been duly incorporated the LTO will give final approval and submit the final PPR to the GEF coordination Unit for final clearance and upload in FPMIS.

**Annual Project Implementation Review (PIR):** The LTO supported by the LTU and the FAO Project Task Manager and with inputs from the PMO, will prepare an annual PIR covering the period July (the previous year) through June (current year) to be submitted to the GEF Coordination Unit for review and approval no later than 31 July. The GEF Coordination will upload the final report on FAO FPMIS and submit it to the GEF Secretariat and Evaluation Office as part of the Annual Monitoring Review report of the FAO-GEF portfolio. The GEF Coordination Unit will provide the updated format when the first PIR is due.

**Technical Reports:** Technical reports will be prepared as part of project outputs and to document and share project outcomes and lessons learned. The drafts of any technical reports must be submitted by PMO to the FAO Representation in Turkey who will share it with the LTO and LTU for review and clearance and to the GEF Coordination Unit for information and eventual comments, prior to finalization and publication. Copies of the technical reports will be distributed to the PSC and other project partners as appropriate. The final reports will be posted on the FAO FPMIS by the LTO.

**Co-financing Reports:** PMO will be responsible for collecting the required information and reporting on in-kind and cash co-financing provided. PMO will submit the report to the FAO Representation in Turkey in a timely manner on or before 31 July covering the period July (the previous year) through June (current year).

**GEF Tracking Tools:** Following the GEF policies and procedures, necessary tracking tools will be submitted at three moments: (i) with the project document at CEO endorsement; (ii) at the project's mid-term evaluation; and (iii) with the project's final evaluation or final completion report.

**Terminal Report:** Within two months before the end date of the Execution Agreement PMO will submit to the FAO Representation in Turkey a draft Terminal Report. The main purpose of the final report is to give guidance at ministerial or senior government level on the policy decisions required for the follow-up of the Project, and to provide the donor with information on how the funds were utilized. The terminal report is accordingly a concise account of the main products, results, conclusions and recommendations of the Project, without unnecessary background, narrative or technical details. The target readership consists of persons who are not necessarily technical specialists but who need to understand the policy implications of technical findings and needs for insuring sustainability of project results. Work is assessed, lessons learned are summarized, and recommendations are expressed in terms of their application of best principles and practices within the context of national priorities as well as in practical execution terms. This report will specifically include the findings of the final evaluation. A final project review meeting should be held to discuss the draft terminal report before it is finalized by the PMO and approved by the FAO LTO, LTU and the GEF Coordination Unit.

#### Provision for evaluations

An independent Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) will be undertaken during project months 23 and 24. The MTE will review progress and effectiveness of implementation in terms of achieving project objective, outcomes and outputs. Findings and recommendations of this evaluation will be

instrumental for bringing improvement in the overall project design and execution strategy for the remaining period of the project's term if necessary. FAO will arrange for the MTE in consultation with project management.

The evaluation will, inter alia: (i) review the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; (ii) analyse effectiveness of partnership arrangements; (iii) identify issues requiring decisions and remedial actions; (iv) propose any mid-course corrections and/or adjustments to the implementation strategy as necessary; and (v) highlight technical achievements and lessons learned derived from project design, implementation and management.

An independent Final Evaluation (FE) will be completed by project month 46. The FE will identify the project impacts and sustainability of project results and the degree of achievement of long-term results. This Evaluation will indicate future actions needed to sustain project results, expand on the existing Project in subsequent phases, mainstream and up-scale its products and practices, and disseminate information to responsible management authorities to assure continuity of the processes initiated by the Project.

The FAO Project Task Manager will prepare the first draft of the Terms of Reference for the mid-term and the final evaluations and consult with and incorporate comments from key project partners, including the FAO budget holder, the FAO Lead Technical Unit and Officer, and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit. Subsequently the TORs will be sent to the FAO Office of Evaluation for finalization, in accordance with FAO evaluation procedures and taking into consideration evolving guidance from the GEF Evaluation Office.

#### Communication of project results and visibility

Giving high visibility to the project and ensuring effective communications in support of the project's message has been addressed in a number of activities that have been incorporated into its design. The project will sponsor a series of quarterly workshops with the KCB to discuss on-going project activities. During these workshops, key stakeholders from both the private and public sector will report on their personal involvement with project related activities. Members of the press will be invited to key events such as workshops, field trips, and monitoring programs. The project will be creating farmer field schools through the pilot areas. Each of these schools will be using project generated information materials, further enhancing project visibility within the KCB and greater Turkey. The project will launch a website. The site will be designed as an information and learning portal. The project will sponsor several national and regional policy meetings and workshops. The project will have inception, mid-term and final results meetings at the pilot site, KCB, and Ankara levels. These events will expose mid and high-level decision makers to the project activities and results.

## Monitoring and evaluation plan summary

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Budgeted costs
Inception Workshop	PMO, FAO Project Task Manager (PTM) supported by the FAO LTO, BH, and the GEF Coordination Unit	Within two months of project start up	US\$ 19,000
Project Inception Report	PMO, FAO PTM cleared by FAO LTO, LTU, and the GEF Coordination Unit	Immediately after workshop	Covered under PMO responsibilities, valued at \$2,000
Field based impact monitoring	PMO and relevant line agencies.	Continually	US\$ 70,000, for national consultant
Supervision visits and rating of progress in PPRs and PIRs	PMO, FAO LTO/LTU and GEF Coordination Unit	Annual or as required	The visits of the FAO LTU and the GEF Coordination Unit will be paid by GEF agency fee. The visits of the PMO will be paid from the project travel budget
Project Progress Reports	PMO, with inputs from project partners	Six-monthly	Covered under PMO responsibilities, valued at US\$ 6,000
Project Implementation Review report	PMO supported by FAO PTM, LTO, LTU, and project partners and cleared and submitted by the GEF Coordination Unit to the GEF Secretariat	Annual	Covered under PMO/PTM responsibilities, valued at US\$10,000.  FAO officers' time cover by GEF agency fee
Co-financing Reports	PMO	Annual	Covered under PMO responsibilities, valued at US\$ 5,000
Technical reports	PMO	As appropriate	
Mid-term Evaluation	External Consultant, FAO independent evaluation unit in consultation with the project team including the GEF Coordination Unit and other partners	Conducted and completed during project months 23 and 24	US\$ 40,000 for external consultant. In addition, either FAO staff time and travel or an additional consultant will be paid through the agency fee
Final evaluation	External Consultant, FAO independent evaluation unit in consultation with the project team including the GEF Coordination Unit and other partners	Conducted and completed during project months 45 and 46	US\$ 40,000 for external consultant. In addition, either FAO staff time and travel or an additional consultant will be paid through the agency fee
Terminal Report	PMO	Completed by project month 47	US\$ 10,000 for national consultant
Total Budget			US\$ 182,000

**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Prof. Dr. Lutfi AKCA	GEF operational Focal Point	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTRY	03/10/2011

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Gustavo Merino Director Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation Department FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153, Rome, Italy <a href="mailto:TCI-Director@fao.org">TCI-Director@fao.org</a>		October 3, 2014	Ekrem Yazici Forestry Officer Subregional office of Central Asia Ivedik Cad. 55, Yenimahalle ANKARA	Tel: +90- 312-307 95 00	ekrem.yazici@fao.org
Jeff Griffin Environment Officer Officer-in-Charge for daily matters GEF Unit Email: <a href="mailto:Jeffrey.Griffin@fao.org">Jeffrey.Griffin@fao.org</a> Tel: +3906 5705 55680					

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Start of Project Baseline	Project Mid-Term Target (if any)	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<b>Project Objective:</b>  To improve agriculture and forest land use management through the diffusion and adoption of low-carbon technologies with win-win benefits in land degradation, climate change, and biodiversity conservation and increased farm profitability and forest productivity.	Land cover delivering global environmental benefits in the project target area as reported in the GEF LD tracking tool	16 650 hectares of vegetative cover  1200 Kg C/ha/year of biomass  30 trees per ha of tree density	30 000 hectares of vegetative cover  1450 Kg C/ha/year of biomass  40 trees per hectare of tree density	60 000 hectares of vegetative cover  1600 Kg C/ha/year of biomass  50 trees per ha of tree density	Independent evaluations  Annual monitoring through EX-ACT tool	High-level ownership by MFWA and MFAL to apply reforms continues  Substantial buy-in from private industry is sustained and expanded
	Avoided emissions and carbon sequestration delivering global environmental benefits in the project target area as reported in the GEF LD and CC tracking tools	20,000 of degraded forest targeted by the project  No arable land under conservation agriculture due to project intervention  No degraded rangelands and pastures under improved management due to project intervention  No methane capture sites developed due to project intervention	10,000 Ha of degraded forest rehabilitated,  20-25,000 ha of arable land under conservation agriculture  15,000 of degraded rangelands and pastures under improved management  8-10,000 tCO <sub>2</sub> -eq avoided from methane capture sites	20,000 Ha of degraded forest rehabilitated, capturing 43,000 tons of CO <sub>2</sub> eq per year  40-50,000 ha of arable land under conservation agriculture, avoiding 23,000 tons of CO <sub>2</sub> eq per year  30,000 ha of degraded rangelands and pastures under improved management capturing 25,000 tons of CO <sub>2</sub> eq per year  8-10,000 tCO <sub>2</sub> -eq avoided from methane capture sites		

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Start of Project Baseline	Project Mid-Term Target (if any)	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	Number of hectares of forest, pasture, and arable land with biodiversity mainstreamed in management practices resulting from project investments at site level	Biodiversity mainstreamed into management practices covering: 0 ha forest 0 ha pasture 0 ha arable land	Biodiversity mainstreamed into management practices covering:  10,000 ha forest 10,000 ha pasture 10,000 ha arable land	Biodiversity mainstreamed into management practices covering:  20,000 ha forest 30,000 ha pasture 30,000 ha arable land		
	Spatial coverage of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes as reported in GEF LD tracking tool	Spatial coverage of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes:  0 million ha agricultural lands 0 million ha pasture lands 0 ha forests	Spatial coverage of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes:  0 million ha agricultural lands 0 million ha pasture lands 0 ha forests	Spatial coverage of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes:  2.2 million ha agricultural lands 1.8 million ha pasture lands 700,000 ha forests		



Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Start of Project Baseline	Project Mid-Term Target (if any)	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Component 1: Rehabilitation of degraded forest and rangeland						
Outcome 1: Degraded forest and rangeland rehabilitated	Total emission reductions resulting from project related forest and rangeland management improvements	0 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq mitigated as a result of improved range and pastureland management	-	66,000 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq mitigated per year as a result of rehabilitated forests and improved range and pastureland management	Project reporting, in particular reports from FFS and from independent certification agents	High-level ownership by MFWA and MFAL to apply reforms continues  Substantial buy-in from private industry is sustained and expanded
	Hectares of rehabilitated forest land sequestering CO2 as a result of project investments	0 ha of rehabilitated forest land sequestering	10,000 ha of forest land rehabilitated	20,000 hectares of forest land rehabilitated	Independent evaluations	
	Hectares of degraded range and pasturelands rehabilitated as a result of project investments	0 ha of range and pastureland rehabilitated	10,000 ha of range and pastureland rehabilitated	30,000 ha of range and pastureland rehabilitated	Monitoring through Ex-Act tool	
	Measureable global biodiversity benefits in the project target area as reported in the GEF LD tracking tool	Wetland in the pilot site is legally protected, but no ecological restoration plan is in place	Ecological restoration plan developed for 6,680 hectares of protected habitat	6,680 hectares of protected habitat managed under ecological restoration plan		
Output 1.1	Innovative rehabilitation technologies and practices introduced					
Output 1.2	Decision-making tools established					

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Start of Project Baseline	Project Mid-Term Target (if any)	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Component 2: Climate Smart Agriculture						
Outcome 2: Capacities built to apply climate smart agriculture techniques across productive landscapes	Total hectares under conservation agricultural practices as a result of project investments	0 hectares under project driven conservation agricultural practices	20,000 hectares under project driven conservation agricultural practices	40-50,000 ha under conservation agriculture practices	Project reporting, in particular Project Implementation Reports and impact evaluation reports	High-level ownership by MFWA and MFAL to apply reforms continues  Substantial buy-in from private industry is sustained and expanded
	Total emissions reduced as a result of project driven conservation agricultural practices	0 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq reduced as a result of project driven conservation agricultural practices	7,000 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq reduced as a result of project driven conservation agricultural practices	23,000 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq reduced as a result of project driven conservation agricultural practices		
	Total amount of GHG emissions reduced as a result of project driven livestock production improvements, including digesters	0 tons CH <sub>4</sub> emissions reduced as a result of project driven livestock production improvements, including digesters	8,000 tons CH <sub>4</sub> emissions reduced as a result of project driven livestock production improvements, including digesters	9,900 tons CH <sub>4</sub> emissions reduced as a result of project driven livestock production improvements, including digesters	Reports from FFS  Independent evaluations  Tracking tools	
	Number of livestock/poultry producers and number of livestock contributing to digesters as a result of project investments	0 livestock/poultry producers and 0 head of livestock contributing to digesters	20 livestock/poultry producers and 2,500 head of livestock contributing to digesters	50 livestock/poultry producers and 10,000 head of livestock contributing to digesters		
	Average annual income from crop and livestock production as reported in GEF LD tracking tool remains constant and/or improves for farmer field school participants <sup>4</sup>	Average annual income of USD \$ 1 073 from crop and livestock production	Average annual income of \$ 1 180 from crop and livestock production	Average annual income of \$ 1 341 from crop and livestock production		
Output 2.1 Innovative agricultural land rehabilitation technologies introduced Output 2.2 Innovative methane capture and agriculture production technologies introduced						

<sup>4</sup> Baseline, mid-term and final targets to be determined during project year one

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Start of Project Baseline	Project Mid-Term Target (if any)	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Component 3: Enabling legal, policy and institutional environment						
Outcome 3: Enabling legal, policy and institutional environment for sustainable land management strengthened	Number of farm and/or ranch households adopting improved practices that support biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change mitigation	Number of farm and/or ranch households adopting new practices that support biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change mitigation: 0	Number of farm and/or ranch households adopting new practices that support biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change mitigation: 150	Number of farm and/or ranch households adopting new practices that support biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change mitigation: 500	Project reporting, in particular Project Implementation Reports, reports evaluating training and awareness raising programs, reports based on Ex-Act implementation and reports from FFS	High-level ownership by MFWA and MFAL to apply reforms continues  Substantial buy-in from private industry is sustained and expanded
	Number of FFS members	Number of FFS members:  0 males 0 females	Number of FFS members:  500 males 250 females	Number of FFS members:  750 males 500 females		
	Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management score as reported in GEF LD tracking tool	Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management score of 1	Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management score of 2	Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management score of 2	Independent evaluations  Tracking tools	
	Forest policy enhancement score as reported in GEF LD tracking tool	Forest policy enhancement score of 2	Forest policy enhancement score of 2	Forest policy enhancement score of 3		
	Agriculture policy enhancement score as reported in GEF LD tracking tool	Agriculture policy enhancement score of 2	Agriculture policy enhancement score of 2	Agriculture policy enhancement score of 3		
	Number of pilot site level policy frameworks operationalized to integrate SLM, BD, and CC based land use planning and monitoring across productive landscapes	0 pilot site level policy frameworks operationalized to integrate SLM, BD, and CC based land use planning and monitoring across productive landscapes	1 pilot site level policy framework operationalized to integrate SLM, BD, and CC based land use planning and monitoring across productive landscapes	1 pilot site level policy framework operationalized to integrate SLM, BD, and CC based land use planning and monitoring across productive landscapes		

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Start of Project Baseline	Project Mid-Term Target (if any)	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	Number of national policy frameworks operationalized to integrate SLM, BD, and CC based land use planning and monitoring across productive landscapes	0 national policy frameworks operationalized to integrate SLM, BD, and CC based land use planning and monitoring across productive landscapes	N/A	1 national policy framework operationalized to integrate SLM, BD, and CC based land use planning and monitoring across productive landscapes		
	Number of national level monitoring programs for CC, BD, and SLM to inform management decision-making	0 national level monitoring programs for CC, BD, and SLM	0 national level monitoring programs for CC, BD, and SLM	1 national level monitoring programs for CC, BD, and SLM		
Output 3.1	Institutional integrated management capacity building programme established for national and local level decision-makers					
Output 3.2	Comprehensive SLM and CSA extension and awareness programme emplaced					
Output 3.3	Project monitoring and carbon monitoring system based on EX-ACT established					

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comments	Response	Reference in documents
<b>Comments from the GEF Council</b>		
<p>Germany appreciates the holistic approach and approves the PIF. Due to the observed tendencies in land use changes it is recommended to include a systematic monitoring of land use into the biodiversity monitoring system in order to better detect on-going conversions of rangelands etc.</p> <p>Germany is currently conducting the project “Sustainable Management of Biodiversity, South Caucasus” in neighbouring Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan, implemented by the German International Cooperation, GIZ. This project has strong linkages to the establishment of biodiversity monitoring systems, SFM and SLM including sustainable rangeland management. We recommend to contact the GIZ regional office in Tbilisi to discuss possible synergies especially on monitoring of biodiversity and land use based on cost-efficient remote sensing technologies as well as restoration of degraded forests and rangelands</p>	<p>GIZ has been engaged as one of the stakeholders for the project to coordinate activities not only in Turkey, but also in the region.</p> <p>A systematic monitoring system specially geared to the conditions of KCB, focusing on its distinctiveness in case of wetlands, will be set up under the project’s components to monitor biodiversity and alleviate future degradation. Interventions will be monitored to be certain they deliver meaningful improvements to ecosystem integrity. This will include biodiversity, climate change, soil productivity and the status and security of water resources.</p> <p>For rangelands, local user groups will be involved by establishing community grazing management. Farmer Field Schools will be provided with hands-on experience in designing, implementing and monitoring grazing and forest management. Implementation of the rehabilitation program will be closely linked with the monitoring and capacity building programs implemented under all three Components. The rehabilitation programs will also be used as a capacity building exercise for government agencies within the KCB to improve institutional and decision-making. Overall, the project aims at generating a working example for biodiversity and ecosystem services monitoring system for production landscapes in Turkey. Data will be gathered, assessed and key zones for biodiversity and ecosystem services will be mapped. Upon this experience, at the end of the project, an ecosystem services centered biodiversity integration system will be developed. So far, this has been missing for arid and semi-arid regions for sectors like agricultural and pasturelands as well as arid forests.</p>	<p>PRODOC, page 31</p> <p>PRODOC, Section 2, Project framework and expected results (pg 40)</p>
<b>Comments from the GEF Secretariat</b>		
n/a (there were no outstanding issues from PIF review)		
<b>Comments from STAP</b>		
Based on this PIF screening, STAP’s advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies): <b>Minor revision required</b>		
In general, the project framework is defined clearly. Nonetheless, STAP recommends reviewing carefully the outcomes and outputs, since these appear to be transposed in many instances (example “2.3 appears to be an outcome and not an output.”).	The project framework has been revised and care has been taken to ensure that there is no overlap or transposition of outcomes and outputs. The results framework is also in line with FAO’s internal guidance on preparing	Annex A of CEO endorsement request

<p>However, STAP recommends strongly identifying indicators for each global benefit during the project development, as well as specifying how the indicators will be measured and monitored during the project implementation. For carbon benefits, FAO's EX-ACT is mentioned briefly in the project framework, but it is not raised further in the proposal “for example, under the incremental reasoning. Therefore, STAP encourages the project developers to specify further the carbon measuring tool(s) that will be used under incremental reasoning, as well as other methods that will serve to track the delivery of the intended biodiversity, land use, and climate benefits.</p>	<p>Impact and outcome indicators have been developed and are available in the Results Framework, including means for verification.</p> <p>Regarding Ex-Act, the output 3.3 focuses on the establishment of a carbon monitoring system based on Ex-Act. Activities will be carried out in the country to train local stakeholders on the use of Ex-Act.</p>	<p>Annex A of CEO endorsement request</p> <p>Results framework and page 50 (output 3.3) of the Project Document</p>
<p>Soil salinity is only very briefly touched upon in the proposal (e.g. one mention in Table on p. 11) and does not appear in either the baseline description or barrier analysis. Yet, problems caused by increasing salinity and salt crusts are commonly reported for the KCB and they require very specific management techniques “see Driessen, P.M. and Schoorl, R (2006). Mineralogy and Morphology of Salt Efflorescence on Saline Soils in the Great Konya Basin, Turkey. J. Soil Science 24(4): 436-442. Salinity is an aspect that has also been noticed to have increased in conjunction with increased abstraction of groundwater and with increasing aridity (climate change) in this already-dry area. STAP suggests that this omission be addressed, especially as it relates closely to climate change..</p>	<p>Soil salinity is a very important issue and has been considered in project design. The text describes the increase in salinity that the region has experienced (page 12-13 of the PRODOC) and describes the types of CSA interventions the project is considering (eg. water harvesting and water-saving systems to reduce water-logging and soil salinity, as well as the use of plant species resistant to drought and salinity). In particular, activities targeting soil salinity are expected under the Pilot Site Number 3 (Karapınar, Ereğli, Emirgazi).</p> <p>A description of the soil salinity issue and its link to global environmental issues such as loss of ecosystem integrity is also detailed in section B (Global Env. Benefits, page 14-15 and page 50-51) of the PRODOC. In particular, page 51 includes a table that details current practices in the region and the improved practices that will be introduced by the project.</p> <p>Finally, the justification for site selection is included in page 146, and includes, among others, issues of soil salinity.</p>	<p>PRODOC, pg. 12-14, pg. 51</p> <p>PRODOC, appendix 12, under adaptation/mitigation practices and opportunities.</p>
<p>Component 1 will be a major challenge, involving substantial changes in land use, crops, water use and livelihoods of local communities. The description of this component is one short paragraph in the PIF. STAP has concerns that the complexities involved in rehabilitation of degraded land are under-estimated. For example, rehabilitation is far more costly financially than protection of productive land from becoming degraded, Who will bear these costs; will they be sustainable; how are the innovative technologies to be chosen and evaluated; what impact will there be on local land users; have gender issues been considered? Simply trying to implement a number of innovative technologies will not generate rehabilitated land “as many studies</p>	<p>Component 1 (including “certification”) has been developed in full detail in the PRODOC, under section 2.4 “Project components and outputs”, pages 40-43. The estimated cost of this intervention is \$12.98 million dollars, with the government and other stakeholder committing \$10.8 million dollars in co-financing. The GEF will invest \$2.1 million.</p>	<p>PRODOC, pages 40-43</p>

<p>have shown from other dryland areas. Choosing the most degraded areas “such as saline-alkaline sites” will likely be a failure because of intractable soil chemistry.</p> <p>5. In component 1, STAP recommends referring to its advisory document on "Environmental Certification and the Global Environment Facility" for its activity on certification of restored forests and rangeland landscapes. STAP's advisory document contains several key messages that it recommends including in the project design in order to minimize the threats of certification effectiveness. The document also summarizes the evidence base for the effectiveness of certification programs to generate global and local environmental benefits. Once more, STAP suggests accounting for this evidence in the project design. STAP's advisory document can be found at “<a href="http://www.unep.org/stap">www.unep.org/stap</a>”</p>		
<p>6. Also, STAP recommends specifying further the improved pasture management activities in component 1, or component 2. Currently, this activity is only briefly listed in the project framework (under component 1), and in the table under incremental reasoning. This gap leads the proposal to be unclear how livestock will be integrated within a conservation agriculture system. For example, STAP suggests addressing how the potential competing demands will be addressed for crop residues “that is, the need for sufficient biomass to protect and feed the soil, as well as serve as livestock feed</p>	<p>Specific activities for components 1 and 2 are detailed in the PRODOC, section 2.4 “Project components and outputs”, pages 40-50</p>	<p>PRODOC, pages 40-50</p>
<p>The proposal indicates climate change as a significant threat to sustainable land management and its contribution to delivering multiple global benefits in the Konya Closed Basin. A study by Ramazan Topak and Bilal Acar of Selcuk University, Agricultural Faculty, Konya, reports on the unsustainable conjunction of increasing water demand, limited groundwater reserves and climate change. To support further this reasoning, STAP suggests adding climate change projections, or trends, in the proposal. For this data, as well as adaptation measures that could be mainstreamed across the various interventions, the project developers may wish to consult the World Bank Climate Change Knowledge Portal- <a href="http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm">http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm</a></p>	<p>Comment well received. A summary of the possible impacts of climate change and the KCB has been included as Appendix 12 to the PRODOC (pages 165-172)</p>	<p>PRODOC, appendix 12.</p>
Comments from GEF SEC at CEO Endorsement		
<p>n/a (There were no outstanding issues from</p>		

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>5</sup>**

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<i><b>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</b></i>	<i><b>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</b></i>		
	<i><b>Budgeted Amount</b></i>	<i><b>Amount Spent Todate</b></i>	<i><b>Amount Committed</b></i>
Local consultants	57,200	62,488	0
International consultants	39,000	32,077	7,750
Travel	18,000	27,235	6,947
Workshops and consultations	16,000	0	0
Translation, data collection, maps	6,786	1,302	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>136,986</b>	<b>123,102</b>	<b>14,697</b>

<sup>5</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.



**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

N/A