

## Learning/Monitoring Mission to Danube/Black Sea Basin Strategic Partnership on Nutrient Reduction, exemplified by Turkey and Romania investments



Two similar GEF International Waters projects in Romania and Turkey were visited in this learning/monitoring mission. The mission sought to examine projects identified through the 2009 Annual Monitoring Review/PIR process for potential catalytic effects. The projects were pilot investments in Romania and Turkey in agricultural pollution reduction under the Black Sea/Danube GEF/World Bank Investment Fund, one of the first GEF programmatic approaches. Results demonstrated use of good practices in reducing water pollution, through targeting agricultural waste from livestock. In Romania the pilot investment played a catalytic role in the country obtaining a World Bank loan up-scaling the piloted technologies and expanding activities nationwide. In Turkey, the initial pilot investment is still ongoing, but already there is proof of strong buy-in of the pollution reduction practices from farmer to ministerial level that improve health and economy in the communities while benefiting the farmers. In Turkey, ministry personnel are exploring opportunities for a national level up-scaling of what was piloted by the GEF investment.

The GEF/World Bank investments are seen as instrumental and highly catalytic by the countries. They not only reduced downstream nutrient pollution to avoid “Dead Zones” but also had catalytic effects in addressing health issues in polluted groundwater and in accelerating country compliance with the EU Water framework Directive and the EU Nitrate Directive, even in a country not yet on the accession path. These projects are also being utilized by GEFSEC as a basis for revising the IW tracking tool.

Christian Severin, June 2010. GEF Secretariat

# Contents

1. Background: .....	2
2. International Waters Learning and Mission Objectives:.....	2
3.0 Learning Mission background: .....	2
3.1 Project Selection: .....	3
3.1.1 Black Sea Investment Fund for Nutrient Reduction:.....	3
3.2 18-21st of March, Bucharest and Calarsi County, Romania.....	3
3.2.1 National Level:.....	3
3.2.2 Local Level: .....	4
3.3 Observations from the pilot investment in Calarasi, Romania (APCP): .....	4
3.4 22-25 <sup>th</sup> of March, Ankara and Corum Province, Turkey.....	5
3.4.1 National Level:.....	5
3.4.2 Local Level: .....	5
3.5 How will the outcomes of AWPR be sustained after the project closes? .....	5
4.0 Lessons Learned: .....	6
4.1 Environmental management capacity building: .....	6
4.2 Local, national and regional benefits .....	6
4.3 Scaling up: .....	6
Appendix 1: Site selection.....	8
Appendix 2: List of persons met in Romania and Turkey.....	9

## 1. Background:

The GEF Results-based Management (RBM) approach includes improved methodologies for portfolio monitoring and learning. This places priority on using monitoring information for accountability, internal management, learning and knowledge management. The GEF SEC has introduced a pilot portfolio monitoring review process (PMR) to test approaches to portfolio monitoring and the knowledge generated that can help improve accountability, management decision making, and learning.

The GEF International Waters (IW) focal area uses the GEF Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) process to identify jointly with Agencies projects with very good performance and results as well as those with sub-par performance. In the past, the focal area would examine these outliers for lessons of experience. With the new RBM approach focusing on learning, the 2009 annual monitoring process was used to identify two ongoing projects to serve as test cases for the learning initiative. The two IW projects are instructive cases to visit in that they represent national projects in different stages of implementation, while having the same modus operandi in dealing with agricultural pollution reduction at the household and community level.

## 2. International Waters Learning and Mission Objectives:

A key focal area learning objective is: *to enhance IW focal area results through improved understanding of experiences that produce catalytic impacts.*

For the pilot mission to develop the PMR process, tools will be tested for how to conduct such PMRs in the IW focal area toward a specific mission objective of understanding how the focal area can produce catalytic effects regionally and on-the-ground through national implementation of cooperative frameworks. Based on the pilot missions, the IW Tracking Tool may be redesigned and the use of GEF IW:LEARN will be strengthened as a portfolio knowledge, experience sharing and communication platform.

To satisfy the learning objective of the International Waters focal area two activities will be undertaken:

- An analysis of IW activities that enhance catalytic effects at regional and national levels and leverage further commitments and resources.
- The identification of good practices and means utilized to achieve replication of these practices in order to incorporate into the IW tracking Tools

## 3.0 Learning Mission background:

In 1991, the EU introduced the Nitrates Directive, which aims to protect water bodies against pollution induced by nitrates from agricultural sources. The Directive classifies groundwater with nitrate concentrations exceeding 50 mg/l as polluted groundwater. The only requirement for EU member states is to set up “action programmes” for reducing the pollution of their water bodies and create a national Code of Good Agricultural Practice.<sup>1</sup>

To avoid a new increase of nutrient loads into the Black Sea, it is essential to adopt best-practice methods to get both point source as well as non-point source emissions in the entire Danube catchment area under control. The implementation of the Nitrates Directive is challenging to nearly all EU member states, but its implementation is a dynamic process which highly depends on the political will and financial situation of the member states. Please see link for a summary on the Nitrate Directive: <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/pubs/pdf/factsheets/nitrates.pdf>.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this respect, the Nitrates Directive essentially differs from the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD), the latter requiring that a “good status” of all water bodies be achieved by 2015. So the Nitrate Directive is effectively easier to comply with, even though the restriction in the Nitrate Directive on only allowing 170 kg of nitrogen/hectare/year in manure to be applied to arable land creates difficulties for states with a high livestock density; there is simply not enough land available on which the excess manure could be applied to.

### 3.1 Project Selection:

The Secretariat utilized the annual PIR process to identify appropriate projects for the pilot portfolio monitoring exercise. Through this process, the pilot investment in Romania (Agricultural Pollution Control) was selected for two main reasons: 1) the consistency of its performance over the 5 year lifetime of the project (see Appendix 1)) the pilot led to a follow-up scaling-up of the pilot activities (Integrated Nutrient Pollution Control Project). There is presumably a strong linkage between the successful pilot and the follow up national up-scaling investment. Similarly the annual PIR process revealed that the pilot on agricultural nutrient reduction in Turkey (Anatolia Highlands Watershed Rehabilitation project, that started implementation in 2006), has recently shown a decline in performance from earlier years (see Appendix 1). If the trend continues, it may affect the potential outcomes of the Anatolia Highlands Watershed Rehabilitation Project as well as a potential upscale to the national level. This trend of lower PIR ratings was the reason to visit this project.

#### 3.1.1 Black Sea Investment Fund for Nutrient Reduction:

Both visited projects are part of the GEF-WB Investment Fund for Nutrient Reduction aimed at a common goal of reducing nutrient pollution in the Black Sea and helping accelerate investments in key sectors such as municipal wastewater, agricultural run-off, and industrial pollution as well as policy and legal reforms and capacity building for enhanced monitoring and enforcement.

The GEF-WB Investment Fund, together with two GEF-UNDP regional projects composed a GEF strategic approach, putting in place sustainable governance and investment frameworks to prevent the renewed ecosystem deterioration that might occur with expected future economic improvement in DRB and Black Sea countries.

### 3.2 18-21st of March, Bucharest and Calarsi County, Romania

The Romanian Government applied for the Agricultural Pollution Control Project (APCP) to enable implementation of the Water Framework Directive and the Nitrate Directive in the process of the EU Accession process in a country that had identified that there were major problems with diffused agricultural pollution from more than 1.5 million farmers with plots ranging from 0.5 ha to 2000 ha. An indicator of too high levels of Nitrate in the drinking water, namely Blue Baby Syndrome<sup>2</sup> was identified in abnormally high numbers. This has been improving, but numbers are still too high, which leads one to a conclusion that Nitrate levels may still be too high in drinking water wells. Nitrate/bacteriological levels have diminished in rivers and streams, as an effect of the APCP pilot investment, but no effect is seen in the drinking water wells. It has been strongly suggested by the PMU that the water quality in the drinking water wells will not improve before the household latrines are targeted. Please see appendix 2 for details on the program for the project visit.

The APCP has been working on different levels, which of course all are interlinked, but can be divided, into National and Local level:

#### 3.2.1 National Level:

Through the activities under the APCP, which at the same time also is a prerequisite for the EU Nitrate Directive, the implementation of the Code of Good Agricultural Practices and a National Monitoring System were written up, implemented and lead to the establishment of a National Extension Programme. The APCP functioned as a pilot and as a trigger for Romania to undertake the INPCP. Further, the project has been instrumental in showcasing for the administrators on all levels of society that something can be done, using relative simple and sound methods.

---

<sup>2</sup> Blue baby syndrome can also be caused by [Methemoglobinemia](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Methemoglobinemia). It is believed to be caused by high nitrate contamination in ground water resulting in *decreased oxygen carrying capacity of hemoglobin* in babies leading to death. The groundwater is thought to be contaminated by leaching of nitrate generated from fertilizer used in agricultural lands and waste dumps (Source: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Blue\\_baby\\_syndrome](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Blue_baby_syndrome))

### 3.2.2 Local Level:

While supporting a National process towards the EU Nitrate Directive, APCP also instigated a number of Local activities that have been central in proving to local farmers, administrators as well as regional and National authorities that the APCP pilot investment should be up-scaled to the National level:

Prior to the project, manure had no value; farmers did not want to move the manure around, rather having it lying around the farm or place it by the riverbed, so that it washed away by itself. After the APCP 69.000 ha under manure management, through raising the understanding in the farming communities that it makes sense both financial and agricultural to use organic manure instead of applying inorganic fertilizer. This coupling of agricultural practices and financial sensibility was an important vehicle to make the farmers and communities implement and sustain the nutrient management practices as well as manure handling facilities.

Manure storage facilities have been established at the household and community level. The APCP ended in June 2007, today the manure platforms are still fully functional and being used, the organic agricultural practices is also still used by the farmers, as they see a benefit both on the financial, side as the need to buy a lot less inorganic fertilizer, on top the farmers are experiencing increased yields.

The manure platforms have been adopted due to a number of reasons:

- They provide an opportunity for the farmers to get rid of the manure from their own plots
- The farmers understand that the manure will leach into their drinking water source
- The farmers can buy back or get some organic manure, according to a rotation system, as they do NOT need to apply organic fertilizer, every year, the remaining composted manure is sold to larger farms.

The manure platforms are still running because:

- A fee system has been constructed and is enforced, each farmer has to pay an annual fee of 20 Euro, if they bring the manure to the platform, if it is to be collected they have to pay 40 Euro.
- The farmers are paying these fees, probably primarily because it is mandatory to store the manure at these communal sites.
- Larger farms have to have their own handling facilities. In some instances the communal platforms have been constructed close to the larger farms, for their use as well.
- The fees and revenue from selling the composted manure is used to pay for a care taker, diesel to handle the manure and make sure it is properly aerated.

Initial problems, first year after having collected the manure, the farmers did not want it back after it had composted, second year they gave it away and then everybody want to have some, and third year gradually a payment system were introduced.

### 3.3 Observations from the pilot investment in Calarasi, Romania (APCP):

During the National up-scaling project (INPCP) the successful pilots in the Calarasi area will be scaled up at 86 sites distributed across the country in areas that has been identified as Vulnerable Zones. It is believed that the INPCP will also be successful, due to a number of things, among others, that farmers have seen the benefit in the pilot area and now more surrounding comunas have asked for similar interventions, both on the manure side as well as the afforestation. Another reason identified may be that the PMU from APCP will be continuing.

Project and ministerial staff believes that it is highly likely that the INPCP investments will be taken over by the country/ministries as the country need to comply with the EU Water framework Directive as well as the Nitrate Directive and hence the interventions of both APCP and INPCP is good and sustainable measures that are easy to maintain and that will provide some of the outputs needed.

The up-scaling and continuation of implementing manure storage facilities in new regions will be supported by the INPCP, but will after this project most likely be funded under the EU's Commission through the Rural Development Programme, while also being worked into both the Agricultural and Environmental Ministries' strategies, on a path towards getting it to financed by the State budget.

The extension programme is already imbedded in both Ministries and will in the near term also be supported by the INPCP. The APCP provided a large sum of evidence that extension is needed and hence it is unlikely that it will be discontinued. At the same time it is also a prerequisite to be in full compliance with the Code of Good Agricultural Practices under the Nitrate Directive.

### **3.4 22-25<sup>th</sup> of March, Ankara and Corum Province, Turkey**

One of the key drivers for the Turkish Government to apply for the Anatolia Watershed Rehabilitation Project (AWRP) was the prospect of EU accession process which has been instrumental in the development of Turkey's sustainable development and environmental agenda, even more so after the opening of the EU environmental chapter in December 2009. The project also links to the process of enabling Turkey to comply with the Water Framework Directive and the Nitrate Directive in the process of the EU Accession process. It is a highly complex matter to start this process, especially as the agricultural sector is highly diversified both regionally in the country as well as the farms distribution with reference to size. In today's Turkey the farm sizes vary a lot from small household subsistence farming to the larger commercial farms. Please see appendix 2 for details on the program for the project visit.

The AWRP has been working on different levels, which of course all are interlinked, but can be divided, into National and Local level:

#### **3.4.1 National Level:**

The project has effected that a need for creating a National Extension programme has been identified. One reason being that the extension services as part of the AWRP has proved to be having a great impact on the farming communities. Secondly, it is believed that all the valuable information and lessons learned through the AWRP (such as Soil, Manure and water management, as well as eg. agricultural financing) could (and should) be shared with neighboring countries in Central Asia, such as Armenia and Georgia.

#### **3.4.2 Local Level:**

- The farmers, as an effect of the project, now fully appreciate that they will increase their crop yield, while saving money on inorganic fertilizers, if they incorporate organic fertilizers into their agricultural practices. Further, the positive effect (reduced smell, a healthier micro climate around the farm etc) on having the on-farm manure storage facilities is fully embraced by the farmers. In communities where these platforms have been established in some farms, all farmers would like to have a similar platform implemented at their farm. However, there seems to be a lack of funding to support this development, presently the construction costs are too high for the farmers to carry. Maybe the implementation of legislative requirements, in conjunction with a smaller financial incentive, could trigger the spreading of the household manure platforms to occur without being fully financed by either ministerial funds or external funds.
- 327 Manure Storage facilities has been established at household level and 8 manure storage facilities at community level
- Training of farmers in the 4 catchments, in the following communities (Aşdagul, Arifegazili, Derinçay, İlyaslı, Yörükler, Kızık & Dazy)

### **3.5 How will the outcomes of AWPR be sustained after the project closes?**

A payment system (similar to the system implemented and used in Romania) has been established which will enable continuation, after the project ends, of the Community platforms as well as the "pick-up service" from the household storage facilities, in case the farmer are not able to deliver the manure to the Community platform.

It will be interesting to see how the household platforms will be maintained by the farmers themselves and the community platforms by the farmers associations and communities. But looking at similar projects, such as the APCP in Romania, the tendency is that farmers will keep on maintaining the household and communal platforms, as it is a suitable technology that benefits them. Multiple officials from Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs suggested that they are very interested in exploring the possibilities to try to upscale the AWRP pilot project to national level in Turkey.



## 4.0 Lessons Learned:

It was interesting to compare the situation of two pilots under the Black Sea Danube Investment Fund for Nutrient Reduction, as they are demonstrating similar technologies and approaches. It is obvious that in Romania the streamlining into the Ministry of Environment has taken place and multiple activities under APCP are now, under the national up-scaling project (INPCP) being implemented in accordance with and by ministerial staff. In Turkey, the positive effects of the activities of the AWRP can be seen both locally as well as on organizational and ministerial levels. Still the Turkish investment is younger and has still not reached the same level of results. On the other hand, the fact that the PMU was within the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs should vouch for easier coordination efforts between Ministry activities and project funded activities.

Having visited these two projects has offered an excellent opportunity to get a better insight about the application of a set of technologies while also offering some best practice examples of implementation practices. These first hand experiences will enable me to share these with other regions with nutrient reduction activities which may lead to replication of the same or modified technologies.

### 4.1 Environmental management capacity building:

One of the issues that stand out when visiting two national investments under the Black Sea Danube Nutrient Reduction Investment Fund is that having a regional pool of experiences forming over a 10 year time frame offers ample opportunity for learning among the national investments. One driver is the sheer need to learn from countries that have had successful interventions, but just as important is it to have a the regional overview that the implementing agency has had and hence can identify potential synergies and try to facilitate that. That has been happening at regional conferences as well as through smaller exchanges between a couple of countries.

### 4.2 Local, national and regional benefits

The GEF has supported several regional projects and 11 single country investment projects under the GEF/World Bank Investment Fund for Nutrient reduction in a partnership the last decade to reduce nitrogen and phosphorus pollution in the Danube Delta and downstream Black Sea. Sixteen countries have worked together with GEF, UNDP, and World Bank assistance and the European Union to address these land-based pollution sources creating dead zones in the Danube Delta and Black Sea. Pilot demonstrations for nutrient reduction in the agriculture, municipal sewage, and industrial sectors and to trap nutrients in restored floodplains are proving to be cost effective ways of reversing coastal dead zones. The overarching Investment Fund were conceived to reach a goal that no individual national project would be able to achieve single-handed.

After visiting project sites, local administration units and ministries in the two countries, it became evident that the national projects, have positive impacts on local level through its activities and engagement with the farmer communities, improving their health situation and income generation. While at the same time catalyzing the national efforts towards e.g. complying with the EU Nitrate Directive

### 4.3 Scaling up:

One of the highest forms of catalytic effect within the International Waters Focal area is if pilot investments test and showcase a set of specific interventions are successful enough for the country to be willing to up-scale to the national level, through additional loans through the World Bank mixed with GEF financing. That happened in Romania through the INPCP project and there is a likelihood that the indicative statements that was given in Turkey may also lead to a national up-scaling. There is no doubt that the success of the initial Romania pilot investment, the second Romanian national up-scaling as well as the Turkish pilot is closely linked to the EU accession process as well as a nationally identified need to reduce the health impacts (i.e. blue baby syndrome) from the nitrate in the groundwater. Both countries are striding to comply with the Water Framework Directive and the Nitrate Directive. This process has also been supported by the commitments to the Danube /Black Sea Treaty.

The GEF 3 Tracking Tool provides some possibility to report on the qualitative achievements of the projects. However, a need to be able to record the qualitative achievements of a project through some kind of quantitative scale has been identified and hence incorporated into the GEF4 IW tracking tool. According to the GEF3 IW Tracking Tools both the APCP and the AWRP are on track towards reaching the indicators that they are measured on. These reports are backed up through the site visits and meeting with ministerial representatives. However, out of the mission the need for developing a “score card” which should be fed back to the project

management units from GEF IW, has been identified. So that the project would be provided an overview of how they are doing comparing the previous years of their own achievements as well as comparing it to how other similar projects in the same Strategic Programme/Objective are performing.

For this specific learning mission an additional benefit was to be able to attend the Country Portfolio Evaluation meeting, hosted by the GEF Evaluation Office, to gain a good insight of the entire GEF funded portfolio, while at the same time to have good opportunity to interact with the attendees on issues relating to the Country Portfolio evaluation as well as on more specific issues relating to the International Waters portfolio. Through the deliberations at the Country Portfolio meeting it was again stressed that the GEF-UNDP Danube Regional Project (DRP) was a critical element for the catalytic effect of the GEF strategic approach towards the reduction of nutrient pollution in 12 beneficiary and 2 cooperating countries in the Danube and Black Sea Basins. The GEF TDA/SAP process led to the development of the Danube River Basin Analysis and the Danube River Basin Management Plan. The nutrient pollution was one of four key issues that Danube countries risked in not being able to fulfill their originally voluntary obligation to meet the EU Water Framework Directive's requirements and to reduce their nutrient loads to meet other EU directives including the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive (UWWT) and Nitrates Directive.



## Appendix 1: Site selection

Romania:

The annual PIR process had indicated that the pilot investment in Romania (Agricultural Pollution Control Project) had received satisfactory ratings throughout the entire life time (Table 1), apart from the last year where it reached Highly Satisfactory for both Implementation Progress (IP) and Development Objective (DO) ratings. The initial PIR report from the first year of implementation of the national scaling up of the pilot activities (Integrated Nutrient Pollution Control Project) have revealed that it is on track with a Satisfactory rating for both IP and DO ratings. There is a presumable a strong linkage between the successful pilot and the follow up national up-scaling investment. The GEF3 IW Tracking Tool showed that the project is on track with indicators such as Functioning & Sustainable Regional Transboundary Waters Institution and National/Local Reforms Enacted/Implemented, both of them being in progress but not yet fully functional. Further, the establishment of an Inter ministerial Committee has been started and an IMC has been established and is functioning on an informal basis. Lastly, the process of establishing national demos have still not started, and hence that indicator showed the lowest possible rating (No progress on implementing demonstrations or investments). In assessing this data it has to be considered that the project still has three more years before it is expected to close in December 2013. There should still be time to reach the highest Tracking Tool rating for all these indicators.

Turkey:

Likewise the annual PIR process indicated that the pilot on agricultural nutrient reduction in Turkey (Anatolia Highlands Watershed Rehabilitation project, that started implementation in 2006), initially had both DO and IP at Satisfactory, since the IP rating in both 2007 and 2008 has been at Marginally Satisfactory, whereas the DO has been stable at Satisfactory. In 2009, both IP and DO ratings were at Marginally Satisfactory. If the trend continues, it may affect the potential outcomes of the Anatolia Highlands Watershed Rehabilitation Project as well as a potential upscale to national level, should that be wished for by the Government of Turkey. The trend of lower PIR ratings was the reason to visit this project. The GEF 3 IW Tracking Tool reported that the project is fully on track, and is doing better than expected for a project that will finish implementation medio 2012. For indicators such as National/local Reforms Enacted/Implemented and On-the-ground Results through demonstrations and investments, the project has reached more than 50% of the target. The Inter Ministerial Committee has been established and is functioning and formalized thru legal and/or institutional arrangements.

Table1:

Project name (Agency)	Reg	MTR		01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09
		Closing										
Agricultural Pollution Control Project, Romania (WB)	ECA		DO			S	S	S	S	S		
		06/30/2007	IP			S	S	S	S	S		
Integrated Nutrient Pollution Control Project, Romania (WB)	ECA	11/30/2010	DO									S
		12/30/2013	IP									S
Anatolia WATERSHED REHAB Turkey (WB)	ECA	05/29-08	DO						S	S	S	MS
		06/30-12	IP						S	MS	MS	MS

## Appendix 2: List of persons met in Romania and Turkey

### Romania:

The Romanian part of the learning mission, consisted of several ministerial meetings, where the initial pilot investment was discussed (Agricultural Pollution Control Project) as well as the catalytic follow-up investment for up-scaling of the demonstrated technologies on a national level (Integrated Nutrient Pollution Control Project - INPCP). This national scale-up was funded through a World Bank loan and a GEF grant, the up-scaling project is just starting implementation, hence these investments were not visited, but instead discussed during the ministerial meetings. A day was spent in the field to study the investments on community level. The final day was spent with the supervision mission team from the World Bank to acquire a better and fuller understanding of issues around implementation of the Integrated Nutrient Pollution Control Project.

Thursday 18 <sup>th</sup> of March 15.00 – 16.00	Director General Mr.Gheorghe Constantin
Friday 19 <sup>th</sup> of March 10.00 – 12.20	Director Mr Valentin Alexandrescu, Dr. Stefa Nicolau and Ms Naiana Milea at Ministry of Environment.
Saturday 20 <sup>th</sup> of March 8.30 – 18.00	Field visit in Calarasi County
Sunday 21 <sup>st</sup> of March 9.00-14.00	Informal meeting with World Bank Supervision Mission Team

List of persons met in connection with learning mission to Agricultural Pollution Control Project in Romania	
Name	Title
Project Management Unit	
Mr. Valentin Alexandrescu	PMU Director
Mr. Stefan Nicolau	Senior Technical M&E Specialist
Ms. Naiana Milea	Financial Manager
Regional Official Representative	
Mr. Niculae Enciu	Prefect of Calarasi County
World Bank	
Mr. Cesar Niculesco	Environmental Specialist
Mr. Peter Harrold	Country Director for Central Europe and Baltic Countries, Europe and Central Asia
Mr. Francios Rantrua	Country Manager
Mr. Aziz Bouzaher	Country Sector Coordinator Central Europe and Baltic Countries, Europe and Central Asia
Jitendra P. Srivastava	Agricultural & Rural Development (SASDA)

### Turkey:

The Turkey part of the learning mission started out with a full day of participating in the EO Country Portfolio meeting, which was a very interesting event, with lots of good opportunity to interact with Ministries, NGOs and Agencies alike. It appears to be a good idea, which could be considered to become a standard practice for the GEF Secretariat to be represented at the EOs Country Portfolio Evaluation Meetings. It seemed as if the participants highly appreciated that the GEFSEC was present and that they could direct questions directly to GEFSEC in addition to the EO. Moreover, the participation in the Country portfolio meeting (on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of March 2010) offered good opportunities to interactions with relevant persons that have been active in the Anatolia Highlands Watershed Rehabilitation project. The following day were spent on a field visit to study the investments on household and community level. The last day was spent with ministerial representatives and on a visit at the National Reference Lab.

On March 23<sup>th</sup>, a group consisting of Mr. Ali Kasaci, Mr. Süleyman Demir, Mr Hilmi Soy and Mr Christian Severin visited the Provincial Headquarters of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs. The Provincial Director, Mr Abdulbaki Şahin welcomed us, and shared together with his colleagues some basic data on the accomplishments and impacts of the ACPR.

Following that morning programme, a larger group went to visit the Corum Community and the Asdagul community, which is also a part of Corum region, where farms were visited and a small gathering with the Asdagul farmers and cooperative members were held. Furthermore, we visited both a community platform as well as a number of the on-farm storage facilities.

On March 24<sup>th</sup>, A visit to the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs to meet with Mr. Ömer Faruk Mutlu to discuss the AWRP , its impact and ideas for national up scaling of the AWRP technologies. Following that was a interesting meeting with Mr Mevlana Karakaya, Chief Chemist at the National Environment Reference Laboratory, under the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, which were able to elaborate on the testing methodologies. Unfortunately, the data has still to be analyzed, so it was not possible to get a concise set of ata showing a positive impact on rivers and streams in the catchments, as an effect of the AWRP investments. To this specific point Mr Karakaya indicated that it will most likely be very hard to see much impact of the investment as the communities in many instances still has only gotten pit latrines, which will keep on seeping to streams and rivers within the catchments.

Monday 22 <sup>nd</sup> of March 2010 8:30 – 18:00: EO Country Portfolio Evaluation Meeting
Tuesday 23 <sup>rd</sup> of March 2010: 07:00 – 22:30: Field trip to Corum,
Wednesday 24 <sup>th</sup> of March 2010: 10:00 – 11:30 Meeting in Ministry of agriculture and Rural Affairs
Wednesday 24 <sup>th</sup> of March 2010: 14:00 – 17:30 Meeting in Turkish National Reference Lab.

List of persons met in connection with learning mission to Agricultural Pollution Control Project in Romania	
Mr. Ömer Faruk Mutlu	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs/General Directorate of Protection and Control - Head of Department
Mr. Ali Kasaci	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs/General Directorate of Protection and Control - Department Manager - Technical Project Coordinator (Beneficiary Country Co-Project Leader)
Mr. Süleyman Demir	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs/General Directorate of Protection and Control - Chief Engineer
Mr Hilmi Soy	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, technician
Mr. Abdalbaki Şahin	Çorum Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs - Provincial Director
Mr. Yusuf Şahinbaş	Çorum Farmer Education and Publication - Department Manager
Mr. Semai Özkan	Çorum Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs - Agricultural Engineer
Mr. Murat Yemenici	Çorum Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs - Agricultural Engineer
Mr. Yavuz Er	Head of Çorum Aşdagul Cooperative
Mr Mevlana Karakaya	Ministry of Environment and Forestry, National Environment Reference Laboratory, Chemist
Ms fatma Topal	Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Specialist
Ms Ebru Celik	Ministry of Environment and Forestry, National Environment Reference Laboratory, Translator