



GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Addressing Invasive Alien Species threats at key marine biodiversity areas			
Country(ies):	Turkey	GEF Project ID: ¹	9233
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5733
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs	Submission Date:	20 September 2017
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration (Months)	60
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/>	Corporate Program: SGP <input type="checkbox"/>	
Name of Parent Program	N/A	Agency Fee (\$)	317,742

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES²

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
BD-2 Program 4	Outcome 4.1 Improved management frameworks to prevent, control, and manage invasive alien species (IAS).	GEFTF	3,344,654	13,200,000
Total project costs			3,344,654	13,200,000

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: To ensure resilience of marine and coastal ecosystems through strengthened capacities and investment in prevention, detection, control and management of Invasive Alien Species.						
Project Components/Programs	Financing Type ³	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
1. Effective national policy framework on Invasive Alien Species	TA	Enabling policy environment for reducing IAS threats in marine and coastal ecosystems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National legislation, policy, and regulations addressing prevention, management and mitigation of marine IAS developed, adopted and under implementation, supporting Aichi Target 9 (as measured by GEF 	Output 1.1. Regulations on introduction, early detection, prevention and management of IAS in marine and coastal wetland ecosystems developed and submitted for adoption. Output 1.2. Main pathway and vectors for IAS identified. ⁽¹⁾ _{SEP} Output 1.3. Protocols and quarantine mechanisms consistent with bio-security requirements and	GEFTF	806,385	3,182,476

¹ Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

² When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF](#) and [CBIT programming directions](#).

³ Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

		<p>Tracking Tool Section III Question 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ~700,000 hectares of Turkey's seascape benefiting from improved national management of IAS (Total approximate coastline of 8,000 km x 1 ha equals ~800,000 ha, less the area of direct influence of 94,800 ha = ~700,000 ha; there is no official figure for the exact length of Turkey's coastline) • Increase in funding towards marine and coastal biosecurity and ecosystem resilience support measures in Turkey in amount of \$500,000/year (% increase not possible from baseline of \$0) 	<p>international standards for IAS in marine and coastal wetland ecosystems in place.</p> <p>Output 1.4. Fiscal incentives introduced for effective removal of IAS (e.g. Lion fish, Balloon fish) in marine and coastal wetland ecosystems (to encourage selective fishing and removal of IAS by fishermen) jointly with MFAL. ^[1]_[SEP]</p> <p>Output 1.5. Regulations and standards on control, minimization and removal of IAS from ballast water developed jointly with MTMAC and put for ^[1]_[SEP] enforcement.</p> <p>Output 1.6. Sustainability and Replication mechanism: National Strategy and Action Plan on IAS in marine and coastal wetland ecosystems developed and approved to inform future actions on identifying priority habitats and species to be protected, evaluating financial and socio-economic effects of action/inaction for marine and freshwater IAS based on a thorough cost/benefit analysis.</p>			
2. Capacity building, knowledge and information sharing systems to address the IAS threats	TA	Institutional and stakeholders capacity to understand and apply technical, legal and administrative tools enhanced to increase the prevention, eradication and control of IAS as measured by GEF IAS Tracking Tool and	Output 2.1. Inter-sectoral multi-stakeholder Advisory Technical Board under Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs capacitated to deal with IAS prevention, early detection, rapid response, management and eradication.	GEFTF	696,000	2,746,831

		<p>evidenced through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Detection surveys rank and target IAS in terms of their potential damage - Priority pathways for invasions are being actively managed and monitored to prevent invasions <p>Improved information systems for monitoring and control of Marine IAS in marine and coastal wetland ecosystems, enable effective prevention, early detection, rapid response and management of IAS in marine and coastal wetland ecosystems <i>(please refer to Annex A Project Results Framework for full list of Outcome indicators)</i></p>	<p>Output 2.2. Information system with official list of prohibited IAS, modules on risk analysis, early warning response and monitoring for IAS in marine and coastal ecosystems is in use by government regulations. The system enables a comprehensive inventory and monitoring of IAS threats at the most sensitive marine and coastal habitats and species (Posidonia meadows, coralligenous, sea turtles, anchovy, mussel, oyster), as well as measures to detect and prevent entry of risky IAS at key points of entry.</p> <p>Output 2.3. Engagement with shipping industry, and transport and customs sectors, on implementation of regulations and standards on control, minimization and removal of IAS from ballast water; and on procedures for regulating the entry of species for ornamental and aquaculture purposes to mitigate the introduction of Marine and freshwater IAS.</p> <p>Output 2.4. Increased knowledge and awareness on IAS threats, impacts, management options and best practices for relevant industries, enterprises (aquaculture, transport, custom, tourism, etc.) media, security forces (gendarme), schools etc. through a</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			comprehensive national communication, outreach program and delivery of community training.			
3. Investment in sustainable management, prevention, eradication, and control of IAS and restoration of IAS-degraded habitat at key marine and coastal areas	TA	Enhanced IAS prevention surveillance and control strategies in place and targeted IAS eradication activities in four key biodiversity areas (İğneada, Marmara Islands, Ayvalık Adaları Nature Park, and Hatay Samandağ coast, evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prevention of new introductions, and reduction of threats to key species (Green Sea Turtle and <i>Posidonia Oceanica</i>) at 94,800 ha <p><i>(please refer to Annex A Project Results Framework for full list of Outcome indicators)</i></p>	<p>Output 3.1. Management plans^[1] designed and launched for 4 areas, with identification of site-specific measures for prevention, ensure eradication, control and management of IAS.</p> <p>Output 3.2. Measures to detect, control spread of IAS at the target sites in collaboration with local communities and targeted restoration of ecosystems degraded as a result of IAS.</p> <p>Output 3.3. Support for the recovery of native species disturbed by IAS at selected sites.</p>	GEFTF	1,683,000	6,642,123
Subtotal					3,185,385	12,571,430
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⁴ (including Direct Project Costs: \$25,723)				GEF TF	159,269	628,570
Total project costs					3,344,654	13,200,000

C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	UNDP	In-kind	170,000

⁴ For GEF Project Financing up to \$2 million, PMC could be up to 10% of the subtotal; above \$2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.

GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	30,000
Recipient Government	Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs	In-kind	500,000
Recipient Government	Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs	Grants	12,500,000
Total Co-financing			13,200,000

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES), FOCAL AREA AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee ^{a)} (b) ²	Total (c)=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Turkey	Biodiversity	N/A	3,344,654	317,742	3,662,396
Total Grant Resources					3,344,654	317,742	3,662,396

a) Refer to the Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies

E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS⁵

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society	Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares	94,800* hectares

* 94,800 hectares will be directly improved through the management and control of IAS at four demonstration pilot sites. An additional ~700,000 ha of Turkey's coastline will be improved through strengthened national enforcement, and implemented national policy, legislative and regulatory framework to address marine IAS. Turkey's total coastline is approximately 8,000 km; therefore, applying a minimum extent of influence of 1 km from the shoreline, the total seascape influenced by policy is 800,000 ha. Based on the fact that the GEF does not count hectares influenced by policy, the figure given in the table is limited to the area of the pilot sites.

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? No

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

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF⁶

A.1. *Project Description.* Elaborate on: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects, 3) the proposed alternative

⁵ Update the applicable indicators provided at PIF stage. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the *Corporate Results Framework* in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#), will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period.

⁶ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF , no need to respond, please enter "NA" after the respective question.

scenario, GEF focal area⁷ strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, 4) [incremental/additional cost reasoning](#) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, CBIT and [co-financing](#); 5) [global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF) and/or [adaptation benefits](#) (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

A.1.1) The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed:

Section II. Development Challenge of the UNDP Prodoc describes in more detail: the geographic context of Turkey, the biodiversity significance and conservation of Turkey's marine and coastal globally significant biodiversity, the major pathways of IAS into Turkey's marine and coastal waters. Additional detailed information on the socio-economic and biodiversity context for each of the four proposed pilot sites has been included in Annex K of the Prodoc, the Project Site Profiles.

Section II. Development Challenge of the UNDP Prodoc provides additional confirmation of the expanding threat of IAS in Turkey's marine and coastal waters, and additional information on specific threats related to IAS relative to native biodiversity has been included in Annex K of the Prodoc, the Project Site Profiles. Also further elaborated is confirmation and description of the three main barriers to effective management and control of IAS in Turkey's marine waters.

A.1.2) Baseline scenario and associated baseline projects:

There are relatively few if any projects in Turkey focusing specifically on addressing IAS, and in particular marine IAS. Turkey set the basis for monitoring of all aspects of biodiversity through its National Biodiversity Inventory Monitoring Project (2013 – 2018, implemented under MoFWA, funding US\$8 million). The protected area (6%) are monitored at the ecosystem level. The regular monitoring of the species listed in the Hunting and Fisheries Laws is in place at the species level. A national monitoring unit has been established in the MoFWA to perform monitoring at both the species and ecosystem levels, and it is currently gaining effect. MEU carries out monitoring under the Regulation on the Environmental Impact Assessment and monitors any activities that may have adverse impacts on the environment and takes measures to remove the impacts to the greatest extent possible. The MEU has also developed a Marine Strategy Framework Directive Initial Assessment for the Black Sea and Levant coastlines, in correspondence with the EU's Marine Directive; this includes an assessment of the situation with respect to marine IAS. Also, any activities that may have adverse impacts on monk seals and sea turtles (sand hauling from the sea, fishing, industrial wastes, etc.) are followed up under the monitoring programs implemented for these two endangered species. The program, however is focusing primarily on the terrestrial biodiversity flora and fauna. Since it does not include IAS system, the proposed GEF project will be of outstanding importance as an increment to this baseline program of the Government.

The "Protection of Threatened Species" program aims to develop the conservation strategy and action plans for threatened species. The project is implemented between 2015 – 2019 with a US\$3.3 million. The Implementation of Conservation Action Plans for Threatened Species project aiming to implement the prepared action plans in the field, and also establishing the monitoring system for selected threatened species. The program, however, is limited only to action plan preparation and does not have resource for capacity building, and investment.

The "Enhancing the Management and Control on Protected Areas" project of the Government is aiming to enhance the management and control mechanisms of the protected areas. The project will be implemented between 2015 – 2016

⁷ For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which [Aichi Target\(s\)](#) the project will directly contribute to achieving..

with a budget of US\$4 million and will conduct trainings for protected areas on improved management effectiveness. This program is important as it acts as a basis for practical action envisaged in this GEF Project at the four marine sites. The GEF Project will also build on the ongoing process of wetland inventory (The Wetlands Inventory and Management Plan project will with a budget of US\$1.5 million, 2011 – 2017). In addition, as part of co-financing of the GEF Project, the Government is going to allocate about US\$0.5 million for habitat restoration activities in the Yeşilirmak Delta.

Gökova Bay is located to the south of the proposed Ayvalik Islands project pilot site, along Turkey's Aegean coast. At the local level, the Gökova Bay Community Conservation Project is being implemented by the Mediterranean Conservation Society. This is an ongoing project, expected to be completed in January 2019. The project has \$95,000 in funding from the Whitley Fund for Nature and Fauna and Flora International. In July 2010, six No Fishing Zones covering 24 km² were officially declared in Gökova Bay Turkey to protect biodiversity and restore heavily depleted fish stocks. Due to the geographic location and extent of the NFZs, the enforcement effort by Coast Guard was not sufficient to mitigate illegal fishing activity threats. While law abiding local fishers agreed to give up these fishing grounds for protection, illegal fishing activities were evident. MCS established a "Local Marine Ranger" system training and employing local fishermen as marine rangers in two marine ranger stations with speed boats. Four local rangers have been working in close cooperation with Coast Guard since January 2013. The continuing monitoring of fish biomass within and outside the protected areas reveal up to 7 folds increase in fish biomass in No Fishing Zones. A well-enforced Marine Protected Area matures within 5 to 10 years where spillover effects can be observed. In the case of the Gökova MPA, spillover effects are already started as the fishery cooperative revenues increased over 400% since the project started. The project aims To establish a co-management model based on community conservation for the management of marine protected areas to conserve the marine biodiversity and sustainable use of marine resources. The project has four objectives: Objective 1 Improve No Take Zone compliance and enforcement in order to conserve the marine ecosystem and restore fish stocks to benefit local livelihoods; Objective 2 Developing active monitoring scheme to understand status and trends in marine environment for effective NFZ management; Objective 3 Develop sustainable livelihood diversification strategies and improve sustainability of fishing practices promoting invasive species consumption; Objective 4 Raise awareness of marine biodiversity conservation and the benefits of marine protected areas.

A.1.3) The proposed alternative scenario, GEF Focal Area strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project:

The Section III. Strategy, and the Section IV.i. Expected Results of the UNDP Prodoc has been significantly improved and further developed during the PPG phase, including incorporating inputs based on STAP and GEF Council comments. These improvements are briefly summarized below.

The strategic context for the project is underpinned by multiple overarching policy frameworks. These include A.) the CBD's strategy for addressing IAS; B.) Recognition of the importance of addressing IAS as a priority for biodiversity conservation within Turkey as codified in Turkey's NBSAP; C.) the UN Country Programme Document for Turkey, which emphasizes the importance of preventing and responding to environmental degradation in relation to biodiversity conservation; and D.) the entry into force of the international Ballast Water Convention, expected in September 2017. The project's Theory of Change (ToC) has three parts, which correspond to the CBD's strategy for addressing IAS. The first part of the ToC is prevention of new IAS introductions into Turkey's marine waters in the future. This will be achieved by increasing the capacity of the Government of Turkey to implement the Ballast Water Convention and the National Ballast Water Management Strategy. Ship mediated transport (primarily ballast water) is the main IAS pathway into Turkey's marine and coastal waters (equating to 30% of invasions) over which Turkey has any real control. The other major pathway is the Suez canal (66% of invasions), which is not in Turkey's national waters. The

second part of the ToC relates to the control of IAS already in Turkey's marine ecosystems. The third part of the ToC focuses on the mitigation of negative marine IAS impacts in Turkey's marine and coastal ecosystems.

The project is aligned with the GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Objective 2: Reduce threats to globally significant biodiversity, Program 4: Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species. The project supports the relevant GEF Outcome 4.1 Improved management frameworks to prevent, control, and manage invasive alien species. As indicated in the table below, the project contributes to the respective indicator for this outcome, as well as to the relevant global corporate results replenishment target.

TABLE 1 PROJECT COMPLIANCE WITH GEF BIODIVERSITY RESULTS FRAMEWORK AND GEF CORPORATE RESULTS FRAMEWORK

GEF-6 Biodiversity Results Framework			
Objective	Program	Outcome	Indicator (and project contribution to indicator)
BD-2 Reduce threats to globally significant biodiversity	Program 4: Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species	Outcome 4.1 Improved management frameworks to prevent, control, and manage invasive alien species (IAS).	Indicator 4.1: IAS management framework operational score. <i>Project contribution to indicator:</i> The project will strengthen the management framework for IAS management at the national level in multiple ways. The project results framework breaks down the GEF Tracking Tool scorecard for IAS management frameworks, and uses all six individual components of the score as indicators in the strategic results framework. From a baseline of 2, the project aims to increase the IAS management framework operational score to 21 (out of a possible 27).
GEF-6 Corporate Results Framework			
1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society			Target: Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares <i>Project contribution to indicator:</i> The project directly improves the management of 94,800 hectares of seascapes through site-based interventions and management capacity strengthening at four globally significant Key Biodiversity Area sites along Turkey's coast. Also, through improving national policy, legislation and regulatory frameworks, and supporting implementation of the Ballast Water Convention in Turkey, the project will indirectly improve the prevention, control and mitigation of marine IAS along all of Turkey's coastline, an area of more than 700,000 hectares, assessed as covering 1 km from Turkey's entire coastline. (Turkey's total approximate coastline is 8,000 km, therefore a 1 km extent of influence equates to a total of ~800,000 ha; subtracting the area of direct influence, this equals an area of indirect influence of ~700,000 ha.)

The project will contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets, in particular under the strategic goal B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use, Target 9: By 2020, invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent introduction and establishment; and under strategic goal C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity, Target 12: By 2020, the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has improved and sustained.

The project's ToC is executed through multiple strategic implementation approaches. These include i.) strengthening the policy framework and enabling environment for addressing marine IAS; ii.) Developing new tools and mechanisms to control and manage IAS, such as fiscal incentives; iii.) Improving data and information management related to marine IAS in order to strengthen management and control measures; iv.) Increasing understanding and awareness about the threats of marine IAS among all relevant stakeholders; v.) Developing site-based management approaches, such as site-

based IAS management plans and local IAS stakeholder working groups; and vi.) Undertaking direct management and control measures to both reduce populations of IAS, and strengthening the resiliency of native marine biota in order to resist IAS.

At the PIF stage there were four demonstration sites proposed, and in the full project document there are also four proposed demonstration sites. Three of these are the same as those initially proposed in the PIF, while the fourth site has been changed from Yumurtalik Lagoon to the Marmara Islands, based on the strategic site prioritization and assessment carried out during the PPG phase. The Marmara Islands were identified as being highly impacted by IAS, having greater biodiversity significance, and having higher feasibility for the success of the proposed interventions. All four of the proposed demonstration sites have been confirmed as either partially protected or unprotected Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) within Turkey as part of a national KBAs assessment.

The project is structured in three components with each component comprised of three to six outputs, which will collectively contribute to realizing the targeted outcomes for the project. The first component focuses on strengthening the policy and regulatory framework related to IAS, and developing new tools and approaches for management and control of IAS. This component will focus around six areas of support: Output 1.1: Regulations on introduction, early detection, prevention and management of IAS in marine and coastal wetland ecosystems developed and submitted for adoption;^[SEP] Output 1.2: Main pathway and vectors for IAS identified; Output 1.3: Protocols and quarantine mechanisms consistent with bio-security requirements and international standards for IAS in marine and coastal wetland ecosystems in place; Output 1.4: Fiscal incentives introduced for effective removal of IAS (e.g. Lion fish, Balloon fish) in marine and coastal wetland ecosystems (to encourage selective fishing and removal of IAS by fishermen) jointly with MFAL; Output 1.5: Regulations and standards on control, minimization and removal of IAS from ballast water developed jointly with MTMAC and put for enforcement; Output 1.6: Sustainability and Replication mechanism: National Strategy and Action Plan on IAS in marine and coastal wetland ecosystems developed and approved to inform future actions on identifying priority habitats and species to be protected, evaluating financial and socio-economic effects of action/inaction for marine and freshwater IAS based on a thorough cost/benefit analysis.

The second component addresses capacity building, and knowledge and information sharing systems to address IAS threats. This component will deliver four outputs to ensure increased capacities and knowledge-information sharing mechanisms are in place. Those outputs will be: Output 2.1. Inter-sectoral multi-stakeholder Advisory Technical Board under Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs capacitated to deal with IAS prevention, early detection, rapid response, management and eradication; Output 2.2. Output 2.2: Information system with official list of prohibited IAS, modules on risk analysis, early warning response and monitoring for IAS in marine and coastal ecosystems is in use by government regulators; Output 2.3: Engagement with shipping industry, and transport and customs sectors, on implementation of regulations and standards on control, minimization and removal of IAS from ballast water; and on procedures for regulating the entry of species for ornamental and aquaculture purposes to mitigate the introduction of marine and freshwater IAS; and Output 2.4: Increased knowledge and awareness on IAS threats, impacts, management options and best practices for relevant industries, enterprises (aquaculture, transport, custom, tourism, etc.) media, security forces (gendarme), schools etc. through a comprehensive national communication, outreach program and delivery of community training.

The third component supports investment in sustainable management, prevention, eradication, and control of IAS and restoration of IAS- degraded habitat at key marine and coastal areas. This component consists of three outputs: Output 3.1: Management plans designed and launched for 4 areas, with identification of site-specific measures for prevention, ensure eradication, control and management of IAS; Output 3.2: Measures to detect, control spread of IAS at the target sites in collaboration with local communities, and targeted restoration of ecosystems degraded as a result of IAS; and Output 3.3: Support for the recovery of native species disturbed by IAS at selected sites.

Section IV, Part i. "Expected Results" of the UNDP Prodoc more fully details the full suite of project outcomes, outputs, and activities as well as the specific implementation arrangements for the outputs and activities.

The table below summarizes the adjustments made to the strategic focus of the components based on the feedback from STAP and the GEF Council at the PIF phase.

TABLE 2 SUMMARY OF STRATEGIC ADJUSTMENTS FROM PIF PHASE

Components	Key comments on the strategic focus of the component	Strategic Adjustment
<p><i>1. Effective national policy framework on marine Invasive Alien Species</i></p>	<p>STAP: No STAP comments specifically related to the strategic focus of Component 1.</p> <p>GEF Council Members: No GEF Council comments specifically related to the strategic focus of Component 1.</p>	<p>No strategic adjustments made to Component 1 during PPG phase.</p>
<p><i>2. Capacity building, knowledge and information sharing systems to address the IAS threats</i></p>	<p>STAP: “As detailed in the text below, the PPG/ProDoc needs to specifically address key issues such as what "2.3 engagement with the shipping industry" and "2.4 increased knowledge and awareness" really mean in operational terms as it does so well with 2.1 and 2.2.”</p> <p>“The project design should consider not only how it will draw upon existing experience and knowledgebases (such as the global invasive species database, already mentioned in the PIF, EASIN and DAISIE (see References) but also contribute to these in order to maximize the potential for scaling up and impact. For example, within the Mediterranean region the MedPAN offers well-researched tools (e.g. see Otero, et al, 2013) and collaboration mechanisms regarding IAS prevention and management in protected areas. STAP encourages proponents to use existing databases and information management tools wherever possible before building unique datasets, and consider appropriate interoperability standards. Within the KM section of the full proposal these aspects should be set out clearly and referenced within the body</p>	<p>No strategic adjustment made, but Outputs 2.3 and 2.4 have been fully developed during the PPG phase in line with STAP comments. The specific activities to be carried out under these outputs have been developed and are elaborated. In particular, with respect to engagement with the shipping industry, the project will support the Government in implementing the Ballast Water Convention and the National Ballast Water Management Strategy. This will include organizing a national symposium on ballast water management involving the shipping sector representatives (building on the efforts undertaken regionally as part of the GloBallast project supported by the GEF). The project will carry out workshops and trainings for the shipping sector to increase understanding of the requirements for ballast water management under the convention, and to identify strategies and priorities for public-private partnerships to invest in the necessary technologies and infrastructure to effectively monitor and manage ballast water at Turkey’s ports and in Turkish national waters.</p> <p>With respect to Output 2.4 on “Increased knowledge and awareness...” this output has also been further developed and specified, keeping in mind STAP’s comments. The project will target multiple stakeholder groups to increase understanding and awareness about the presence and threats from marine IAS. In particular the project will work with resource user groups, such as fishermen and marine tourism companies (e.g. boat tours and diving companies), as well as relevant sectors such as the hobby aquarium and aquaculture sectors. Through multiple education and awareness strategies and activities the project will work to reduce risks of new IAS introductions, and to support resource users to assist with monitoring and presence and spread of key IAS.</p>

Components	Key comments on the strategic focus of the component	Strategic Adjustment
	<p>of the proposal.”</p> <p>GEF Council Members: No GEF Council comments specifically related to the strategic focus of Component 2.</p>	<p>The STAP comment regarding knowledgebases relates primarily to proposed Output 2.2 on the establishment of information systems related to IAS, as well as Output 2.4 on knowledge and awareness raising. The project assessed the potential relevance and linkages to existing databases mentioned by STAP (i.e. EASIN), and has made reference to these in the Prodoc. The exact linkages will have to be determined by the scientists and IT technicians engaged by the project during implementation.</p>
<p><i>3. Investment in sustainable management, prevention, eradication, and control of IAS and restoration of IAS-degraded habitat at key marine and coastal areas</i></p>	<p>STAP: No STAP comments specifically related to the strategic focus of Component 3.</p> <p>GEF Council Members: No GEF Council comments specifically related to the strategic focus of Component 3.</p>	<p>No strategic adjustments made to Component 3 during the PPG phase. However, the functional approach was slightly modified as such: The development of site-based IAS management plans and the establishment of local site-based “control units” was combined into a single output (Output 3.1), while measures to implement the site-based management plans were designed as a stand-alone output (Output 3.2).</p>
<p><i>Strategic Results Framework</i></p>	<p>STAP: “Finally, better and more specific indicators are needed in the Project Description than merely mentioning GEF tracking tools. Thus realistic output and outcome targets for intervention action need to be more narrowly defined within the work proposed. STAP welcomes the tighter focus on fewer areas within the revised PIF, but the full project proposal should consider carefully a theory of change informed by relevant experience from similar initiatives.”</p>	<p>As per normal PPG procedures the project Strategic Results Framework has been fully developed through the PPG process, with indicators and targets meeting SMART criteria to the extent feasible and possible. Beyond just the GEF tracking tool-linked indicators, other key indicators include the total area of directly improved marine and coastal seascape, for which the target is 94,800 hectares, the total area of the four proposed demonstration sites.</p> <p>With respect to the STAP comment regarding the project’s Theory of Change, the full Theory of Change has been developed and is described in the project document. The Theory of Change is directly based on CBD guidance and strategies for addressing IAS, and incorporates the CBD’s three-step approach (prevention, control, and mitigation), as well as the CBD’s 15 guiding principles related to IAS. During the PPG process a review was also conducted of similar relevant initiatives, which were also used to inform the development of the project’s Theory of Change. The project document includes a table (Table 2) on Key Lessons and Good Practices incorporated in the proposed project from other GEF funded projects.</p>
<p><i>Additional information</i></p>	<p>STAP: “There is not a single reference or evidence provided as to whether these interventions have succeeded/failed in the past. It is impossible to judge if the approaches suggested are speculative or</p>	<p>In response to the STAP comments, two reviews were conducted during the PPG phase of other relevant similar interventions, and key lessons and good practices were identified and incorporated in the project design. These are summarized in Table 2 in the project document. This specifically included a review of available evaluations of</p>

Components	Key comments on the strategic focus of the component	Strategic Adjustment
	<p>tried and tested. Therefore the full project proposal should review and refer to similar actions that have been implemented elsewhere, particularly drawing from the growing number of completed and ongoing GEF projects that address IAS, associated regulations and management measures.”</p> <p>“This is a strategically important and well conceptualized project that begins to address the serious problem of IAS in Turkey. It will reveal important lessons, and will need to be managed adaptively. It also cannot on its own complete the job and will need to be followed up with additional activities that hopefully can be based on experience developed through this highly worthwhile investment.”</p> <p>GEF Council Members: United States: “The United States supports the proposed project, which will help integrate Turkey into larger, regional efforts to reduce the spread and mitigate impacts of invasive species. As the proposal is further developed, we request that UNDP reflect on the recommendations made by the STAP with the further suggestion that it add more background on feasibility or lessons learned from similar efforts in nearby regions.”</p>	<p>previous GEF-funded projects addressing IAS. In addition, examples of other successful interventions targeting IAS at the global level were also researched and reviewed.</p>

The table below summarizes the changes made to the outputs originally proposed in the PIF, and the rationale for these changes.

TABLE 3 SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO OUTPUTS FROM PIF AND RATIONALE FOR CHANGES

Components	Original outputs in the PIF	Changes made to outputs at GEF CEO ER stage	Rationale for changes to outputs
Component 1 and Component 2	All outputs.	No changes made.	
Component	3.1 Management plans ^{CEP} designed and launched	3.1. Management	No change in description of output,

Components	Original outputs in the PIF	Changes made to outputs at GEF CEO ER stage	Rationale for changes to outputs
3 (Outputs)	with site- specific measures for prevention, ensure eradication, control and management of IAS (see details in the text)	plans designed and launched for 4 areas, with identification of site-specific measures for prevention, ensure eradication, control and management of IAS	but the establishment of “control units” previously described in PIF Output 3.2 has been functionally incorporated into this output, because these local stakeholder working groups will be formed as the conduit for the process of developing the local site-based management plans. These groups will then remain after the management plans are developed, and will be tasked with the implementation of the management plans, which is further described in the new Output 3.2.
	3.2 Four control units set up and equipped to detect, control spread of IAS at the target sites in collaboration with fishermen communities and manage targeted restoration of ecosystems degraded as a result of IAS.	3.2 Measures to detect, control spread of IAS at the target sites in collaboration with local communities, and targeted restoration of ecosystems degraded as a result of IAS.	As described immediately above, the PIF Output 3.2 has been incorporated into Output 3.1, while a new Output 3.2 was developed to facilitate an emphasis on implementation during the project of the site-based IAS management plans that will be developed.
	3.3 Reintroduction of native species at selected sites (details in the text; subject to a feasibility study at PPG)	3.3 Support for the recovery of native species disturbed by IAS at selected sites	Description adjusted slightly, based on feasibility assessments during the PPG stage. The actual reintroduction of native species at selected sites is not necessary as there are not yet any known local extinctions that have resulted from IAS invasions. Rather, what is required is a variety of support measures to improve the resiliency of native biota to fend off and be resistant to the spread of IAS, thereby reducing the ability of IAS to gain a foothold in compromised native ecosystems.

A.1.4 Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCE, SCCF, and co-financing; and

A.1.5. Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF)

The Section III. Strategy of the UNDP Prodoc has been significantly strengthened and further detailed compared to the "Project Components" section of the PIF. This has included further elaboration on a number of aspects in response to STAP and GEF Council comments. In particular, further reference has been made to other similar efforts in relevant contexts, including the a number of relevant projects addressing IAS within the current GEF portfolio.

Without the GEF investment in the proposed project, the "business-as-usual" scenario for the conservation of Turkey's marine and coastal biodiversity is one where:

(i) The invasions of alien species in the marine environment continue at a consistent rate, with new introductions occurring every four weeks on average via ship ballast water and other sources, likely including increasing introductions and spread from sectors such as tourism, aquaculture, and the aquarium sector, leading to increasingly diminished native biodiversity in sensitive and highly important marine and coastal ecosystems.

(ii) The Government of Turkey's capacity to implement, regulate and enforce policies, laws and bylaws related to the management and control of marine IAS remains inadequate, contributing to more rapid and expansive invasions of alien species introduced;

(iii) Awareness about the presence and impacts of marine IAS on native species and ecosystems remains low among policy and decision-makers, resource users, and regulatory authorities;

(iv) Native marine species and ecosystems continue to be degraded due to the negative impacts of marine IAS.

The 'alternative scenario' that the project seeks to contribute to is characterized by: (i) preventing the further degradation of key marine and coastal ecosystems and loss of native marine and coastal species that provide critical ecosystem services; (ii) reduced risks of new marine IAS introductions; (iii) increased understanding and awareness of the presence and threats of marine IAS in Turkey's coastal and marine environment; (iv) implementation of marine IAS management and control measures, leading to directly reduced threats to marine biodiversity; and (v) improved resiliency of native species and ecosystems to the introduction and expansion of marine IAS.

The total cost of investment in the project is estimated at \$16,544,654 USD of which \$3,344,654 USD constitutes grant funding from GEF and \$16,200,000 USD comprises co-financing from national government (MFWA) and UNDP.

The incremental value of the alternative scenario is summarized in the table below:

TABLE 4 LONG-TERM BENEFITS OF THE GEF INVESTMENT

Baseline	GEF Alternative	Benefits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of comprehensive and integrated national policy, legislative and regulatory framework and coordinating mechanism results in inefficient and ad hoc approaches to management and control of IAS, without clearly defined priorities to guide actions. Inadequate capacity of regulatory authorities, environmental inspectors, customs control authorities, and private sector for surveillance and prevention of IAS. No system for early detection and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive national framework and coordinating mechanism results in more efficient and effective actions to address IAS with clearly defined priorities. IAS related risks for biodiversity, food security, livelihoods, health and trade clearly identified, with economic and biodiversity risks and impacts assessed. Increased understanding and awareness of negative impacts of marine IAS, with documented cost-effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 94,800 ha of seascape and coastal environment under improved management for biodiversity conservation, including improved management of IAS and enhanced ecosystem resilience 700,000 ha of coastal and marine ecosystems indirectly improved for IAS management and control, resulting from strengthened policy, legislative and regulatory framework for IAS prevention, management and control, including effective management of ballast water (Total approximate coastline of 8,000 km x 1 ha equals ~800,000 ha, less the area of direct influence of 94,800 ha = ~700,000 ha; there is no official figure for the exact

Baseline	GEF Alternative	Benefits
<p>rapid response results in IAS ongoing introduction and expansion of marine IAS to the point where management and control is cost-prohibitive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate information on risks and impacts of marine IAS to biodiversity, food security, livelihoods, health and trade, and the pathways result in continued introductions and expansion of marine IAS. • Lack of investment in measures to detect, avoid and control IAS at key sites threatening remaining populations of globally significant biodiversity as well as food security, livelihoods, health and trade. 	<p>of a proactive biosecurity approach used to make the case to decision makers for increased investment in biosecurity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ballast water monitoring and control systems implemented to reduce risks of marine IAS introductions • Improved institutional capacity to monitor, prevent and address IAS associated risks. • Enforcement capacity of environmental inspectors and police in place for enhanced prevention, surveillance, management and control reduces movement and spread of high risk IAS. 	<p>length of Turkey’s coastline)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAS of high risk to biodiversity, food security, livelihoods, health and trade prevented from entering Turkey: the baseline rate of new IAS introductions (on average one every 4 weeks) is reduced • Projected coverage of <i>Posidonia</i> meadows at the 4 target sites (area 32,000) not less than baseline • Reduced populations and spread of targeted high risk IAS, including <i>Caulerpa spp.</i>, <i>Rapana venosa</i>, <i>Asterias rubens</i>, and <i>Pterois spp.</i> • Improved breeding success of globally important IAS-threatened sea turtles at the target sites • Increase in funding towards marine and coastal biosecurity and ecosystem resilience support measures in Turkey, compared to a baseline of zero funding specifically allocated for marine IAS management and control • Improved food security and livelihoods of fishing communities

A.1.6. Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling-up:

Innovativeness: There are many aspects of the project that are highly innovative, particularly within Turkey. The overall project is innovative within Turkey as there has not previously been any broad national effort to address marine IAS. Therefore the entire strategy and specific approaches to be implemented by the project will be new in Turkey; this includes elements such as the mechanisms to control and manage ballast water, site-based marine IAS management plans, the establishment of site-based marine IAS working groups. Further, the project’s proposed use of fiscal incentive mechanisms to help manage and control marine IAS is highly innovative. No such mechanisms have been implemented in Turkey, and there are not a large number of examples globally of such mechanisms in contexts that would be relevant for Turkey; this is partly due to the fact that each IAS has particular characteristics in terms of population dynamics, habitats, and types of impacts. Other particularly innovative approaches include the application of new technologies. For example, the project will demonstrate the use of eDNA analysis to identify the presence of specific IAS. eDNA is a new, cost-effective technology by which a sample of a medium (such as water, or dirt) is collected, and then analyzed for traces of DNA from specific species. In addition, the project will assess the feasibility of the use of robots for control of lionfish in the context of the Turkish marine ecosystem, under a new technology being developed by the company Robots in the Service of the Environment (RISE).

Sustainability and potential for scaling-up: Experience has shown in UNDP-GEF projects that sustainability is critically dependent on stakeholder ownership of the process and project results. Throughout implementation the project will continue to work closely with all stakeholders to ensure the strong engagement and ownership by stakeholders is carried on past the life of the project. The GEF has identified four key elements to sustainability, which are discussed in further detail below.

Financial Sustainability: There are two main activities of the project for which financial sustainability is a consideration. First is the project’s approach of establishing local marine IAS working groups in each of the project

pilot sites. Some investment will be required during the project to initiate these groups, and operationalize stakeholder communication and coordination procedures. However, once the project is completed, little to no additional investment will be required to continue the operations of these groups. Their main function will be local regular meetings and communication amongst all stakeholders relevant for the management and control of marine IAS in their region. If these groups prove effective and worthwhile it is anticipated that the local stakeholders involved will voluntarily continue their existence, as little or no additional financing would be required to do so. To help ensure their sustainability, the project will identify a working group member that is a local partner organization (for example, an NGO, a private sector partner, or a local government institution) that will assume the responsibility at the end of the project to serve as the working group focal point in charge of continuing to organize working meetings and maintain lines of communication between all working group members.

The second item is the fiscal incentive programs to be piloted under the project. These programs are not designed to be self-sustaining – their effectiveness and utility must be assessed and proven before they should be sustained; no such programs currently exist in Turkey. The effectiveness of the fiscal incentive programs will be carefully assessed; if the programs are deemed a valuable and cost-effective approach to managing and controlling marine IAS then it is anticipated that the central government will allocate budget resources once the project is complete to continue these programs. Increasing the government budget allocation to address marine IAS is one of the key results indicators of the project. The feasibility of financial sustainability in this regard is closely linked with the project's success in achieving the target of increasing government investment in IAS management and control to \$500,000 USD/year, as codified by indicator #4 in the project Results Framework. The fiscal incentive mechanisms are budgeted during project implementation at \$10,000 - \$14,000 per each for each pilot program. The investment required is small enough that it should be easy for the increased government expenditure on IAS to further finance the programs.

To avoid creating expectations that people will only remove IAS if they are paid, the project will also focus on behavior change related to local populations, which will be targeted as part of Output 2.4 related to education and awareness raising. The project will work with local stakeholders to increase the awareness and understanding of IAS presence and threats, to catalyze behaviors that support IAS management and control in addition to the fiscal incentive mechanisms, which are only one part of an overall strategy. For example, the project will carry out education and awareness activities with tourists and dive boat operators such that spear fishermen will be encouraged to capture targeted IAS species. In addition, fishermen will be encouraged to report any sightings or by-catch of IAS species, in order to help inform management and control strategies. In addition, one component of the fiscal incentive mechanisms does target the development of value chains, and other market mechanisms, in situations where this is relevant and feasible. For example, in the project site targeting lionfish, the project may develop a local cooking contest among tourist restaurants for lionfish recipes. The project may also develop fishing tournaments or contests where financial awards will be made to participants who catch the most number or kilograms of the targeted species.

Institutional Sustainability: The main institutional sustainability mechanism will be via the MFWA as the key national executing partner. Based on the project experiences MFWA will disseminate and implement the good practices identified for wider application throughout all territories under MFWA's mandate. Furthermore, the project will establish the national coordination mechanism on marine IAS, involving all relevant stakeholders. This body will be a key node for dissemination of lessons learned and good practices. In addition, the project includes a focus on knowledge management to disseminate lessons learned to stakeholders beyond MFWA and other stakeholders represented on the national coordination mechanism.

Socio-economic Sustainability: Socio-economic sustainability for the marine IAS project relies on the effective engagement of local marine resource users. In addition, this aspect of sustainability is dependent on the effectiveness of the project's education and awareness raising activities. If the project is successful at increasing the awareness and

understanding of local government officials then there will be sufficient local stakeholder ownership to sustain marine IAS management and control efforts at the local level.

Environmental Sustainability: Environmental sustainability in the context of this marine IAS project means that the positive impacts achieved by the project in terms of improving the condition of the native biota and ecosystems will be sustained once the project finishes. The project activities are designed to ensure this is achieved, including the implementation of IAS risk management systems. This includes control and monitoring of ballast water discharges (to minimize new IAS introductions), and centralized information systems to track the presence and abundance of marine IAS in Turkey’s coastal ecosystems.

Replication and up-scaling of good practices developed by the project will be achieved through the direct replication of selected project elements and practices and methods, as well as the scaling up of experiences. The following activities have preliminarily been identified as suitable for replication and/or scaling up:

- Establishment of local marine IAS control working groups at targeted high priority sites;
- Development of local site-based marine IAS management plans identifying strategies and priority actions to minimize the negative impacts of marine IAS at targeted high priority sites;
- Implementation of management and control measures for marine IAS (e.g. establishment of mooring buoys in sensitive seagrass habitats; application of new technologies such as robots for targeted control of marine IAS) that are proven to be successful and cost-effective at targeted high priority sites;
- Establishment of fiscal incentive mechanisms for targeted marine IAS;
- Use of eDNA testing to identify the presence and distribution of high priority marine IAS;

Between the project’s final PIR and the initiation of the project’s terminal evaluation, the project team will work with all project stakeholders to develop a brief exit strategy document that clearly and specifically indicates how key project results will be sustained in terms of roles and responsibilities following project completion. This will include, for example, clearly identifying the institutional “owner” of project outputs such as the marine IAS database.

A.2. *Child Project?* If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

N/A

A.3. Stakeholders. Elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement, particularly with regard to civil society organizations and indigenous peoples, is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project.

Note: There are no defined groups of indigenous people in Turkey.

During the project preparation stage, a stakeholder analysis was carried out to identify key stakeholders and assess their prospective roles and responsibilities in the context of the proposed project. The table below lists the key stakeholder organisations, and broadly describes the anticipated relationship of each of the stakeholder organizations in supporting or facilitating the implementation of project activities. Relevant civil society organizations have been identified are included in the summary table below.

TABLE 5 TURKEY MARINE IAS PROJECT KEY STAKEHOLDERS

Project Stakeholder	Relationship With The Project
Government Organizations	
Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs (MFWA)	MFWA is the responsible body for conservation of biodiversity and nature in Turkey as well as management and conservation of water and forest resources. The Ministry has six general directorates: State Hydraulic Works, Nature Conservation and National Parks (GDNCNP), Forestry, Water

Project Stakeholder	Relationship With The Project
	<p>Management, Combating Desertification and Erosion, State Meteorological Service.</p> <p>GDNCNP is responsible for the declaration and management of protected areas, ecological construction, preparing management plans for those sites, conservation of species of special concern and critical habitats, preparing development strategy, planning and drafting relevant laws and regulations, and supervising the implementation of the organization to carry out investigation, monitoring of wildlife and ecosystems.</p> <p>MFWA will support for the design, implementation, financing and mainstreaming of the IAS regulations, and policies as envisaged under Component I, but it will also oversee the implementation of the whole project. It will also ensure coordination among all project stakeholders, ensure impact and progress monitoring and information dissemination and national replication/scaling up of project lessons.</p> <p>MFWA and GDNCNP will be natural members of the project board.</p>
<p>Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (MFAL)</p>	<p>MFAL is the Ministry in Turkey that is responsible from management of agricultural resources and pastures, fishing waters and conservation of agricultural biodiversity as well as achieving agricultural sustainable development. The Ministry is the body for adopting laws and regulations regarding plant and animal epidemic prevention and quarantine, signing intergovernmental agreements, agreements to develop standards, organization, supervision of domestic animals and plants epidemic prevention and quarantine work, publishing the epidemic and responsible for the organization of extinguishing.</p> <p>The General Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture (GDFA) is the key department of the Ministry that is responsible from sustainable management and conservation of marine and inland water fisheries and aquaculture in Turkey.</p> <p>For the IAS project, MFAL will be responsible for upscaling of project results nationwide within their jurisdiction. Collaboration with MFAL is crucial for Marine IAS management activities. It will be involved in component 1 and 2 directly and will provide support for the other components at the technical level. Moreover, MFAL will be a member of the Project Board.</p>
<p>Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communications (MTMAC)</p>	<p>MTMAC is responsible for organizing, coordinating and guiding of shipping activities in Turkey. MTMAC has the responsibility in managing the shipping routes and management of ballast water and hence the Ministry will be the key partner to identify the alternative solutions and strategy options for ballast water and IAS. The Ministry is the focal point for the Ballast Water Convention in Turkey and is responsible from coordination of Turkish organizations for the Convention related subjects.</p> <p>The Ministry will provide technical support for components 1 and 2 and will be the beneficiary of the dedicated capacity building activities on handling ballast water. MTMAC will be a member of the Project Board. General Directorate of Maritime and Inland Waters Regulation will be the focal point of the Ministry for the IAS Project.</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Urbanism (MEU)</p>	<p>MEU is the Ministry that is responsible from protection and management of environment, organization of public work and urban planning. Ministry is the focal point of UNFCCC in Turkey. In relation to the project, the Ministry is responsible for protection of marine environment in terms of pollution. The General Directorate of Environmental Management of the Ministry will support the design and implementation of the quarantine measures and IAS protocols. It will be one of the key Government partners for the implementation of Components 1 and 2.</p>
<p>Ministry of Health</p>	<p>MoH is responsible for coordinating human health support services. Specifically, MoH has the</p>

Project Stakeholder	Relationship With The Project
(MoH)	responsibility in first aid and cure patients injured or poisoned by Marine Invasive Alien Species. Education and awareness raising activities for staff of the MoH along Turkish coastline will be held on rapid treatment of IAS poisoned/injured people. They will be also involved to ensure that the volunteer ranger program (Component 3) is effectively and securely implemented.
Ministry of Culture and Tourism ^[1] (MCT)	MCT is responsible for organizing, coordinating and guiding of tourism activities. MCT has the responsibility in managing the tourism activities such as diving, swimming, recreational etc. Information dissemination for tourists and also to minimize/manage the negative impacts of mass tourism to vulnerable ecosystems. The Ministry will be providing technical inputs and implementation support for the knowledge building and advocacy campaign as it is indicated in component 2.
Ministry of Development (MD)	Ministry of Development plans and guides Turkey's development sustainable process and focuses on the coordination of policies and strategy development, will support the project to monitor the progress and disseminating the relevant information. The Ministry will be also providing the guidance to ensure that the developed strategies and action plans are in line with the national priorities. MD will be also part of the Project Board.
Regional-Government Agencies	
Regional Directorates of Forestry and Water Affairs (RDoM - MFWA)	RDoM is responsible for the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources and protected areas such as natural parks, nature parks, nature conservation areas and wildlife resources at local scale. The RDoM will be a member of the project implementation unit and support monitoring of objective achievement and information sharing. RDoM will lead in foundation and operation of local committees and task forces regarding the management planning and related implementations. RDoM will ensure effective participation of local communities and NGOs as well as private sector to the local activities of the project.
Province Directorates of Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (Kırklareli, Balıkesir and Hatay)	Province directorates of MFAL are the local units of the Ministry that are responsible from undertaking the local duties and keeping the direct relations with farmers, rangers and fishermen. These units will be natural members of local committees and task forces that will be established during the project course.
Turkish Coast Guard Command (TCGC)	TCGC is the responsible body to enforce national and international laws and to ensure the safety of life and property within its area of maritime jurisdiction. TCGC will enhance the implementation of the project via its ability and capacity to control illegal activities such as illegal fishing etc. It is the key recipient of may of the trainings and capacity building activities envisaged under the project.
Turkish Customs	The Turkish Customs are related to IAS introduction, such as hobby aquarium and aquaculture sectors. Customs are generally the first control point for introduction of alien species and hence their participation to the project is key. The project will pay attention to capacity building elements for customs staff for combating IAS.
Gendarmes	The Gendarmes is the responsible body to enforce national and international laws and to ensure the safety of life and property within its jurisdiction. It also has nature conservation teams to protect biodiversity, and thus it is an important beneficiary of the capacity building activities and trainings under the project.
NGOs and Local Communities	
Underwater Research Society – Monk Seal Research Group	SAD-AFAG is one of the oldest NGOs (founded in 1987) working for the conservation of marine and coastal ecosystems with a specific focus to Monk Seal. SAD-AFAG works to protect fish stocks besides monk seal habitat conservation activities. Organization also works closely with local public

Project Stakeholder	Relationship With The Project
(SAD-AFAG)	authorities to development necessary regulations and effective implementation of existing legislations. (www.sadafag.org)
Mediterranean Conservation Society	The Society aims to protect Mediterranean ecosystem and support communities for sustainable living areas. Main working areas of the organization are large-scale fisheries, aquaculture, amateur fishing, sustainable fishing, marine protected areas and invasive alien species. Society's experience on IAS will be an asset for the project. (akdenizkoruma.org.tr)
Turkish Marine Research Foundation	Founded in 1997, TUDAV aims to undertake research in marine sciences and protect marine life in Turkey. TUDAV's experience in marine research and capacity building activities in the coastal regions can be an asset for the project. (tudav.org)
WWF-Türkiye	WWF in Turkey aims to prevent the degradation of Turkey's natural environment and to build a future in which humans live in harmony with nature. The organization has a long history of working in marine and coastal areas and key marine species including sea turtles and dusky grouper (<i>Epinephelus marginatus</i>). (wwf.org.tr) WWF-Türkiye will be consulted and involved in all aspects of the project relevant to WWF-Türkiye's work.
Local communities at the pilot sites	Inhabitants of the villages within the selected pilot project areas will be made aware of the issues and invited to take part in the decision making process. They will be represented in the local committees that will be founded for the preparation and effective implementation of management plans. Local communities will be represented by the village headmen (muhtar) and they will be asked to actively involve in the project activities. The village headmen will be the main counterparts in linking the project objectives and activities to the needs of the people in the project area. They will be involved mainly in component 3, but also be consulted for the policies developed under the Component 1.
Private Sector	
Fisheries, aquaculture companies and hobby aquarium sector	Under Component 3, the project will work with fishermen, fish producers and aquarists in the region.
Tourism Agencies	The outreach activities of the project will seek cooperation with tourism agencies in the region involved in diving, yachting, and sightseeing.
Marine transport sector	Under Component 2, the project will work with marine transport sector employees.

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Elaborate on how gender equality and women's empowerment issues are mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men.

The project development phase included a gender analysis (see Annex L), and direct coordination and cooperation with the UNDP Turkey Country Office gender mainstreaming specialist. The project preparation also included completion of the mandatory UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Protocol, which is included as an annex to the UNDP Prodoc. The project was designed in accordance with the UNDP Gender Equality Strategy 2014-2017, in support of the GEF Gender Mainstreaming Policy, and in relation to the GEF Gender Equality Action Plan. The UNDP Turkey Country Office has developed a Gender Equality Strategy for 2016-2020; this strategy has been reviewed during the project development process, and the project has been designed with this strategy in mind. The project was developed following the steps of the UNDP Turkey Country Office Gender Screening Guidelines for Project Development and

Implementation (also see Annex L of the UNDP Prodoc). The project is addressing and incorporating gender mainstreaming in all relevant aspects. Key aspects of the gender mainstreaming approach include:

- The full suite of project staff and technical consultants will have gender balance to the extent possible and feasible, in accordance with consideration of the technical qualifications of all candidates for any position, and in accordance with UNDP procurement and human resources policies;
- The Project Board will request a review of the draft annual project workplan by the UNDP Turkey Country Office gender mainstreaming expert prior to the Project Board meeting;
- The Project Technical Advisory Group will either have gender-balanced membership, or will include a special gender mainstreaming representative, to ensure that all aspects of project activities incorporate gender mainstreaming approaches;
- The marine IAS working groups established in each of the project demonstration sites will also either have gender-balanced representation or have a specific gender mainstreaming representative, and the site-based management plans will include a gender mainstreaming perspective, as relevant;
- The project activities related to fiscal incentives for management and control of marine IAS (Output 1.4) will be designed to ensure gender mainstreaming aspects, as appropriate (for example, financial incentive mechanisms may be designed to particularly consider the role of women in the artisanal fishing sector);
- Project activities such as workshops and trainings will ensure gender balance to the extent feasible;
- Government regulations, policies, or legislation developed under the project will include a gender mainstreaming perspective, as relevant;
- Project knowledge products and case studies will include a gender perspective, as relevant;
- The project Strategic Results Framework includes gender-disaggregated indicators, as relevant, and includes a specific indicator on the level of implementation of gender mainstreaming during the project;
- The project activities targeting management and control of marine IAS (Component 3) will ensure consideration of gender mainstreaming aspects, as they will be reviewed and assessed at the national and site levels through the Project Board, National Technical Advisory Group, and local working groups, which will all have gender mainstreaming inputs.

A.5 Risk. Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

Project risks and mitigation measures have been significantly improved. The revised risks and risk mitigation measures are described in the table below. In addition, the project has received an overall “low risk” rating in the UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Protocol (SESP) (Annex F of the UNDP Prodoc). The project is only relevant to three of the risk standards, and the risk for each is assessed as “low”; explanations related to each of the identified standards are provided in the UNDP Prodoc SECTION V.iii. Social and Environmental Safeguards. Any environmental or social grievances raised may be reported to any of the three channels outlined in the UNDP Prodoc.

TABLE 6 TURKEY MARINE IAS PROJECT RISK ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION

Description	Type	Impact & Probability	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
Insufficient national institutional coordination to effectively implement key policies and regulations on	Results	Impact = 3 Probability = 2	The project plans to specifically establish an inter-ministerial coordination mechanism, which will serve as the primary mitigation measure to this risk. Nonetheless, the project touches on the institutional mandates of multiple governmental institutions in Turkey (MFWA, MFAL, MTMAC, MEU) at the national and local level. Addressing marine IAS is inherently a multi-	PMU	N/A

Description	Type	Impact & Probability	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
marine IAS management and control			sectoral issue. As back-up approach, if by the 3 rd year the project faces insurmountable challenges with working on marine IAS issues that are within the purview of MFAL, MTMAC, or MEU, the project will prioritize all efforts toward a.) ensuring implementation of the Ballast Water Convention in collaboration with MTMAC, and b.) working at the site level on marine IAS aspects within the institutional mandate of MFWA.		
Insufficient local stakeholder buy-in to effectively implement marine IAS management and control measures over the long-term	Results	Impact = 3 Probability = 2	There are few, if any, negative risks to local stakeholders from proposed project activities, but successful long-term management and control of marine IAS does require the involvement and support of local resource-users. However, the threats posed by IAS in most cases is not easily seen, and can be long-term through degraded ecosystems, etc. This significance of this type of threat may not be immediately clear and apparent to local resource users, who may not then be motivated to act in support of IAS control and management measures. The project will work to mitigate this risk through two approaches: 1. The education and awareness raising activities that will be carried out at the site level targeting all different types of stakeholders; 2. The formation of the local IAS task force in each of the demonstration sites will involve representatives of key local stakeholder groups, who will then act as channels of communication and motivation to the wider local stakeholder community.	PMU	N/A
Lack of marine ecosystem and biodiversity data	Results	Impact = 2 Probability = 3	Only one of the four planned demonstration sites has extensive historical biodiversity monitoring data, which presents some risks in terms of effectively organizing all planned project activities, and tracking the impact of project results over time. The project will mitigate this to the extent possible by undertaking direct ecosystem and biodiversity monitoring of key activities during the project, instead of relying on existing 3 rd party data or sources. For example, the project will specifically track the results of the fiscal incentive activities through direct monitoring to assess effectiveness.	PMU	N/A
Insufficiently robust technical approaches to managing and	Results	Impact = 4 Probability = 2	Although Turkey has a number of high quality academic institutions and many highly qualified scientists, the field of management and control of marine IAS is still essentially a new realm of	PMU	N/A

Description	Type	Impact & Probability	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
controlling marine IAS due to lack of experience and know-how			marine ecosystem management in Turkey. Therefore there is little direct experience with real-world implementation of many of the technical aspects of marine IAS management and control activities that will be necessary to achieve the project objective. Therefore there is a risk that some project activities could be delayed or could face unexpected problems due to inadequate technical experience. The project will mitigate this by ensuring that the project draws on the best international practices known that are relevant for the Turkish context. This will include, for example, conducting conferences and seminars with invited international experts. The project also plans to possibly undertake study tour activities to other countries with more extensive experience in this realm, as long as they are relevant for the Turkish context.		
Inadequate stakeholder engagement related to potential institutional instability and change relating to national political context.	Operational	Impact = 3 Probability = 2	Addressing marine IAS in a comprehensive manner requires involvement of multiple national institutions, as well as coordination at the field level. The project has built in specific mechanisms to support this coordination and interaction. However, Turkey is currently undergoing some national political changes ⁸ that may result in changes to institutional structures or mandates in the coming years. In this context of institutional uncertainty and change it may be difficult for the project to effectively engage all necessary stakeholders during project implementation. The project will continuously monitor this risk and take adaptive management measures as necessary if this risk appears to negatively affect the project's operational approach and effectiveness.	PMU	N/A
Climate change affects marine ecosystems in a manner that overwhelms the project efforts	Results	Impact = 5 Probability = 1	Climate change can create stress on marine ecosystems, which in turn can stress native biota. It is in such circumstances that certain marine IAS can successfully colonize marine ecosystems, and expand their presence in a way that harms and degrades native ecosystems and biota. There is no question that climate change is occurring and affecting Turkey's coastal and marine ecosystems. However, currently the rate of change is not so great as to catalyze ecosystem	PMU	N/A

⁸ Turkey held a national constitutional referendum in April 2017.

Description	Type	Impact & Probability	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
			changes that would potentially supersede the project's results. Nonetheless, the project will mitigate this risk by tracking some climate change indicators in the project demonstration sites (e.g. water temperature trends), and will continually assess if climate change is leading to any catastrophic changes in relation to the colonization and expansion of marine IAS. If it is identified that catastrophic changes are occurring, the project will re-direct and re-plan project resources and activities, as appropriate, to address these challenges. The Project Board will make any decision along these lines, with technical input from the project Technical Advisory Group.		

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination. Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

Institutional Arrangements:

SECTION VIII. Governance and Management Arrangements of the UNDP Prodoc has been fully elaborated during the PPG phase, with the additional information summarized below.

Roles and responsibilities of the project's governance mechanism: The project will be implemented following UNDP's national implementation modality, according to the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between UNDP and the Government of Turkey, and the Country Programme. The UNDP Project Quality Assurance Report is attached as Annex G to the UNDP Prodoc.

The **Implementing Partner** for this project is Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs – General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks. The Implementing Partner is responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources. The results of the UNDP capacity assessment of the project implementing partner and HACT micro-assessment are included as Annex I to the UNDP Prodoc.

The project organization structure is indicated in the UNDP Prodoc.

The **Project Board** (also called Project Steering Committee) is responsible for making by consensus, management decisions when guidance is required by the Project Technical Coordinator, including recommendation for UNDP/Implementing Partner approval of project plans and revisions. In order to ensure UNDP's ultimate accountability, Project Board decisions should be made in accordance with standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. In case a consensus cannot be reached within the Board, final decision shall rest with the UNDP Portfolio Manager. The terms of reference for the Project Board are contained in Annex E. The Project Board is comprised of the following roles:

- Senior Executive (Chairman of the Board) – Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs: The Senior Executive is ultimately responsible for the project, supported by the Senior Beneficiary and Senior Supplier. This role requires representing the interests of Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs who will ultimately benefit from the project. The Senior Executive's primary function within the Board will be to ensure that the project is focused throughout its life cycle on achieving its objectives and delivering outputs that will contribute to higher level outcomes. The Senior Executive has to ensure that the project gives value for money, ensuring a cost-conscious approach to the project, balancing the demands of beneficiary and supplier. Senior executive role will be held by the Undersecretary of the MoFWA. The Undersecretary may delegate this role to another senior official within the MoFWA.

- **Senior Beneficiary** – General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks: The Senior Beneficiary is responsible for validating the needs and for monitoring that the solution will meet those needs within the constraints of the project. The role represents the interests of all those who will benefit from the project, or those for whom the deliverables resulting from activities will achieve specific output targets. The Senior Beneficiary role monitors progress against targets and quality criteria. This role will be held by General Director of the The General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks while General Director may delegate another senior official within the General Directorate.
- **Senior Supplier** – UNDP: The Senior Supplier represents the interests of the parties which provide funding and/or technical expertise to the project (designing, developing, facilitating, procuring, implementing). The Senior Supplier’s primary function within the Board will be to provide guidance regarding the technical feasibility of the project. This role will rest with UNDP-Turkey represented by the Country Director.

The **Project Assurance** supports the Project Board by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. This role ensures appropriate project management milestones are managed and completed. Project Assurance has to be independent of the Project Technical Coordinator; therefore, the Project Board cannot delegate any of its assurance responsibilities to the Project Technical Coordinator. The Project Assurance role will rest with combination of several positions. A deputy General Director from GDNCNP will lead the Project Assurance. Moreover, a representative from Department of Environmentally Sensitive Areas will be appointed. Finally, UNDP Turkey Assistant Resident Representative for Programme (ARR-P) will be a member of Project Assurance team.

The project **Technical Advisory Group** will be established to provide technical oversight and assurance of all project activities. The Technical Advisory Group will consist of technical representatives of key stakeholders. Membership will include representatives from the following: MoFWA, MoTMAC, MFAL, each of the pilot sites, a civil society representative, and a scientific / academic expert. In addition, if the Technical Advisory Group does not innately have gender balance, then the Technical Advisory Group will include a gender mainstreaming representative.

The **Project Implementation Unit (PIU)** will assist the GDNCNP in performing its role as implementing partner. PIU will be comprised of three sub-units according to implementing function of the project.

- First sub-unit, namely Governmental Sub-unit, will be established by Department of Environmentally Sensitive Areas for governmental support function and will have two representatives.
- Second sub-unit, namely Technical Sub-unit, will be established by UNDP, through new recruitments for daily implementation of the project. Project Management function will be carried on by a Project Technical Coordinator and a Project Associate. Technical sub-unit will be composed of : a Project Technical Coordinator and a Project Associate.
- Third sub-unit, namely Administrative Sub-unit, will be established by UNDP for undertaking administrative management function of the project and ensuring compliance with UNDP/GEF administrative regulations. Administrative sub-unit will be composed of: half time of project associate and UNDP Operations Unit.as per LOA between UNDP and the Government of Turkey.

The three sub-units will work in harmony and compliment each other for smooth implementation in line with UNDP/GEF rules and regulations.

The **Project Technical Coordinator (PTC)** will run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Implementing Partner within the constraints laid down by the Board. The Project Technical Coordinator function will end when the final project terminal evaluation report, and other documentation required by the GEF and UNDP, has been completed and submitted to UNDP (including operational closure of the project). The PTC will perform its function with support of UNDP Portfolio Manager and Cluster Lead, based in Ankara. The PTC and Project Associate will nationally recruited.

The UNDP Regional Technical Advisor will provide additional quality assurance as needed.

The UNDP CO will provide, at the request of GDNCNP, the following support services for the activities of the project (see Annex O Direct Project Costs Letter):

- a) Identification and recruitment of project and programme personnel;
- b) Identification and facilitation of training activities;

- c) Procurement of goods and services;

Coordination:

Partnerships: The Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs (MoFWA) is the main beneficiary of the project. The General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks Unit of Marine Protected Areas is the organization responsible from management of IAS in Turkey. The Unit will coordinate project activities with other key partners of the project. The Unit is currently developing a project proposal focusing on IAS in terrestrial and inland regions for European Commission Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA) grant funding. The project aims to identify threats related to IAS, and eradication of the targeted IAS species. The project will focus on six key alien species, and it is expected to start in 2018 if accepted by the EU. Moreover, currently the General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks is leading another GEF-funded project in collaboration with the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in Turkey, “Conservation and Sustainable Management of Turkey's Steppe Ecosystems” (GEF ID# 5657). This project aims to conserve steppe ecosystems and achieve sustainable use of steppe natural resources. Although the topics of both projects are different, the two GEF supported projects under the same General Directorate will be encouraged to communicate with each other and share experiences towards achievement of their results.

The Ministry of Food Agriculture and Livestock (MFAL) is one of the key partners to this project. MFAL and its provincial directorates will play a key role in implementation as fishing circular and aquaculture related subjects are within the authority of this Ministry. The Project Implementation Unit will closely work with and inform the General Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture throughout the project course. The annual fishery circular of the ministry and general permissions / restrictions regulated by the Ministry are key factors that will determine several project issues. MFAL will also be represented on the Project Technical Advisory Group.

The Ministry of Transportation, Maritime Affairs and Communication (MTMAC) is another key partner in terms of maritime regulations and management and control of ballast water in the shipping sector. The Ministry is the focal point for the Ballast Water Convention in Turkey. The Project Management Implementation Unit will coordinate project activities regarding ballast water regulations as well as capacity building in customs and shipping sectors. MTMAC will also be represented on the Project Technical Advisory Group.

UNDP Turkey, as the project executing partner, will coordinate all project activities with the key partners. UNDP with its long lasting experience in GEF project management will benefit from its experience with previous GEF projects. Specifically, the IAS project will be leveraged by the experience created during the implementation of the previous GEF project “Strengthening the System of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas of Turkey” (GEF ID# 3550). In particular, the experiences, infrastructures and systems created for biodiversity monitoring data and site-specific knowledge of the project will be used.

South-south and Triangular Cooperation: There are two main project strategies that will target South-South cooperation. First, the project team will actively research, review, and incorporate best practices for management and control of marine IAS from other developing countries, particularly in relation to contexts relevant for Turkey. This will likely include integration of best practices from other developing countries. For example, the project will analyze and consider the applicability in Turkey of various practices for managing lionfish in the Caribbean. Second, the project plans to carry out some site-based study-tours related to marine IAS management, and the project will prioritize visits to developing countries that are successfully implementing models of management and control of marine IAS. In addition, the project plans to organize a number of knowledge-sharing activities, such as scientific conferences and events. The project will ensure that experts from developing countries with good marine IAS management and control practices are invited to participate in these events.

In addition, Turkey is a relatively more developed country than many Global South countries. As a result of this marine IAS project Turkey may gain valuable knowledge and experience that could be relevant for other Global South countries. In this regard, Turkey will, via this project, seek to share and disseminate knowledge and experience on the management and control of marine IAS species. This will be achieved by ensuring experts from other relevant Global South countries are invited to international events organized by the project. Any key reports or research papers will also be translated into English for wider international dissemination.

Coordination with related initiatives: As previously discussed in the above section on Baseline Projects, there are no notable significant other efforts related to marine IAS in Turkey. However, the proposed project adds value to a number of related initiatives as set out below:

- Control and Management of Aquatic Organisms Carried via Ballast Water Project (2006-2008). The aim of the project was to strengthen the ballast water management within Turkish territorial waters and prepare a national ballast water strategy. An action plan on ballast water management was prepared in 2010. This new GEF project is a logical extension, in that it will, under Output 2.3. build capacities to minimize the uptake of IAS with ballast water and release ballast water in a way which allows confinement of IAS and avoiding their release into coastal waters.
- In 2013 Turkey completed a GEF project on Expansion and support of the Marine Protected Areas. The project created several new protected areas at critical sites and helped to develop a National MCPA Strategy. However, that project did not envisage tackling in detail the threats associated with IAS, hence this new GEF project will be a logical next stage investment supporting globally important marine and coastal biodiversity present in Turkey.

A.7 Benefits. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

The project will generate socio-economic benefits by helping securing livelihoods, food security, and health benefits that are dependent on the marine environment and coastal ecosystems. The most notable aspect of this is in relation to working to maintain sustainably harvestable populations of marine fish and other organisms that have economic importance for local fishers. There are approximately 2,500 people amongst the four sites whose livelihoods depend directly on fishing, who will therefore directly benefit from the project activities (1,288 licensed fishers in Igneada, 64 registered fishers in Marmara Islands, approximately 1,000 fishers in Ayvalik Islands, and approximately 300 fishers in Hatay-Samandag). In addition the project will work to maintain the integrity of coastal and marine ecosystems that support sustainable development and local livelihoods in other ways, such as tourism. The total population of these coastal settlements is approximately 200,000 (2015 population figures: 2,148 Igneada; 8,848 Marmara Islands; 67,902 Ayvalik Islands; 117,770 Hatay-Samandag), and a large percentage of this population benefits in various ways from a healthy coastal and marine ecosystem, but the number of tourists visiting these sites is significantly higher. Tourism in each of these sites mostly relates in some way to the marine environment, such as through yachting, beachgoing, diving, or other such activities. It is estimated that annually more than 20,000 tourists visit Igneada, more than 100,000 visit Marmara islands, and more than 230,000 visit Ayvalik Islands (there is no official estimate for Hatay-Samandag), for a total annual visitation figure of 350,000-400,000 tourists in the project pilot sites. There is significant potential for tourism to be negatively affected by marine IAS, which is an important issue for Turkey, since tourism makes up a large percentage of Turkey's national economy. For example, the use of beaches, swimming, and diving can be negatively affected by lionfish (which eat large amounts of native fish), species of invasive alien jellyfish, and the water hyacinth biomass that ends up on the beaches in Hatay-Samandag. The project will specifically: (1) work with local resource users and stakeholders to manage and control marine IAS to support local sustainable livelihoods such as fishing and shellfish harvesting; (2) assist local governments to identify options and potential funding sources for improving their marine and coastal environment, including developing strategies to address key pressures such as tourism development

and wastewater management; (3) provide financial support to resource users who participate in marine IAS management and control activities through fiscal incentive mechanisms; and (4) work directly and collaboratively with the private sector to develop mutually feasible strategies to support implementation of the Ballast Water Convention. At the local level the project will work through local stakeholder working groups as a means of improving the communication, collaboration and cooperation between stakeholders with complementary and overlapping resource management mandates in relation to marine IAS, as well as resource users with tenure and usufruct rights.

A.8 Knowledge Management. Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

The project includes two outputs that specifically relate to and support knowledge management. Output 2.2 supports the development of a national public-access database relating to different aspects of prevention, management and control of marine IAS, including ballast water management and the monitoring of the spread of marine IAS in Turkey's coastal and marine ecosystems. Output 2.4 is designed as a knowledge and awareness raising component targeting a range of relevant stakeholders from the local to the national level. For example the project will target the hobby aquarium industry and the aquaculture sector with the aim of preventing new IAS introductions. The project also aims to work with local resource users and local communities to raise awareness about the threats and negative impacts of marine IAS, as well as the potential pathways for invasions. Such efforts are critical for comprehensively minimizing risks from marine IAS.

In addition, knowledge management is an integral part of the project M&E plan, and the key lessons and good practices relating to each of the project outputs will be documented and shared through various project knowledge products produced by the project management unit. These include, for example, the annual PIR, mid-term review and terminal evaluation, as well as public outreach products such as media pieces, web-based articles and case studies, and other similar efforts. The project will also support specific scientific-method documentation of marine IAS threats and impacts, and the production of peer-reviewed scientific articles is one of the indicators for the project, with a target of 4 articles published.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

B.1 Consistency with National Priorities. Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.:

IAS are high on the agenda of Turkey's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). The project addresses the following actions of NBSAP: strategic action: 1.3.4. "Taking appropriate legal and institutional measures, including the improvement of human resources, for the identification of the alien species that are introduced or most probably will be introduced into Turkey, the prevention of the introduction of invasive alien species, the determination of any possible adverse impacts of them on biological diversity and the elimination and control of those impacts"; measure no 11: "The appropriate legal and institutional measures for the identification of the alien species that are entering or most probably will enter Turkey, the prevention of the invasive alien species from entering Turkey, the determination of any possible adverse impacts of them on biological diversity and the removal and control of those impacts are taken and implemented". This investment promotes closer cooperation among agencies, sectors and stakeholders on biosecurity; strengthens capacity; develops awareness and enforcement and raises public awareness of the threat caused by marine traffic in spread of IAS; and establishes a database of invasive species present in Turkey. [11] [SEP]

In addition, the project will contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets, in particular under the strategic goal B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use, Target 9: By 2020, invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent introduction and establishment; and under strategic goal C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity, Target 12: By 2020, the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has improved and sustained.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The project will be monitored through the following Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) activities. The project strategic results framework – an integral part of the M&E plan – is attached as Annex A to this CEO Endorsement Request. The UNDP Prodoc also includes a specific project monitoring plan (Annex B to the UNDP Prodoc) and evaluation plan (Annex C to the UNDP Prodoc).

Inception Workshop and Report: A project inception workshop will be held within two months after the project document has been signed by all relevant parties to, amongst others:

- a) Re-orient project stakeholders to the project strategy and discuss any changes in the overall context that influence project implementation;
- b) Discuss the roles and responsibilities of the project team, including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms;
- c) Review the results framework and finalize the indicators, means of verification and monitoring plan;
- d) Discuss reporting, monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities and finalize the M&E budget; identify national/regional institutes to be involved in project-level M&E; discuss the role of the GEF OFP in M&E;
- e) Update and review responsibilities for monitoring the various project plans and strategies, including the risk log; Environmental and Social Management Plan and other safeguard requirements; the gender strategy; the knowledge management strategy, and other relevant strategies;
- f) Review financial reporting procedures and mandatory requirements, and agree on the arrangements for the annual audit; and
- g) Plan and schedule Project Board meetings and finalize the first year annual work plan.

The Project Technical Coordinator will prepare the inception report no later than one month after the inception workshop. The inception report will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and will be approved by the Project Board.

GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR): The Project Technical Coordinator, the UNDP Country Office, and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor will provide objective input to the annual GEF PIR covering the reporting period July (previous year) to June (current year) for each year of project implementation. The Project Technical Coordinator will ensure that the indicators included in the project results framework are monitored annually in advance of the PIR submission deadline so that progress can be reported in the PIR. Any environmental and social risks and related management plans will be monitored regularly, and progress will be reported in the PIR.

The PIR submitted to the GEF will be shared with the Project Board. The UNDP Country Office will coordinate the input of the GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders to the PIR as appropriate. The quality rating of the previous year's PIR will be used to inform the preparation of the subsequent PIR.

Lessons learned and knowledge generation: Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention area through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to the project. The project will identify, analyze and share lessons learned that might be beneficial to the design and implementation of similar projects and disseminate these lessons widely. There will be continuous information exchange between this project and other projects of similar focus in the same country, region and globally.

GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools: The following GEF Tracking Tool(s) will be used to monitor global environmental benefit results: GEF Biodiversity Invasive Species Tracking Tool. The baseline/CEO Endorsement GEF Focal Area Tracking Tool(s) – submitted in Annex D to this project document – will be updated by the Project Technical Advisor/Team and shared with the mid-term review consultants and terminal evaluation consultants (not the evaluation consultants hired to undertake the MTR or the TE) before the required review/evaluation missions take place. The updated GEF Tracking Tool(s) will be submitted to the GEF along with the completed Mid-term Review report and Terminal Evaluation report.

Independent Mid-term Review (MTR): An independent MTR process will begin after the second PIR has been submitted to the GEF, and the MTR report will be submitted to the GEF in the same year as the 3rd PIR. The MTR findings and responses outlined in the management response will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's duration. The terms of reference, the review process and the MTR report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the UNDP Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). As noted in this guidance, the evaluation will be 'independent, impartial and rigorous'. The consultants that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. The GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders will be involved and consulted during the MTR process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the UNDP-GEF Directorate. The final MTR report will be available in English and will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and approved by the Project Board.

Terminal Evaluation (TE): An independent TE will take place upon completion of all major project outputs and activities. The terminal evaluation process will begin three months before operational closure of the project allowing the evaluation mission to proceed while the project team is still in place, yet ensuring the project is close enough to completion for the evaluation team to reach conclusions on key aspects such as project sustainability. The Project Technical Coordinator will remain on contract until the TE report and management response have been finalized. The terms of reference, the evaluation process and the final TE report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the UNDP Evaluation Resource Center. As noted in this guidance, the evaluation will be 'independent, impartial and rigorous'. The consultants that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. The GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders will be involved and consulted during the terminal evaluation process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the UNDP-GEF Directorate. The final TE report will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and will be approved by the Project Board. The TE report will be publically available in English on the UNDP ERC.

The UNDP Country Office will include the planned project terminal evaluation in the UNDP Country Office evaluation plan, and will upload the final terminal evaluation report in English and the corresponding management response to the UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). Once uploaded to the ERC, the UNDP IEO will undertake a quality

assessment and validate the findings and ratings in the TE report, and rate the quality of the TE report. The UNDP IEO assessment report will be sent to the GEF IEO along with the project terminal evaluation report.

Final Report: The project’s terminal PIR along with the terminal evaluation (TE) report and corresponding management response will serve as the final project report package. The final project report package shall be discussed with the Project Board during an end-of-project review meeting to discuss lesson learned and opportunities for scaling up.

Gender: The PIU, with support from UNDP and MFWA, will be responsible for monitoring gender aspects during project implementation. This will include ensuring the project meets requirements for compliance with at least UNDP Gender Marker 1.

TABLE 7 BUDGETED M&E PLAN

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget ⁹ (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF	Co-financing	
Inception Workshop	UNDP Turkey Country Office	USD \$10,000	\$5,000	Within three months of project document signature
Inception Report	Project Technical Coordinator	None	None	Within four weeks of inception workshop
Standard UNDP monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP	UNDP Country Office	None	None	Quarterly, annually
Monitoring of indicators in project results framework	Project Technical Coordinator	USD \$5,000	None	Annually
GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)	Project Technical Coordinator and UNDP Turkey Country Office and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	Annually
NIM Audit as per UNDP audit policies	UNDP Turkey Country Office	Per year: USD \$10,000	\$3,000	Annually or other frequency as per UNDP Audit policies
Lessons learned and knowledge generation	Project Technical Coordinator	Covered under Output 2.4.	None	Annually
Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant	Project Technical Coordinator UNDP Turkey Country Office	None	None	On-going
Addressing environmental and social grievances	Project Technical Coordinator UNDP Turkey Country Office BPPS as needed	None for time of Project Technical Coordinator, and UNDP CO	None	On-going (as necessary)
Project Board meetings	Project Board UNDP Turkey Country Office	\$15,000	\$5,000	At minimum annually

⁹ Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses.

	Project Technical Coordinator			
Supervision missions	UNDP Turkey Country Office	None ¹⁰	None	Annually
Oversight missions	UNDP-GEF team	None ¹⁰	None	Troubleshooting as needed
Knowledge management as outlined in Outcome 4	Project Technical Coordinator	Covered under Output 2.4 [>1% of GEF grant], budgeted at a total of \$393,000	None	On-going
GEF Secretariat learning missions/site visits	UNDP Turkey Country Office and Project Technical Coordinator and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	To be determined.
Mid-term GEF Tracking Tool to be updated by Project Steering Committee	Project Technical Coordinator	USD \$2,000	\$2,000	Before mid-term review mission takes place.
Independent Mid-term Review (MTR) and management response	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	USD \$25,000	None	Between 2 nd and 3 rd PIR.
Terminal GEF Tracking Tool to be updated by Project Steering Committee	Project Technical Coordinator	USD \$2,000	\$2,000	Before terminal evaluation mission takes place
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) included in UNDP evaluation plan, and management response	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	USD \$35,000	None	At least three months before operational closure
Translation of MTR and TE reports into national language / English	UNDP Country Office	USD \$5,000	\$5,000	To be determined.
Total Indicative Cost Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses		USD \$109,000 (3% of total project budget)		

¹⁰ The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit's participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee.

PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies¹¹ and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (MM/dd/yyyy)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator.		09/20/2017	Maxim Vergeichik, Regional Technical Advisor, EBD	+ 421-2- 59337152	maxim.vergeichik@undp.org

¹¹ GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF and CBIT

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).

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
<i>Objective: To ensure resilience of marine and coastal ecosystems through strengthened capacities and investment in prevention, detection, control and management of Invasive Alien Species</i>	1. Hectares of seascape with <u>directly</u> improved management of IAS and enhanced ecosystem resilience	0 ha	>94,800 ha <u>İğneada</u> : 34,200 ha of marine habitat (including 22 km of coastal habitat) <u>Marmara Islands and Kapıdağ Peninsula</u> : 46,600 ha of marine habitat (including 186.5 km of coastal habitat) <u>Ayvalik Adalari Nature Park</u> : 13,969 ha of marine habitat (including approximately 112 km of coastal habitat) <u>Samandağ Turtle Nesting Beach</u> : 32 ha of marine habitat (including 16 km of coastal habitat)	- GEF IAS Tracking Tool, cell C24	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project work at the site level has sufficient impact to improve the ecological situation - Site-based management measures developed are fully implemented with support of local stakeholders
	2. Hectares of seascape with <u>indirectly</u> improved management of IAS and enhanced ecosystem resilience	0 ha	~700,000 ha (Total approximate coastline of 8,000 km x 1 ha equals ~800,000 ha, less the area of direct influence of 94,800 ha = ~700,000 ha; there is no official figure for the exact length of Turkey's coastline)	- GEF IAS Tracking Tool, cell C25	
	3. Rate of new IAS introduction events in marine ecosystems along the coasts of	1 new alien species every 4 weeks along the coasts of Turkey between 1991 and 2010 (as per source methodology: Cinar, et al, 2011).	< baseline	- Scientific monitoring - Scientific research and analysis by end of project, with	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project timeframe is sufficient to

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
	Turkey			comparable methodology to baseline source	influence outcomes within the project timeframe such that a change in the rate of new introductions can be monitored
	4. National funding toward marine and coastal biosecurity and ecosystem resilience support measures in Turkey	Currently no designated national funding related to marine IAS management and control.	National funding at \$500,000/year* is allocated specifically for marine IAS management and control. <i>*% increase from baseline of \$0 is not possible</i>	Relevant budget lines of funding from MoFWA, MFAL, MEU, and MTMAC	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The national economic situation does not catastrophically change for the worse - Addressing marine IAS remains a priority among national institutional partners - Project outputs make the case that investing in prevention, control and mitigation of IAS is a cost-effective government strategy
<i>Outcome 1: Effective national policy framework on Invasive Alien Species</i>	5. Existence and functioning of national coordination mechanism [links to GEF BD indicator 4.1]	0: National Coordination Mechanism does not exist	3: The national coordination mechanism (interministerial Advisory Technical Board, chaired by MFWA, meeting biannually) capacitated to	GEF IAS Tracking tool, cell C48	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is in the interest of all relevant national stakeholders to

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
			develop, review and oversee implementation of IAS National Strategy		participate in and contribute to national coordination mechanism
	6. Existence and level of implementation of national IAS strategy for marine ecosystems [links to GEF BD indicator 4.1]	0: IAS strategy has not been developed	2: IAS strategy exists but is only partially implemented due to lack of funding or other problems	GEF IAS Tracking tool, cell C50	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project has sufficient time and resources to support development of a national marine IAS strategy, have it adopted, and begin implementation - The requirements of the Ballast Water Convention are not so overwhelming that appropriate regulations cannot be developed, adopted, and under implementation before the end of the project.
	7. Status of national policy and regulatory framework related to IAS in marine ecosystems [links to Aichi Target 9 indicator on countries adopting relevant national legislation] [links to GEF BD indicator 4.1]	0: IAS policy does not exist	4: The regulations are under implementation and enforced for some of the main priority pathways for IAS (shipping sector)	GEF IAS Tracking tool, cell C52	
	8. Existence of fiscal incentive mechanisms for control or eradication of IAS in marine ecosystems	No incentive mechanisms exist	4 fiscal incentive mechanisms are developed (including gender perspectives, as relevant) and tested, with results from piloting documented and disseminated at national level, including at least one mechanism effective for	Project documents and records	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fiscal incentive mechanisms proposed by the project are well-developed and responsive

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
			reducing the targeted species		to local conditions and circumstances - Fiscal incentive mechanisms are adequately designed to have an impact on the targeted marine IAS populations
<i>Outcome 2: Increased capacity and improved knowledge and information sharing systems to address IAS threats</i>	9. Existence of detection, delimiting and monitoring surveys	1: Detection surveys (observational) are conducted on a regular basis Note: Surveys are conducted frequently in various areas for various reasons (mainly academic), but not in an organized, consistent and structured manner.	5. Detection surveys rank IAS in terms of their potential damage and detection systems target the IAS that are potentially the most damaging to globally significant biodiversity	GEF IAS Tracking tool, cell C56	Assumptions: - Government and stakeholders have technical capacity to undertake a systematized approach to detection surveys - Detection surveys can be organized in a strategic and cost-effective manner to monitor potential presence of the most threatening and harmful marine IAS
	10. Identification and management of priority pathways (shipping sector)	1: Priority pathways for invasions have been identified using risk assessment procedures as appropriate	2: Priority pathways for invasions are being actively managed and monitored to prevent invasions (In comment section please specify methods for prevention of	GEF IAS Tracking tool, cell C54	Assumptions: - Current lower priority pathways do not increase in

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
			entry: quarantine laws and regulation, database establishment, public education, inspection, treatment technologies (fumigation, etc.) in the comment box.)		importance - Ballast Water Convention is implemented in Turkey
	11. Availability of current data on IAS to decision-makers and ecosystem managers in multiple institutions	No national mechanism for aggregating and disseminating the most current information and data on IAS in marine waters	National IAS knowledge management system in place (including gender perspective as relevant) with multi-stakeholder access, and training on use conducted for all relevant government officials in various institutions	Monitoring via annual project reporting (PIR) by project team; Site-based verification at mid-term review and terminal evaluation by independent external experts	Assumptions: - Barriers related to multi-institutional reporting and data aggregation are not insurmountable
	12. National capacity to implement and enforce Ballast Water Conventions as defined by (as per BWC requirements): a. % of ships docking at Turkish ports have Ballast Water Management Plans and Ballast Water Record Books b. % of ships docking at Turkish ports have approved ballast water management systems (BWC regulation D-3), and meet BWC Regulation D-2: Ballast Water Performance Standard	Ballast Water Convention signed but not implemented and not in force. No monitoring, management, or control of ship ballast water at Turkish ports, and no facilities for control and safe discharge of ballast water.	Ballast Water Convention under implementation: a.. >50% b.. >50% c.. >50% d.. >75% e.. 100% f.. None g.. Feasibility assessment conducted	Project documents and records; verification at mid-term review and terminal evaluation by independent external experts based on qualitative data collection from private sector (shipping sector) and national authorities	Assumptions: - Implementation of the Ballast Water Convention within Turkey is feasible

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. % of ships carrying foreign ballast water in Turkish waters are surveyed and certified d. Ports receiving XX% of ballast water by volume have reception facilities for the reception of sediments e. % of ballast water entering Turkish waters that is tracked and monitored for management f. Amount of ballast water exchanges occur within 50 nautical miles of Turkish land g. Status of designation of ballast water exchange zones within Turkey's territorial waters 				
	13. Scientific publications produced based on project work to address key data and knowledge gaps for improved development of policy and implementation of management and control measures	0	4 scientific publications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Update on key pathways and distribution of marine IAS in Turkey b. Analysis of ecological impacts of marine IAS in Turkey's marine and coastal ecosystems c. Analysis of socio-economic impacts of marine IAS in Turkey's marine and coastal 	Status of publication of scientific papers	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sufficient time provided in project implementation for activities to produce results that can be scientifically documented, and then scientific

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
			ecosystems d. Results of piloting fiscal incentive programs for marine IAS removal		papers published
	14. Level of knowledge and understanding relating to marine IAS: a. Among local populations (with additional targeted subset of tourism operators) in project pilot sites b. Among school-age children in project pilot sites c. Among national and local (in project pilot sites) government officials in relevant institutions	Fishermen are aware of presence of IAS, but cannot consistently identify IAS species, especially commercial species that have been present for more than 20 years. School children in coastal communities have no knowledge of IAS. Local and national government officials are only aware of the 2-3 most significant and damaging IAS (notably balloon fish and lion fish).	> baseline, with a higher percentage of survey respondents indicating that i.) they know what IAS are generally, ii.) which marine IAS are present in their region, iii.) what the negative impacts that marine IAS can have are, iv.) and what are the key mechanisms by which IAS can be introduced and spread (Monitoring of awareness to be disaggregated by gender)	Annual tracking survey (Monitoring of awareness to be disaggregated by gender)	Assumptions: - Project education and awareness raising activities can reach a sufficient number of people to modify resource-user behavior as appropriate
<i>Outcome 3: Sustainable management, prevention, eradication, and control of IAS and restoration of IAS-degraded habitat at key marine and coastal areas</i>	15. Trend in status of native biodiversity indicator species in targeted marine environments	a.- Extent of <i>Mytilus galloprovincialis</i> presence significantly below historical standard (Igneada and Marmara Islands) b.- Extent of seagrass beds (Ayvalik Islands) c.- Trend in small fish stocks (lion fish prey species) (Hatay-Samandag) <i>Exact figures will be confirmed through surveys by end of Year 1.</i>	> baseline a. hectares b. hectares c. number of individuals in survey, and/or biomass measurements in survey area	Project-supported monitoring surveys tracking effectiveness of fiscal incentive programs and other management and control measures	Assumptions: - Project efforts to support the resilience of native biodiversity will be effective within the timeframe of the project
	16. Application of best management practices in project target areas	1: Management goal and target area has been defined and acceptable threshold of population level of the species established	5: Funding for sustained and ongoing management and monitoring of the target area is secured.	GEF IAS Tracking tool, cell C58	Assumptions: - The site-based local marine IAS management

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
					plans sufficiently reflect best practices
	17. Level of resource management planning related to IAS in pilot sites	No IAS-specific management plans in project pilot sites	IAS-specific management plans developed, adopted, and under implementation by relevant local authority in each project pilot site (including gender perspectives as relevant)	Monitoring via annual project reporting (PIR) by project team; Site-based verification at mid-term review and terminal evaluation by independent external experts	Assumptions: - It is in the interest of all relevant local stakeholders to develop and implement IAS-specific management plans
<i>Cross-cutting: Gender mainstreaming during implementation</i>	18. Consistency of project gender mainstreaming approach with project plans	N/A – Project not under implementation; project design includes multiple elements designed to mainstream gender	Gender mainstreaming carried out during project implementation, as indicated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project Technical Working Group and local stakeholder working groups have gender balance or include a gender mainstreaming representative; - Policies, laws, and regulations developed with project support include gender perspectives, as relevant - Fiscal incentive programs, and other management and control measures implemented at the site level are designed incorporating gender perspectives as relevant - Project events and activities (e.g. trainings) ensure gender balance among invited participants, as feasible - Project education and awareness activities are 	Monitoring via annual project reporting (PIR) by project team; Verification at mid-term review and terminal evaluation by independent external experts	Assumptions: - All relevant stakeholders support or are in accordance with gender mainstreaming efforts undertaken by the project

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
			developed and carried out incorporating gender perspectives, as relevant		

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 (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
Scientific and Technical Screening of the PIF (STAP Review)		
<p>There is not a single reference or evidence provided as to whether these interventions have succeeded/failed in the past. It is impossible to judge if the approaches suggested are speculative or tried and tested. Therefore the full project proposal should review and refer to similar actions that have been implemented elsewhere, particularly drawing from the growing number of completed and ongoing GEF projects that address IAS, associated regulations and management measures.</p>	<p>Fully concur. There were two specific efforts undertaken during the PPG phase in response to this point: (1) There was a review conducted of lessons and good practices from previous GEF-funded IAS projects; (2) A review of global best practices relating to marine IAS that have been published in scientific journals was undertaken in order to best inform the design and development of project outputs and activities.</p>	<p>The project outputs and activities were designed to reflect international best practices and lessons learned from relevant marine IAS prevention, control and mitigation efforts in other countries. A table has been included in the UNDP Prodoc on “Key Lessons and Good Practices Incorporated in the Proposed Project from GEF-funded Projects” (Table 2 in the UNDP Prodoc). Additional information relating to previous efforts targeting IAS funded by the GEF is included in Annex M of the UNDP Prodoc. The review report on international good practices and standards related to the management and control of marine IAS is also included as Annex N of the UNDP Prodoc.</p>
<p>As detailed in the text below, the PPG/ProDoc needs to specifically address key issues such as what "2.3 engagement with the shipping industry" and "2.4 increased knowledge and awareness" really mean in operational terms as it does so well with 2.1 and 2.2.</p>	<p>Full concur; outputs further developed and specified in UNDP Prodoc.</p>	<p>Additional explanation provided under Outputs 2.3 and 2.4.</p>
<p>The PPG needs to address risk more carefully, and also the question of sustainability and scaling, as a \$3.3 project aimed at the challenge of over 450 alien invasive species on over 8,592km of coastline is optimistic.</p>	<p>Full concur; issues further detailed in full UNDP Prodoc.</p>	<p>Additional explanation and information provided in full Prodoc in Section V.ii on Risk Management, and in Section V.iv on Sustainability and Scaling-up.</p>
<p>Finally, better and more specific indicators are needed in the Project Description than merely mentioning GEF tracking tools. Thus realistic output and outcome targets for intervention action need to be more narrowly defined within the work proposed. STAP welcomes the tighter focus on fewer areas within the revised PIF, but the full project proposal should consider carefully a theory of change informed by relevant experience from similar initiatives.</p>	<p>Fully concur; strategic results framework fully developed during PPG phase.</p>	<p>Strategic Results Framework includes 22 results-based SMART indicators, fully extending beyond (though still including and building on) the GEF tracking tool for BD-2, Program 4 on IAS. The project’s Theory-of-Change is also more fully developed and explained in the SECTION III. “Strategy” of the UNDP Prodoc.</p>
<p>The project design should consider not only how it will draw upon existing experience and knowledgebases (such as the global invasive species database,</p>	<p>Fully concur; the PPG technical experts have been consulted on this point and appropriate</p>	<p>Output 2.2 (which is a key element of the knowledge management efforts of the project) specifically refers to these databases: “The database will build-on and</p>

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
<p>already mentioned in the PIF, EASIN and DAISIE “ see References) but also contribute to these in order to maximize the potential for scaling up and impact. For example, within the Mediterranean region the MedPAN offers well-researched tools (e.g. see Otero, et al, 2013) and collaboration mechanisms regarding IAS prevention and management in protected areas. STAP encourages proponents to use existing databases and information management tools wherever possible before building unique datasets, and consider appropriate interoperability standards. Within the KM section of the full proposal these aspects should be set out clearly and referenced within the body of the proposal.</p>	<p>adjustments and references made. At the same time, the specific details of the relevance and technical details of linkages between efforts within Turkey and wider regional or global databases will need to be further discussed and agreed by technical experts during project implementation.</p>	<p>link to existing databases to the extent possible, such as the Global Invasive Species Database and EASIN.”</p>
<p>This is a strategically important and well conceptualized project that begins to address the serious problem of IAS in Turkey. It will reveal important lessons, and will need to be managed adaptively. It also cannot on its own complete the job and will need to be followed up with additional activities that hopefully can be based on experience developed through this highly worthwhile investment.</p>	<p>Fully concur; this supportive comment is appreciated.</p>	<p>No changes required. The sustainability aspects of the project are further detailed in SECTION V.iv. Sustainability and Scaling-up of the UNDP Prodoc.</p>
GEF Council comments on the PIF (United States)		
<p>The United States supports the proposed project, which will help integrate Turkey into larger, regional efforts to reduce the spread and mitigate impacts of invasive species. As the proposal is further developed, we request that UNDP reflect on the recommendations made by the STAP with the further suggestion that it add more background on feasibility or lessons learned from similar efforts in nearby regions.</p>	<p>Fully concur. Additional information added in Prodoc on relevant regional efforts.</p>	<p>Changes made as outlined in relation to the first STAP comment above.</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹²

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 150.000,00			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent till 20 June 2017</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Component A: Technical Review	23,000.00	14,136.67	8,863.33
Component B: Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation	22,000.00	14,136.66	7,863.34
Component C: Financial planning and co-financing investments:	40,000.00	20,046.67	19,953.33
Component D: Validation workshop	17,500.00	14,517.54	2,982.46
Component E: Completion of final documentation	47,500.00	0.00	47,500.00
Total	150,000.00	62,837.54	87,162.46

¹² If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to 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. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

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

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A