



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

GEF ID:	9233		
Country/Region:	Turkey		
Project Title:	Addressing Invasive Alien Species Threats at Key Marine Biodiversity Areas		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5733 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$3,344,654
Co-financing:	\$12,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$15,344,654
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Maxim Vergeichik

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	Yes, the project is closely aligned with BD2, Program 4:Prevention, Control, and Management of Invasive Alien Species. 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, and strategic goal C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Design		diversity, Target 12.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes, the project is aligned with Turkey's NBSAP.	
	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>Drivers: IAS have been identified as one of the top threats to biodiversity globally by the UNEP Global Biodiversity Outlook. The project proposal describes remediation and preventative measures in support of valuable biodiversity from the harmful impacts of IAS. In Turkey, effects of economic activities, namely shipping, pollution loads, and climate change are identified as key contributors to the proliferation of IAS.</p> <p>However, while shipping has been identified as a major source of IAS, this project does not appear to engage with the shipping industry beyond regulations. Based on the identified introduction pathways including shipping, the project will likely be less effective without engaging this sector. Working with this industry and relevant ministries may also provide additional sources of co-financing.</p> <p>Innovativeness: The PIF describes</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>that the project will consider how climate change will change the odds of IAS.</p> <p>Sustainability: The sustainability of the project is not sufficiently outlined. Regulations, identification of main pathways, establishing protocols and quarantine mechanisms, are low-regret measures and are justified in this proposal. However, the PIF proposes investing directly in 5 priority areas, while proposing to, in parallel, develop the National Strategy and Action Plan on IAS to inform future actions on identifying priority habitats and species, and evaluation action/inaction, based on a thorough cost/benefit analysis. It appears that this should be ideally done before a number of activities proposed here are carried out, namely those in Component 3. However, it appears that piloting interventions in the 5 areas could provide useful and important insights, as well as help get an earlier start in better supporting sensitive and valuable biodiversity.</p> <p>The proposal does not explain the source, and hence sustainability, of the fiscal incentives that would engage the relevant groups in the removal and remediation. It does not</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>explain how such interventions would continue in an ongoing manner (as opposed to a one-off intervention. For example, the proposal does not mention exploring the potential economic uses for IAS in the 5 pilot areas, which could be an incentive to harvest on an ongoing basis and as a result control the abundance of the species.)</p> <p>Recommended action:</p> <p>Please consider if piloting interventions in fewer, high priority areas (one or two) would be more appropriate, given that the identification of priority areas and cost/benefit analysis have yet to be carried out. Or alternately, outline the differences between the sites and how these lessons can be more broadly applied. Accordingly, it should be ensured that the mechanisms for capturing and disseminating the knowledge generated from such pilot efforts are appropriate.</p> <p>Please consider further the feasibility of engaging local populace (e.g. fishermen) in the management/remediation activities, with sustainability beyond the life of</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the project in mind. Also, please consider working with the shipping industry and other areas of the private sector to address IAS.</p> <p>Update 9/30/2015: Cleared. The revision reflects an additional emphasis on private sector in output 2.3. The Component 3 outline now mentions the link between the National Strategy and Action Plan on IAS and work in sites. Component 1 outline now includes reference to potential sources of financing for incentives and their feasibility being explored during the PPG phase, including potential income e.g. from Rapana for export.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	The incremental reasoning is clear.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>Not entirely. For the most part, the components are sound, clear, and appropriate. However, it is unclear if 3.2 -- setting up control units in five areas to detect and control IAS, and restore ecosystems is appropriate. It is not clear if this action is cost-effective and feasible beyond the life of the project.</p> <p>The GEF-6 strategy focuses on "comprehensive prevention, early detection, control and management frameworks that emphasize risk-</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>management". From the PIF, it appears that significant resources will be focused on eradication, which not typically included with GEF resources. There is an exception for targeted eradication in "specific circumstances where proven, low-cost, and effective eradication would result in the extermination of the IAS and the survival of globally significant species and/or ecosystems". The project does not appear to have met this threshold with most of the control activities described. In addition, GEF support for ecosystem restoration is also limited to activities that will directly support the survival of globally significant species and/or ecosystems, and it is also unclear whether the restoration activities described in the PIF meet these requirements. The example of water hyacinth and the sea turtles makes a good case for the intervention - both demonstrating the impact of the IAS on a globally threatened species and how the threat can be eliminated through one time interventions.</p> <p>For control and eradication activities that do not/cannot lead to extermination, financial sustainability is particularly important as the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>activities will need to be continued long after project completion. Commercialization of the species when extermination is not possible may be an option. Another GEF/UNDP project is using taxes and fines for violation of regulations on shipping as sources of revenue for IAS control which could also be an option.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please see the relevant comment in section 3. Please indicate how the cost-effectiveness and feasibility of these activities will be assured, and, in absence of such an analysis, consider scaling down and concentrating the effort on a fewer pilots.</p> <p>Update 9/30/2015: Cleared. The agency has made appropriate revisions responding to the previous comments.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Not clear. It is not clear how will the local population will assist in harvesting the invasive species. It is unclear what the incentive to do so will be, namely what the fiscal incentives are, and how they will be sustained. It is also unclear how the risks involved in harvesting and handling the dangerous IAS be managed.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Update 9/30/2015: Cleared. The agency has provided further information on the issue of financial sustainability of the project, which will be tested through technical competitions and small grant mechanisms to better understand the potential alternatives for future solutions and also to incentivize the future technical and financial sustainability. The IAS-related risks will be managed with outreach and awareness-raising.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	Not yet. This project is closely aligned with the focal area objective/program. While many of the activities proposed appear to be sound and necessary, additional clarifications are required on the financial feasibility, cost-effectiveness, and sustainability of this project beyond its life,	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>particularly in relation to component 3. Please also address comments 3, 5, and 6.</p> <p>Update 9/30, 2015: All previously-pending comments have been adequately addressed. The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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