

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3550	
GEF Agency project ID		3697	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Strengthening Protected Area Network of Turkey- Catalyzing Sustainability of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas	
Country/Countries		Turkey	
Region		Europe and Central Asia	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD-SP 1; BD SP 2	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environment and Urbanization	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Executing partners: World Wildlife Fund (MedPO and Turkey Office), COMDEKS, Underwater Research Society, Gökova Sailing Club, and the Mediterranean Conservation Society	
Private sector involvement			
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		April 17, 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		September 2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		September 2013	
Actual date of project completion		April 30, 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.1	.1
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		2.2	2.19
Co-financing	IA own	.02	.025
	Government	4	4.47
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		2.3	2.29
Total Co-financing		4.02	4.5
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.32	6.79
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 2014	
Author of TE		James Lenoci	
TER completion date		1/12/2016	
TER prepared by		Laura Nissley	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	--	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	--	ML
M&E Design		MS	--	MU
M&E Implementation		S	--	MS
Quality of Implementation		S	--	MS
Quality of Execution		S	--	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	--	MS

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective was “conservation of marine biodiversity within Turkey’s territorial waters” (PD pg. 45).

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objectives was “to facilitate expansion of the national system of marine and coastal protected areas and improve its management effectiveness” (TE pg. 5).

### 3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

The TE and project documents do not cite any changes to the Global Environment or Development Objectives during implementation.

## 4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
---------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a rating of “relevant” for this component of project outcomes. This TER, which uses a different scale, provides a rating of **Satisfactory**. The project sought to expand Turkey’s national system of marine and coastal protected areas (MCPAs) and improve the management of these areas. These

project outcomes are consistent with GEF-4 Strategic Objective 1, *Catalyze Sustainability of Protected Area Systems*, in particular Strategic Programs 1 and 2 which focus on sustainable financing of protected area systems and increased representation of effectively managed marine protected areas, respectively (TE pg. 37).

The project is also consistent with Turkey's environmental and bio-diversity priorities. Turkey's Ninth Development Plan (2007-2013) includes provisions for "activities researching, protecting and utilizing the biological diversity and genetic resources in Turkey and for transforming them into economic value" (TE pg. 36). Previous iterations of the national development plan have called specifically for management and action plans for Specially Protected Areas (PD pg. 29). Furthermore, the project is consistent with Turkey's National Biological Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), a goal of which is to "develop and implement effective methods for the conservation of coastal and marine biological diversity, the maintenance of ecological functions provided by coastal and marine ecosystems, and the sustainable use of these ecosystems" (TE pg. 36).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project effectiveness, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The project achieved key outcomes such as the expansion of marine and coastal protected areas (MCPAs) and the establishment of no-take fishing zones (NFZs). Institutional capacity building for managing MCPAs and sustainable financing at the national and site-levels was less successful and the project fell short of achieving its targets.

A summary of the project's achievements, by outcome, is provided below:

- Outcome 1: Responsible institutions have the capacities and internal structure needed for prioritizing the establishment of new MCPAs and for more effectively managing existing MCPAs:**  
 Expected results under this outcome included the expansion of MCPAs and the demarcation of Special Environmental Protected Areas (SEPAs). In addition, the project sought to enhance the management capacities of MCPAs and approve a national strategy for MCPA expansion and strengthening (PD pg. 19). By project end, the total area of MCPAs expanded by 106,230 hectares, including the addition of a new SEPA (Saros Gulf) and the expansion of an existing SEPA (Gökova Bay). The expanded MCPAs accounted for 4.8% of Turkey's overall ecological zone, exceeding the project's target of 4.0% (TE Annex 6, pg. 1). Additionally, the project contributed to the drafting of a National Strategy for MCPAs, which was awaiting endorsement by the Minister of Environment and Urbanization at the end of the project (2014 PIR pg. 21).

The final expected result under this outcome, enhanced management capacities of MCPAs, was less successful. Draft management plans were prepared for the six pilot MCPAs, including economic analyses, socioeconomic studies, and biodiversity inventories. However, the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, as part of a larger centralization effort, decided not to

establish local management units at the MCPAs (TE pg. iii-iv). As a result, the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool and Capacity Assessment Scorecard utilized by the project indicated that the MCPAs largely fell short of their management targets. However, the TE does note that the indicators for this result fail to capture additional capacity building achievements, including the establishment of two training centers and an e-learning system for MCPA partners (TE pg. 29).

- **Outcome 2: MCPA financial planning and management systems are facilitating effective business planning, adequate levels of revenue generation and cost-effective management:** Expected results under this outcome included the development and implementation of management systems for expanding revenue generation and ensuring cost effectiveness. The project also sought to increase the institutional capacity of the Environmental Protection Agency for Special Areas (EPASA) for sustainable financing management. This outcome also included a component for increasing public awareness and support for MCPAs (PD pg. 21).

Utilizing the Financial Sustainability Scorecard, the TE did not find significant improvements over baseline. The achievement of this outcome was also affected by increased centralization of management structures. A business development unit was established at the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, however business plans have not been developed for the MCPA sites. Self-funded revenue increased nominally over the life of the project (\$2.16 million in 2010 to 2.72 million in 2013), however new sources of self-financing have been limited (TE Annex 6 pgs. 2-3). With respect to public awareness, the project held a number of workshops and sponsoring events, however the TE does not cite any evidence of increased awareness (TE pg. 22).

- **Outcome 3: Inter-agency coordination mechanisms in place to regulate and manage economic activities within multiple use areas of the MCPAs:** Expected results under this outcome included a national-level and MCPA site-level coordination mechanisms. In addition, the project sought to establish no-take fishing zones (NFZs) within two SEPAs, and establish mechanisms for regulating ship-based threats to SEPAs (such as solid and liquid wastes) (TE pg. 24). By project end, 10 NFZ areas were established within two SEPAs. The NFZs covered approximately 3,500 hectares, exceeding project targets by 1,000 (TE Annex 6 pg. 3). The Mediterranean Conservation Society conducted underwater monitoring in 2013-2014 in Gökova Bay and found significantly more biomass inside the NFZ than outside of it (TE pg. 31). The project also supported a field demonstration on collecting ship-based liquid wastes at a MCPA site. The TE notes that this intervention was limited in scope and the effect on marine pollution levels cannot be determined (TE pg. 34). Additionally, the project supported the prohibition of anchoring in Göcek Bay, above sea grass beds, and demonstrated alternative mooring systems. Interviews with local officials indicated an 80-90% usage rate among surveyed boaters (TE pg. 48).

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
----------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project efficiency, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. Midway through implementation, Turkey experienced institutional restructuring which affected the project's timeline. The original executing agency, the Environmental Protection Agency for Special Areas (EPASA) was reorganized into the General Directorate for Protection of Natural Assets (GDPNA) under the new Ministry of Environment and Urbanization. This restructuring disrupted project implementation and resulted in a six-month no cost extension, shifting the project's completion date from September 2013 to April 2014 (TE pg. 5). The TE notes that project management and other fixed costs associated with the project extension reduced the overall cost-effectiveness of the project (TE pg. 38).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: <b>Moderately Likely</b>
--------------------	----------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for sustainability, and this TER concurs.

#### **Financial Resources**

This TER provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for the sustainability of financial resources. The current national development plan includes provisions for infrastructure projects which reduce pressure on marine and coastal resources, and the TE predicts that spending is likely to continue in the foreseeable future. Additionally, the Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs indicated that they were working on a proposal for the GEF-6 funding cycle which would focus on climate change and marine biodiversity (TE pg. 42). The TE also notes that self-generated revenue within the MCPA system has been on an upward trend. However, the TE does note that new sources of self-financing for the MCPA system have not yet materialized (TE Annex 6 pgs. 2-3).

#### **Sociopolitical**

This TE does not provide sufficient information to assess sociopolitical sustainability. The TE claims that the project resulted in increased public awareness of marine biodiversity conservation but does not provide any evidence of this. TE does note that there are some unresolved issues regarding the no-take fishing zones (NFZs), such as push back from fisher cooperatives operating in Gökova Bay who wish to see the size of the NFZs reduced (TE pg. 32).

#### **Institutional Framework and Governance**

This TER provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance. The project contributed to the drafting of a National Strategy for MCPAs, which was awaiting endorsement by the Minister of Environment and Urbanization at the end of the project (2014

PIR pg. 21). However, the TE notes that the institutional reorganization in Turkey presents a substantial risk to sustainability of project outcomes. Responsibility for marine biodiversity has been split between the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs, and the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. The TE notes that inter-ministerial coordination between these institutions is weak. Additionally, the trend toward centralization in Turkey means that local institutions have limited authority in terms of decision-making for MCPA planning and discretionary spending which puts sustainability at risk (TE pg. 42).

## **Environmental**

The TE does not provide enough information to adequately assess environmental sustainability. The TE does note that environmental risks associated with invasive species are significant (TE pg. 42).

## **5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes**

**5.1 Co-financing.** To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Actual co-financing was approximately 12% higher than expected, largely due to greater than expected co-financing from the Turkish government. Co-financing from the Turkish government contributed to the operations budget (office space, vehicle, staff salaries, etc.), in addition to turtle conservation and monitoring projects in three SEPAs; water quality management projects in five SEPAs; and the monitoring of the current status of fisheries restricted areas in one SEPA (TE pgs. 18-19).

**5.2 Project extensions and/or delays.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project experienced moderate delays midway through the project due to institutional restructuring. The original executing agency, the Environmental Protection Agency for Special Areas (EPASA) was reorganized into the General Directorate for Protection of Natural Assets (GDPNA) under the new Ministry of Environment and Urbanization. This restructuring disrupted project implementation and resulted in a six-month no cost extension, shifting the project's completion date from September 2013 to April 2014 (TE pg. 5).

**5.3 Country ownership.** Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Country ownership over the project was important to the achievement of project outcomes and potential sustainability. The Ministry of Environment and Urbanization (formerly the Environmental Protection Agency for Special Areas) served as the executing agency and the

Turkish government committed \$4.47 million in co-financing. The TE also notes that local government officials participating in activities at the MCPA site level (pg. 38). Additionally, the government approved an additional 106,230 hectares of MCPAs and drafted a National Strategy for MCPAs. If approved, the National Strategy would contribute to the sustainability of financial resources for continued MCPA efforts.

## 6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
-------------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for M&E design at entry, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The results framework outlined in the project document is logically sound, however it does not include outputs and associated output-level indicators. The TE and the Midterm Review also concur that several of the outcome and impact-level indicators were inappropriate for the project. For example, the results framework includes indicators for measuring the emergence/sightings of sea turtles, Mediterranean monk seals, and Sandbar sharks within the MCPAs. The TE notes that while status changes in these populations are relevant to the project, it is unreasonable to expect a four-year intervention largely focused on capacity building activities to have an immediate impact on these status changes. Furthermore, the TE notes that the Scorecard approaches (management effectiveness tracking tool, capacity assessment scorecard, and financial sustainability scorecard) were not sufficient for capturing project performance at the outcome level (TE pgs. 9-10).

The project document does however include a detailed description of the M&E activities, responsible parties, associated budget, and appropriate timeframe for completing activities. Provisions were included for a Project Inception Workshop, where the project team would review the results framework and revise indicators as necessary, as well as become familiar with UNDP-GEF M&E requirements. The project document also provided a dedicated M&E budget of \$157,000, approximately 7% of the overall GEF grant.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
------------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E implementation, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The TE found that the M&E plan was implemented as outlined in the design stage. Project activities were regularly monitored by the appropriate staff and project reports were complete and accurate. However, as the TE notes, project monitoring was inherently limited by indicators which were inadequate for capturing project results. Unfortunately, these indicators were not revised during the Project Inception Workshop (TE pg. 20). It should also be noted that a midterm review was conducted in late 2011 and the findings were used for adaptive management to the extent possible (TE pgs. 21-23).

## 7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
---------------------------------------	--

The TE provided a rating of **Satisfactory** for Quality of Implementing Agency (UNDP) Execution. This TER downgrades this rating to **Moderately Satisfactory** for Quality of Project Implementation. As noted above, there were flaws in the project design regarding inappropriate indicators for capturing project performance. These indicators were not revised during the Project Inception Workshop or following the Midterm Review in 2011. Overall however, the TE found that UNDP was actively involved in the project, providing supervision and strategic guidance (TE pg. 23). UNDP also established strategic partnerships for facilitating the achievement of project outcomes, including with the World Wildlife Fund Mediterranean Programme Office and the World Wildlife Fund Turkey Office, which developed a curriculum for the MCPA Training and Implementation Center and conducted a marine biodiversity study, respectively (TE pg. 16).



7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
----------------------------------	--

The TE provided a rating of **Satisfactory** for the Quality of the Implementing Partner (GDPNA-MoEU) Execution, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory** for Quality of Project Execution. The project was executed by a Program Management Unit in the Environmental Protection Agency for Special Areas (EPASA). Following the national elections in 2011, EPASA was reorganized into the General Directorate for Protection of Natural Assets (GDPNA) under the new Ministry of Environment and Urbanization (MoEU), as part of a larger national centralization effort. Therefore, project delays associated with the restructuring of the executing agency were largely outside of the control of the executing agency. The national coordinator and other key stakeholders in the MoEU did remain the same, affording a degree of continuity to the project (TE pg. 23). Following this transition however, the MoEU decided against establishing local management units at the MCPAs. As mentioned in the effectiveness section, this decision affected the achievement of key outcomes, including enhanced management and financial planning capacities of MCPAs.

## 8. Assessment of Project Impacts

***Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.***

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

By the end of the project, Turkey's national system of marine and coastal protected areas (MCPAs) expanded by 106,230 hectares, including the addition of a new Special Environmental Protected Area (SEPA), Saros Gulf, and the expansion of an existing SEPA, Gökova Bay (TE pg. 24). Additionally, 10 no-take fishing zone (NFZ) areas were established within two SEPAs, covering approximately 3,500 hectares. The Mediterranean Conservation Society conducted underwater monitoring in 2013-2014 in Gökova Bay and found significantly more biomass inside the NFZ than outside of it (TE pg. 31).

The project also documented increases in the emergence and/or sightings of three endangered species: (1) emergence of 300-350 sea turtle nests annually in the Fethiye and Dalyan SEPAs; (2) 10-20% increase in the number of sightings of the Mediterranean Monk Seal within pilot and new SEPAs; and (3) an average of 25 annual sightings of the Sandbar Sharks at the Gökova Bay

SEPA. However, as noted in earlier sections, these changes cannot be attributed solely to the project.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE does not cite any socioeconomic changes that occurred by the end of the project.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The TE notes that the project delivered high quality trainings and workshops on protected area management approaches to a wide range of stakeholders, and concluded that these efforts led to strengthened individual and institutional capacities (TE pg. 47). However, the TE does not cite evidence of these changes in capacities. The TE does note that two MCPA Training and Implementation Centers were established in Akyaka and Foça (TE pg. 34).

b) Governance

The TE does not cite any changes in governance, except for the drafting of a National Strategy for MCPAs which was awaiting endorsement by the Minister of Environment and Urbanization at the end of the project (2014 PIR pg. 21).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

The TE does not cite any unintended impacts that occurred by the end of the project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental

benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE notes that as a result of an increased level of interest among stakeholders, a proposal was submitted in 2013 for a new SEPA in Karaburun which would cover 69,000 hectares (TE pg. 43). Additionally, as a result of the alternative mooring system demonstrations, a local organization (MUCEV) has plans for expanding the mooring system to 400 units and charging a daily fee for its services. This initiative will contribute toward the conservation of sensitive grass sea beds (TE pg. 48).

## 9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE provides the following lessons learned (pgs. 52-53)

- ***Local management influences management effectiveness and financial sustainability of MCPA's***  
The project was advocating local management units in the first half of the implementation phase, but such units were not realized, largely due to management decisions following the restructured institutional landscape in 2011. Based upon international best practice and also shown in the results of the METT [Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool] and financial sustainability scorecard results for this project, site-level management improves management effectiveness and financial sustainability.
- ***M&E plans should be designed to capture the indicators assigned to logical results frameworks***  
Indicators assigned to logical results frameworks need to be verifiable. For example, indicators associated with improvements in marine pollution levels or recovery of fish stocks should be supported with supporting M&E plans and budgets.
- ***As part of the project design, there should be protocol developed for the use of METT, capacity assessment, and financial sustainability scorecards***  
Scoring the METT, capacity assessment, and financial sustainability scorecards was too subjective, often made by a single person, the national coordinator. There should be broader participation, in order to provide a more objective viewpoint. Some type of protocol should be developed for each scorecard, identifying the participants, quality review process, benchmarking, etc.
- ***Monitoring, Control, and Surveillance should be worked out as much as practicable before formally declaring the no-take fishing zones***

At the time of the TE mission, there were uncertainties associated with responsibilities and financing for monitoring, control, and surveillance (MCS) of the no-take fishing zones (NFZs). As much as practicable, MCS issues should be worked out prior to applying for declaration of the NFZs.

- ***MCPAs should not be declared unless there is a management plan in place***  
New MCPAs, such as the Saros Gulf SEPA, should not be approved without a management plan in place, which set out clear goals and objectives for the site, as well as management strategies for achieving these goals.
- ***Facilities such as the MCPA training and implementation centers require business plans***  
The sustainable operation of a training center requires a business plan, which outlines expenditures, examines the market in terms of demand, works out a fee schedule, evaluates alternative financing, such as from renting part of the facility for retail or commercial use, etc.
- ***Community involvement plans should be prepared before engaging with local populations***  
Prior to implementing community outreach activities, a community involvement plan should be developed. The plan should include thorough questions & answers, so that officers are trained on how to respond under different circumstances. For example, some of the interviewed local stakeholders stressed a certain degree of “donor fatigue”, i.e., they have participated in donor sponsored activities in the past but are now more reluctant to participate because they do not see the added value (for themselves).

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations (pgs. 50-51):

Actions to follow-up or reinforce initial benefits from the project:

- Develop a sustainability strategy, defining roles, responsibilities, timeframes, and cost estimations for addressing outstanding issues, including but not limited to the following: (1) finalization of the National MCPA Strategy, (2) financing the operation of the two training centers in Akyaka and Foça, (3) finalizing the management plans for the Gökova and Foça MCPAs, (3) monitoring, surveillance, and control for the no-take fishing zones, (4) continued management and updating of the [www.mpa.gov.tr](http://www.mpa.gov.tr) website.
- Designate and support a champion for at least two years to oversee the implementation of the sustainability strategy outlined in Recommendation 1.
- Develop a management plan for the newly established Saros Gulf SEPA; also covering biodiversity monitoring, possibilities for collaborative management, etc.

- Explore financing options for securing resources for monitoring, surveillance, and control (MCS) of the no-take fishing zones. For example, it might be feasible to allocate a certain proportion of the income from the daily site use revenue to fund the MCS activities.
- Advocate development of a database for compiling biodiversity monitoring data from the MCPA system. Based upon the findings from the TE mission, it seems like it would be advisable to consolidate biodiversity monitoring information into a common platform, e.g., possibly hosted by the website developed for the project: [www.mpa.gov.tr](http://www.mpa.gov.tr).

Proposals for future directions underlying main objectives:

- Implement a biodiversity mainstreaming project among one or more selected provinces, as a way to engage productive sectors, including tourism and local economic development agencies, as well as the private sector, into conservation issues.
- Complement ongoing assistance from the EU toward harmonizing to the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, by developing methodologies for determining good environmental status for a particular MCPA, or a group of MCPAs, according to geographic or administrative boundaries.
- In line with the EU Maritime Spatial Planning Directive (2014/89/ER), promote collaborative development of maritime spatial plans for one or more provinces or for a specific geographic region.
- Identify and promote a model community, as an example of sustainable coastal and marine resource management linked with local economic development. It is important to demonstrate to community leaders that committing to improved conservation can also have economic benefits, e.g., visitors are more interested to visit areas of high natural and cultural value, many customers are willing to pay a premium for sustainably sourced goods and services, etc.
- At the national level, advocate for a rationalization of the roles and responsibilities between the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization (MoEU) and the Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs (MFWA), with respect to biodiversity conservation and planning and management of marine protected areas.

## 10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report provides a credible and systematic analysis of the relevant outcomes. More detail could have been provided on some of the outputs related to inter-agency coordination mechanisms. The analysis is somewhat limited by the lack of appropriate indicators for measuring project performance.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent. More evidence is needed to substantiate claims regarding institutional and individual changes in capacities. On the whole, the ratings appear to be mildly inflated given the evidence provided.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report did not provide enough evidence to support its ratings of sociopolitical and environmental sustainability.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned and recommendations provided are comprehensive and consistent with the evidence provided.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual project costs and co-financing. However, some of the sub-totally/totaling is off in the table provided.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	More evidence could have been provided in support of the "satisfactory" rating for M&E implementation.	MU
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

## 11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).