



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project

THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: 12/23/2010

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 4067

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 00627

COUNTRY(IES): TURKEY

PROJECT TITLE: : Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of the Republic of Turkey

GEF AGENCY(IES): **UNEP**, (select), (select)

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs - General Directorate of Agricultural Research; Ministry of Environment and Forestry - General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks

GEF FOCAL AREA(S): **BIODIVERSITY**

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): **SP6** (see preparation guidelines section on exactly what to write)

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: **BIOSAFETY**

Expected Calendar (mm/dd/yy)	
Milestones	Dates
Work Program (for FSPs only)	N/A
Agency Approval date	Feb 2011
Implementation Start	March 2011
Mid-term Evaluation (if planned)	August 2012
Project Closing Date	Feb 2015

A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK (Expand table as necessary)

Project Objective: To further develop and implement the Biosafety Framework of Turkey in line with its national development priorities and international obligations, especially the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

Project Components	Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA ²	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF Financing ¹		Co-Financing ¹		Total (\$) c=a+ b
				(\$ a)	%	(\$ b)	%	
A. Stocktaking on biosafety in Turkey	TA	The final project has strong stakeholder participation and ownership, and the project effectively and efficiently completes the NBF to be fully consistent with the CBP and other international obligations	[i] Stocktaking report	5,000	50	5,000	50	10,000
B. Regulatory biosafety regime	TA	Regulatory biosafety regime in place and legally mandated	[i] Biosafety Law and its regulations approved [ii] National Biosafety Committee (NBC) established [iii] Competent authorities (CA) and Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) mandated	14,000	45	17,000	55	31,000
C. System for handling of requests, risk assessment,	TA	Functional system for handling of requests, risk	[i] Human resources for handling of requests, risk assessment,	128,000	42	176,500	58	304,500

<p>decision-making and risk management of LMOs</p>		<p>assessment, decision-making and risk management of LMOs established</p>	<p>decision-making and risk management of LMOs improved [ii] Guidelines, methodologies and manuals on risk assessment and risk management prepared [iii] Internet portal prepared and functional for data collection, input and analysis for risk management and risk communication purposes [iv] Possible socio-economical impacts determined and prioritized to be taken into consideration in the process of decision making</p>					
<p>D. Monitoring and inspection system for LMOs</p>	<p>TA</p>	<p>Monitoring and inspection system for LMOs established</p>	<p>[i] Laboratories and research institutes mandated and strengthened for monitoring and inspection [ii] Ankara Control Laboratory accredited for detections of LMOs and detection methods standardized to be used in mandated laboratories [iii] Human resources for monitoring, inspections, border controls, compliance to Biosafety Law and the Protocol and emergency response improved [iv] Guidelines, methodologies and manuals on monitoring, inspections and emergency response prepared [v] Registration system with unique identifiers</p>	<p>272,650</p>	<p>44</p>	<p>350,000</p>	<p>56</p>	<p>622,650</p>

			to trace back LMOs established					
E. Public awareness and participation system for biosafety	TA	Functional system for public awareness and participation established for biosafety	[i] Public awareness action plan of NBF updated [ii] Level of public awareness on biosafety and participation into implementation of NBF improved [iii] National BCH strengthened	53,000	34	101,500	66	154,500
Project monitoring and evaluation	TA			20,000	44	25,000	56	45,000
Project Management				50,000	40	75,000	60	125,000
Total Project Costs				542,650		750,000		1,292,650

¹ List the \$ by project components. The percentage is the share of GEF and Co-financing respectively of the total amount for the component.

² TA = Technical Assistance; STA = Scientific & Technical Analysis.

B. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT (expand the table line items as necessary)

<i>Name of Co-financier (source)</i>	<i>Classification</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>%*</i>
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs	Nat'l Gov't	Grant	550,000	73
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs	Nat'l Gov't	In kind	200,000	27
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
Total Co-financing			750,000	100%

* Percentage of each co-financier's contribution at CEO endorsement to total co-financing.

C. FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECT (\$)

	<i>Project Preparation a</i>	<i>Project b</i>	<i>Total c = a + b</i>	<i>Agency Fee</i>	<i>For comparison: GEF and Co-financing at PIF</i>
GEF financing		542,650	542,650	54,265	542,650
Co-financing		750,000	750,000		750,000
Total		1,292,650	1,292,650	54,265	1,292,650

D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)¹

<i>GEF Agency</i>	<i>Focal Area</i>	<i>Country Name/ Global</i>	<i>(in \$)</i>		
			<i>Project (a)</i>	<i>Agency Fee (b)²</i>	<i>Total c=a+b</i>
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
Total GEF Resources					

¹ No need to provide information for this table if it is a single focal area, single country and single GEF Agency project.

² Relates to the project and any previous project preparation funding that have been provided and for which no Agency fee has been requested from Trustee.

E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

<i>Component</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks</i>	<i>GEF amount(\$)</i>	<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
Local consultants*	9person/9week	18,500		18,500
International consultants*	8person/1 week	38,000		38,000
Total	17 person/10weeks	56,500		56,500

* Details to be provided in Annex C.

F. PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUDGET/COST

<i>Cost Items</i>	<i>Total Estimated person weeks/months</i>	<i>GEF amount (\$)</i>	<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
Local consultants*		40,800	10,800	51,600
International consultants*				
Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications*			3,000	3,000
Travel*		3,000	4,500	7,500
Others**		6,200	56,700	62,900
Total		50,000	75,000	125,000

* Details to be provided in Annex C. ** For others, it has to clearly specify what type of expenses here in a footnote.

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? yes no

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex E an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your agency and to the GEF Trust Fund).

H. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN: Monitoring of the progress of all activities will be undertaken by UNEP in accordance with its Monitoring & Evaluation procedures. The indicators identified in the project RBF will be used for monitoring the development of the project activities. An independent mid-term review will be undertaken. The evaluation will include an assessment of on-going activities including a diagnosis of possible problems and recommend any corrective measures. A final evaluation of the project will be undertaken in accordance with UNEP. Dissemination

of results will take place via the stakeholders meetings, via periodic meetings between the project management team and the government departments, publications and via the public media. Recommendations and best practices will be disseminated for replication to other countries in the region. Estimated total cost of the M&E is 45,000 \$ which 20,000\$ cost to GEF and 25,000\$ cost to the Government (See UNEP Prodoc Appendix 7).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION: In addition to the following questions, please ensure that the project design incorporates key GEF operational principles, including sustainability of global environmental benefits, institutional continuity and replicability, keeping in mind that these principles will be monitored rigorously in the annual Project Implementation Review and other Review stages.

A. STATE THE ISSUE, HOW THE PROJECT SEEKS TO ADDRESS IT, AND THE EXPECTED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS TO BE DELIVERED: Turkey is one of the fortunate country in the world as a country possessing vital resources for people's food security and has the responsibility to protect and use this important wealth rationally for the welfare of the future generations. With three biogeographical regions called Euro-Siberian, Mediterranean and Irano-Turanian and their transition zones Turkey has variety of forest, mountain, steppe, wetland, coastal and marine ecosystems. This extraordinary ecosystem and habitat diversity has produced considerable species diversity and endemism. The number of seed plant species identified in Turkey is currently about 9,200. The number of species and sub-species taxa has reached 11,000. This number increases every day with the identification of new species. In its geographical zone, Turkey is one of the richest countries in endemic plants, 34 % of the plant species in Turkey (3,150) are endemic. This high rate of endemism makes Turkey interesting in terms of seed plants and maintains its character as a centre of attraction in this regard. Turkey's genetic diversity becomes important with plant genetic resources in particular because Turkey is located at the intersection of the Mediterranean and Near Eastern gene centres. These two regions have a key role in the emergence of cereals and horticultural crops. In Turkey, there are 5 micro-gene centres in which more than 100 species display a wide variation and which are the origin or centre of a large number of important crop plants and other economically important plant species such as medical plants. These centres offer very important genetic resources for the future sustainability of many plant species cultivated across the world. In terms of animal genetic resources, it is agreed that many domestic animal races were originally bred in Anatolia as a result of its location and spread from here to other regions of the world. Therefore, taking into consideration the biological diversity of Turkey, in particular genetic centers of origin and diversity of genetic resources important for food and agriculture, biosafety has utmost importance for food security both at national and global levels. Consequently, the unregulated introduction of products of modern biotechnology could lead to loss of wild and agricultural biodiversity and thus an operational biosafety framework with adequate capacity is required to ensure that the potential benefits of modern biotechnology can be captured in a fully legal and transparent manner.

B. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL AND/OR REGIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS:

Turkey has been a party to the convention on biological diversity since 14 May 1998 and a participant of the process of preparations of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety since 1998. The Republic of Turkey signed the Protocol on 24 May 2000 during the COP to the CBD and adopted it on the 17th of June 2003 (Act 4898 of June 2003). The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA) General Directorate of Agricultural Research (GDAR) has been appointed as a National Focal Pont for the Protocol. The National Biological Diversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) which was prepared in 2001 and updated in 2007 gives priority to Biosafety and addresses the issue under the first and fourth goals. The Strategic Action 1.3.5 under the 3rd Objective of the 1st Goal of the NBSAP is "Increasing the effectiveness of the Legal Sanctions for the Countrol of the entry/exit of the GMO's to Turkey and the establishment of inspection standards and other related mechanisms including risk assessment and management. Under the 4th goal, 3rd Objective includes five strategic action plans on Biosafety. "4.3 To prevent or minimize as far as possible any pressures on and threats to agricultural biological diversity which come from the Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO's). 4.3.1. The promotion of researches with a view to unveiling methods for and approaches to the determination of the possible adverse impacts of GMO's on Biological Diversity 4.3.2. Setting up a national biosafety information management and monitoring system which will allow the follow up and determination of any GMO's entry to Turkey. 4.3.3. The enhancement of the required legal, institutional and technical capacity for the regulation, control and monitoring of the activities related

with GMO's and products thereof. 4.3.4 The development and promotion of researches for the determination of the effects of alien species on the natural species and the methods for the prevention of such adverse effects. 4.3.5 The collection of information about the Invasive Alien Species which are introduced or most probably will enter to Turkey and the monitoring of those species. The 9th Development Plan of Turkey which covers the period 2007-2013 identifies in paragraph 161 that "in order to protect and maintain the plant genetic resources and the the biological diversity in Turkey, the need for establishing standards about the use and movement of GMOs and biotechnology products is still continuing". Therefore biosafety has been included under the main objectives of the plan as Para. 460 which aims for minimization of risks related to biosafety and GMOs in a manner of the Integrated policy approach of the Agriculture, Environment and Technology Sectors.

On the other hand, policy of science and technology which is determined by the High Council of Science and Technology under the chairmanship of Prime Minister, with participation of senior officials of related institutions and ministries supports the biotechnology with the provision of ensuring biosafety. Furthermore, biotechnology and gene technology have been identified as one of the strategic technologies in the National Science and Technology Policy Strategy document which was prepared and published in 2004. Agricultural policy of Turkey also identifies the Biosafety as an important issue. Agricultural Council Declaration of 2004 urges for the conservation of genetic resources and biological diversity and it includes policy measures to benefit from opportunities of biotechnology with the provision of biosafety measures.

Agricultural Research Programme reflects the outcomes of the Council decisions with regard to Biotechnology and biosafety. In the scope of the legislation in force, the only regulation directly related with the biosafety is the "communiqué on field trials of cultivated transgenic plants" which is executed by MARA-GDAR and is in force since 1998. The objective of the communiqué is the establishment of procedures and principles of field trials of genetically modified plants (GMPs) intended to agricultural production and it applies to all genetically modified plants whether imported or locally developed. The communiqué determines the procedure of and information to be submitted by applications, establishes the commission for evaluation of applications, authorizes GDAR to undertake field trials. Current legislation was examined in the scope of the UNEP/GEF Project on development of Biosafety Frameworks, in a participatory manner and it is agreed on that there is a need to prepare a law to address biosafety issues in Turkey. Therefore the draft law on biosafety has been prepared by a commission constituting representatives of related stakeholders. The draft law on biosafety is based on the precautionary principle, protection of biological resources and human health and case-by-case scientific risk assessment. It regulates the import, placing on the market for environmental release and/or as food and feed or for processing, contained use, export and transit of GMOs and products thereof. It covers all kind of measures, including risk assessment and regulations for the activities related to GMOs and products thereof including inter-alia research, development, use, production, consumption, processing, trade, marketing, transport, transit, handling, identification, documentation, packaging, labeling, storage, control, inspection, monitoring and traceability. The draft law on biosafety was adopted by the TGNA on 18 March 2010 and will enter into force by 26th September 2010.

C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH [GEF STRATEGIES](#) AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: The project belongs to the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area. Biosafety is one of the priority area of GEF-4 Strategic Programme under SO3: To safeguard biodiversity stating that "In order to safeguard biodiversity, countries require management systems and frameworks that have the capacity to detect, exclude, eradicate, control and effectively manage introduced organisms that pose a risk to biodiversity. Through this strategic objective, GEF will help build country capacity to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety." Therefore, "Building Capacity for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol" is included as SP6 of GEF-4 Strategic Programme. Furthermore, GEF Council adopted the GEF Strategy for Financing Biosafety (GEF C.30/8/Rev.1) to help build the capacity of eligible countries to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety through activities at the national, sub-regional and regional levels. Capacity building is a key prerequisite for the effective implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB). In order to be able to implement their obligations, Parties to the CPB need appropriate institutional mechanisms and infrastructure, well-trained human resources, adequate funding as well as easy access to relevant information. At its first meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol on Biosafety, adopted in annex 1 of decision BS-I/5, an Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. At its second meeting, COP-MOP in decision BS-II/3 adopted terms of reference for a comprehensive review of the Action Plan and invited Governments and relevant organizations to submit information regarding the progress and effectiveness in their implementation of the Action Plan as well as suggestions on the desired revisions. The Secretariat prepared, on the basis of the

submissions received, a synthesis paper including strategic recommendations for a possible revision of the Action Plan. At its third meeting, COP-MOP in decision BS-III/3 adopted an updated version of the Action Plan. Therefore the project is in line with GEF strategies and CPB priorities.

D. JUSTIFY THE TYPE OF FINANCING SUPPORT PROVIDED WITH THE GEF RESOURCES. N/A

E. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES: Turkey executed the UNEP/GEF Project on Development of Biosafety Frameworks between 2002-2005 which were also supported by State Planning Organization from internal resources. National Biosafety Framework was prepared at the end of the development project including draft law on biosafety and the action plan to ensure follow-up of the outputs of the project. The plan includes steps toward the finalization and approval of the draft law on biosafety, public awareness studies and the implementation of the NBF. Actions and activities given below are the main requirements for implementation of the NBF: (i) Preparation of regulations under the biosafety law; (ii) Capacity building to meet risk assessment and management requirements including training of technical staff and establishment of laboratories and reference laboratory ; and (iii) Establishment of Biosafety Clearing House. In spite of submission of project proposal, Turkey could not benefit from the UNEP/GEF project for development of National Biosafety Clearing House (project document signed and sent to UNEP, but no feedback had been received). The project constitutes significant contribution to national effort to meet requirements to implement NBF as outlined above and establishment of Biosafety Clearing House at national level.

F. DISCUSS THE VALUE-ADDED OF GEF INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT DEMONSTRATED THROUGH INCREMENTAL REASONING : The National Biosafety Framework was completed in 2005. The administrative, legislative and institutional status and capacity needs of Turkey with regard to biosafety was determined at that time. Since then, there are some developments and changes in the administrative and institutional status. Therefore, component A (stocktaking exercise) is required to update information on stakeholders and gaps on biosafety for effective planning and implementation of the other components of the project. The draft law on biosafety forms the basis for biosafety regulatory regime in Turkey. Adoption of the draft law was delayed because of the heavy agenda of Turkish National General Assembly (TNGA). Although the Biosafety Law adopted by TGNA recently, it will be enter into force by 26 September 2010. The effective implementation of the Biosafety Law depends on preparation of practical and understandable regulations, full understanding of the members of the Biosafety Committee of their responsibilities and issues related to biosafety, effective implementation of the provisions of the Law with regard to legal and criminal liability, and the clear notification procedures for applicants. Without the project and activities under component B, there would be weak enforcement of the Law and its regulations which may result with the unregulated introduction of LMOs. The institutional baseline for handling of request, risk assessment, risk management, monitoring and inspections constitute two functional laboratories, plus three laboratories with the potential to be included in the biosafety network and three research institutes having experience on field trials of GMPs and for risk assessment of LMOs, and province directorates and control laboratories for regular food controls and inspections. Administrative and technical staff of MARA constitutes a basis to some extent for human resources for handling of requests, risk assessment, decision-making and risk management. However, the current administrative and technical capacity of both MARA and other related institutions is not enough to comply with the provisions of CPB and biosafety law. Without sufficient human resources in quality and in quantity, notifications could not be evaluated in an appropriate manner and the system could not be functional enough to respond notifications within appropriate time periods. There is no approved LMOs in Turkey yet due to lack of functional legal and administrative biosafety system, therefore there is also no operational monitoring and inspection system for LMOs. Monitoring and inspection system is the priority issue for Turkey as being centre of genetic origin and diversity for crops in Turkey. The current technical capacity required to be strengthened to meet fully the obligations of CBD and CPB as well as enforcement of biosafety law. Mandating of particular laboratories for LMO detection and training of technical staff on LMO detection and identification is a key capacity need to have effective monitoring and inspection system to regulate transboundary movements and environmental release of LMOs. Without the component D of the project, determination and handling of illegal movements and release of LMOs would not be possible and may result with damage on biodiversity. The action plan on public awareness, education and participation was prepared in the scope of the NBF project, but could not be operational yet due to lack of resources. The current situation is not available for sustainability and effectiveness of public awareness and

education on biosafety. The project would serve sustainable and effective system for public awareness, education and participation on biosafety. Consequently, baseline for biosafety would lead to illegal introduction of LMOs in Turkey, weak implementation of CPB and possible environmental damages due to weak monitoring and inspection.

G. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED AND OUTLINE RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES: Most important risk is mandating of trained technical staff in different positions other than biosafety facilities. Training of trainers and preparation of guidelines and manuals will provide sustainability of human resources in biosafety laboratories and institutes as included under 3rd and 4th components of the project. Close collaboration and cooperation between institutions is important factor in the successful implementation of the project. In addition to Project Coordination Committee, the establishment and mandating of National Biosafety Committee, competent authorities and Scientific Advisory Committee as defined in the Law, training of Customs personnel on biosafety and informing of Judiciary officials on Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, Biosafety Law and biosafety related definitions, to facilitate dispute settlement, handling of court cases and enforcement of Biosafety Law will serve sustainability of institutional collaboration and cooperation both during and after the project. The stability of the governmental support during and after the project to implement NBF is one of the key assumptions of the project. Therefore, political instability would pose important risk for success of the project as well. The activities under the fifth component of the project that will be executed starting from early stages of the project will contribute growing interest of the public to the biosafety issues. The public interest will be driving force for the governments and politicians to support implementation of NBF.

Risks	Risk mitigation measures
Weak coordination of the project	Mandating a project coordinator and procurement of project assistant
Mandating of trained technical staff in different positions other than biosafety facilities	Training of trainers and preparation of guidelines and manuals to serve regular training of human resources in biosafety laboratories and institutes
Weak collaboration and cooperation between institutions	Giving active role to the representatives of relevant institutions as a member of the Project Coordination Committee and National Biosafety Committee Training of Customs personnel on biosafety Informing of Judiciary officials on Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety
Political instability	Keeping public interest on biosafety issues by the activities under component 5 of the project as a driving force for the governments and politicians to support implementation of NBF
Low level of inputs and contributions of relevant institutions	Procurement of national and international consultancy service

H. EXPLAIN HOW COST-EFFECTIVENESS IS REFLECTED IN THE PROJECT DESIGN:

Monitoring of the progress of all activities will be undertaken by UNEP in accordance with its Monitoring & Evaluation procedures. The indicators identified in the project RBF will be used for monitoring the development of the project activities. An independent mid-term review will be undertaken. The evaluation will include an assessment of on-going activities including a diagnosis of possible problems and recommend any corrective measures. A final evaluation of the project will be undertaken in accordance with UNEP. Dissemination of results will take place via the stakeholders meetings, via periodic meetings between the project management team and the government departments, publications and via the public media. Recommendations and best practices will be disseminated for replication to other countries in the region. Estimated total cost of the M&E is 45,000 \$ which 20,000\$ cost to GEF and 25,000\$ cost to the Government (See UNEP Prodoc Appendix 7).

PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

A. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT:

The Implementing Agency of the project is UNEP. The national execution of the project will be undertaken by Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (General Directorate of Agricultural Research). The National Co-ordinating Committee (NCC) will be established by the National Executing Agency (NEA) to advise and guide the implementation of the National Biosafety Framework. This Committee will include representations of all government agencies which mandates relevant to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and will include representations from the private and public sectors. The National Project Coordinator will be appointed by the National Executing Agency after consultation with UNEP for the duration of the National Project.


B. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT: This project builds on an UNEP's portfolio of enabling activities in over 123 countries and 8 demonstration projects out of 12 on capacity building for the implementation of the CPB carried out through the development and implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks respectively. This reflects UNEP's considerable experience and expertise in the area and therefore its comparative advantage in the field. This portfolio has already produced relevant results, generated lessons learned and best practices being used /which can be used in other countries of the world. In this respect, the project will benefit from UNEP's experience and expertise to develop a fully operational NBF in Turkey, where best practices and lessons learned will add to those being acquired through the eight demonstration projects currently running under UNEP. The project will be executed by MARA-GDAR which was also executing agency of NBF development project. The project will be co-financed by NEA. NEA (GDAR) has experience of project execution and has infrastructure to provide good working conditions for project team and NCC. NEA has food control laboratories and research institutes having capacity to actively participate into the project activities. GDAR has also high-speed Internet access and adequate back-up and security systems and full-time IT staff in place to provide a basis for BCH. The National Project Coordinator (NPC) will be appointed by the NEA, after consultation with UNEP, for the duration of the National Project. The NPC shall be responsible for the overall co-ordination, management and supervision of all aspects of the National Project and assisted by project assistant during the project. He will report to the National Coordinating Committee and UNEP, and liaise closely with the chair and members of the National Coordinating Committee and National Executing Agency in order to coordinate the work plan for the National Project. He shall be responsible for all substantive, managerial and financial reports from the National Project. He will provide overall supervision for any staff in the NBF Team as well as guiding and supervising all other staff appointed for the execution of the various National Project components. The main partner of NEA in execution of the project is MEF as it was in NBF development project. MEF will provide in-kind contribution to the project activities by means of human resources in particular. NEA will execute the project in close collaboration with NBC as mandated in accordance to Biosafety Law. The National Coordinating Committee (NCC) will be established by NEA to act as project steering committee and to advise and guide the implementation of the National Biosafety Framework. This committee will include representations of all government agencies with mandates relevant to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and will include representatives from the private and public sectors as described below under Section 5. This Committee will be multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral in fields relevant to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Since the NCC will include all members of NBC, partnership of key institutions in execution of the project activities will be ensured. The NEA may also establish sub-working groups as necessary with clear Terms of Reference as appropriate.

PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF:

Project activities have been planned in line with the components included in the original PIF. During the design of the project, the Biosafety Law was adopted by the Parliament and therefore instead of activities to facilitate adoption of the Biosafety Law, activities to facilitate information sharing and to strengthen National BCH mechanisms have been planned and budgeted into the project design.

PART V: AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO Endorsement.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Maryam Niamir-Fuller, Director, UNEP Division of Global Environment Facility (GEF) Coordination P O Box 30552 Nairobi, Kenya Email: maryam.niamir-fuller@unep.org Fax: (254 20) 762 4041		October 19, 2010	Alex Owusu- Biney	+254 20 762 4066	Alex.Owusu- Biney@unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Indicators (beginning of year 2014)	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
Objective: Effective implementation of National Biosafety Framework (NBF) that is in line with national biosafety and development priorities, Cartagena Protocol and other international obligations	The entire administrative, legislative and organizational structure ensuring safe use of LMOs or in line with CPB obligations in place	Draft NBF was prepared during 2002 - 2005, but it needs updating	By year 2014, updated NBF is adopted and being implemented effectively	Information on the status of the NBF and its progression towards full implementation will be made available through the regular reporting . project results will be available in project website and BCH.	It is assumed that relevant institutions collaborate effectively during and after the project. Government supports the NBF and biosafety policy is stable.
Outcome A: The final project has strong stakeholder participation and ownership, and the project effectively and efficiently completes the NBF to be fully consistent with the CBP and other international obligations					
Outputs:					
A.1. Stocktaking report that analyses the current status of modern biotechnology and biosafety system	The report on stakeholder and gap analysis including gaps and needs for regional harmonization and consistency where there is potential for reciprocal (transboundary) movement	There is no comprehensive analysis in Turkey, although some information is contained in draft NBF, but it needs updating.	By 2011 stocktaking analysis done	Reporting, Proceedings of meetings, Materials available in project website	It is assumed that the governmental and non-governmental institutions will give attention to the project and actively participated to the stocktaking exercise.
Outcome B: Regulatory biosafety regime in place and legally mandated					
Outputs:					
B.1. Regulations under Biosafety Law approved	Regulations drafted, agreed with stakeholders and adopted.	Biosafety law adopted in 2010, but needs secondary legislation	By 2011, secondary legislation drafted and adopted by 2012	OJ numbers and dates of regulations as well as their texts are available on project website.	It is assumed that the governmental and non-governmental institutions will give attention to the project and actively participated to the preparation of the regulations.
B.2. National Biosafety Committee (NBC) established	OJ numbers and dates which names and coordinates of NBC members published	There is no NBC in Turkey	By 2011, NBC nominated and functional	Coordinates of the NBC and proceedings its meetings available on website of the project	There is political will and administrative support for mandating of NBC
B.3. Competent authorities (CA) and Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) mandated	OJ numbers and dates which names and coordinates of competent authorities and Scientific Advisory Committee	National focal point for the Protocol and for BCH had been nominated, but competent authorities have not been mandated yet in accordance to Biosafety Law and the Protocol.	By 2011, competent authorities mandated and functional By 2011, SAC established and mandated	Coordinates of the competent authorities and SAC and proceedings their meetings available on website of the project	There is political will and administrative support for mandating of SAC and CA.

		No SAC established			
B.4. Manual on application procedure under the Law prepared	Manual on application procedure under the Law published	There is no manual on application procedure under the Law	By the end of 2011, manual prepared	Publication of the manual Hard copy of the Manual is available on website of the project	Sub-working Group of the project has appropriate conditions to work effectively
B.5. Training for lawyers undertaken on legal aspects of transboundary movements of LMOs and products thereof and other aspects about use of LMOs	Number of lawyers participated to the training on legal aspects of transboundary movements of LMOs and products thereof.	No lawyers have been trained on issues related to LMOs	By the end of 2011, at least 60 lawyers trained on legal aspects of transboundary movements of LMOs	Proceedings of the training, List of participants	Lawyers interested on the legal aspects of the biosafety issues and participated to the training course.
Outcome C: Functional system for handling of requests, risk assessment, decision-making and risk management of LMOs established					
Outputs:					
C.1. Human resources for handling of requests, risk assessment, decision-making and risk management of LMOs improved	Improved ability of members of NBC, CA and SAC to handle notifications, to perform risk assessment and decision-making	Capacity for handling of requests and risk assessment is low.	By the 2012 the system for handling of requests, risk assessment and decision-making introduced to the members of NBC, CA and SAC	proceedings of training courses and workshops and list of participants available in project website	It is assumed that relevant institutions collaborate effectively during and after the project.
	Improved human resources to train technical staff at province level to manage risks associated with LMOs	Capacity for risk assessment and risk management is low.	By the 2012 training performed by the help of international consultancy for 11 staff to be mandated to perform local level trainings on risk assessment and risk management	proceedings of training course and list of participants available in project website	It is assumed that positions of the trained personnel have not changed
	Improved capacity of 8(existing) regional research institutes to be act at provincial level to manage risks identified (by informing about protective measures and/or demonstrating some of them to operators (farmers, manufacturers, exc.) involved in various steps of deliberate release of LMOs	There are 8 regional research institutes, but they are not able to manage risks	By the end of 2012, 8 regional trainings performed	proceedings of training courses and workshops and list of participants available in project website	It is assumed that positions of the trained personnel have not changed
C.2. Guidelines, methodologies and manuals on risk assessment and risk management prepared	By the end of 2012, practical guidelines and manuals for risk assessment and risk management,	No guidelines available in local language	By the end of 2012 guidelines and manuals on risk assessment and risk management are published	Guidelines and manuals available in project website	There is institutional collaboration and participation to the working group meetings
C.3. Internet portal, which is accessible by risk assessors, decision-makers and risk managers, prepared and	Functional internet portal for data collection, input and analysis with regard to LMOs	No portal for data collection, input and analysis with regard to LMOs	By 2012 internet portal is functional for data collection, input and analysis with regard to LMOs	Access to the portal	There is institutional collaboration and participation to operate clearing-house mechanism

functional for data collection, input and analysis for risk management and risk communication purposes					
C.4. Criteria to consider possible socio-economical impacts determined and prioritized to be taken into consideration in the process of decision making	Criteria and priority socio-economical issues to be taken into consideration for decision making	No common understanding on socio-economical evaluation with regard to LMOs	By 2012 booklet on criteria and priority socio-economical issues to be taken into consideration for decision making published	Publications available in project website	There is institutional collaboration and participation to the consultation meeting
Outcome D: Monitoring and inspection system for LMOs established					
Outputs:					
D.1. Laboratories and research institutes mandated and strengthened for monitoring and inspection	Strengthened capacity of 5 laboratories and 3 research institutes to detect and identify LMOs by purchase of equipments, training of relevant staff and standardization of detection methods	There are 2 functional laboratories to detect LMOs for the purpose of market control and inspection; however this capacity is not enough to prevent illegal environmental release and transboundary movement of LMOs.	By 2012, equipments are purchased (Real Time PCR and Normal Reverse Transcriptase PCR equipments) and methods are standardized to detect LMOs	List of laboratories and institutes, mandated for controls, monitoring and inspections, as well as list of equipments purchased and standard methods available in project website Proceedings and list of participants of training courses are available in project website	It is assumed that the time frame is sufficient to set up institutional arrangements, administrative procedures shortened to purchase equipments and services and technical staff sufficiently involved in the training courses.
D.2. Ankara Control Laboratory accredited for detections of LMOs and detection methods standardized to be used in mandated laboratories	Accreditation certificate of Ankara Control laboratory	No accredited laboratory to verify detection test results	By 2012, Ankara Control Laboratory accredited	Accreditation certificate of Ankara Control laboratory	It is assumed that the time frame is sufficient to set up institutional arrangements, administrative procedures shortened to purchase equipments and services
D.3. Human resources for monitoring, inspections, border controls, emergency response and compliance to Biosafety Law and the Protocol improved	Number of inspectors, controllers and technical staff of research institutes who are able to execute monitoring and inspection system for biosafety	There are 64 staff trained during the project on preparation of NBFs, but this human resource is not sufficient for effective monitoring and inspection.	By 2014, four trainings performed on inspection methods, and emergency measures to staff of MARA, operators and local managers; and, four trainings performed on border controls to prevent illegal movements of LMOs to the staff of Undersecretary of Customs and MARA	Proceedings and list of participants of training courses available in project website	It is assumed that relevant institutions collaborate effectively during and after the project.
	Number of Judiciary officials who are able to inspect compliance to Biosafety Law and the Protocol	Judiciary officials not familiar with Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, Biosafety Law and	By 2014, briefing given to Judiciary officials on Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, Biosafety Law and		

		biosafety related definitions	biosafety related definitions, to facilitate dispute settlement, handling of court cases and enforcement of Biosafety Law		
D.4. Guidelines, methodologies and manuals on monitoring, inspections and emergency response prepared	Guidelines, methodologies, manuals on monitoring, inspections, compliance and emergency response	No guidelines, methodologies, manuals on monitoring, inspections, compliance and emergency response	By 2013, guidelines, and manuals on monitoring, inspections, compliance and emergency response published	Publications available in project website	It is assumed that appropriate consultancy acquired to prepare the guidelines, methodologies, manuals
D.5. Registration system with unique identifiers to trace back LMOs established	Registration system (coding system, which will be harmonized by the system of OECD and EU to determine unique identifier of LMOs, their producers and purpose of market release to be able to trace them in the market)	No system to trace-back LMOs	By 2012 registration system established to trace-back LMOs	registration system available on web site	Technical staffs that will use the registration system are sufficiently involved in the training course.
Outcome E: Functional system for public awareness and participation established for biosafety					
Outputs:					
E.1 Public awareness action plan of NBF updated	Updated action plan on public awareness and participation	Public awareness action plan was prepared during the project on preparation of NBFs, but needs to be updated and effective implementation.	By 2012, public awareness action plan updated By 2012 training performed to managers and technical staff to implement action plan	Updated action plan on public awareness and participation and list of participants to the training available in project website	Managers and technical staff have willingness to update and implement the action plan
E.2 Raise the public awareness through workshops, publications and trainings	Publications and deliberations for public awareness Percentage of people having opinion about Biosafety , and number of opinions expressed by public about LMO applications	The current situation is not available for sustainability and effectiveness of public awareness and education on biosafety.	At least two info days performed in each year of the project Public awareness campaign performed during the project By 2014 publications and materials published and available in national BCH	Publications, proceedings of info days and activities performed in the scope of the campaign and questionnaire available in project website	It is assumed that interest of the public to the biosafety issues will be maintained and even increased during and after the project execution. No stakeholder group will be opposing project activities.
E.3. National BCH strengthened	Number of visits on national BCH	National BCH is not effective	By 2012 national BCH operational	National BCH	It is assumed that appropriate consultancy acquired to strength national BCH

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)

Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion	Response
<p>6. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The RAF allocation?</p>	<p>09-04-09 Turkey has an allocation of \$6.55M and a balance of \$597,150 as of today. This is more than the \$545K needed for this project. Cleared</p> <p>10-02-09 When adding the Agency Fee for this project \$54,500 Turkey would use \$599,500, which is \$2,350 above the BD Allocation (\$597,150). Please reduce the PIF in the amount of \$54,500 and re-submit.</p>	<p>Justification: Turkey was working to a communication that told them they had an unused allocation of 600K USD – this was perhaps an approximation. The GEF contribution to Project Management costs has been reduced by the required amount and new totals, etc calculated.</p> <p>Response made in PIF: GEF contribution to Project Management costs has been reduced by the required amount and new totals, etc calculated. Milestones adjusted to account for delay.</p>

ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT USING GEF RESOURCES

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ person week*</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks**</i>	<i>Tasks to be performed</i>
For Project Management			
Local			
Project assistant	300	1 person 30 week	Assistance to Project coordinator and NEA to organize, perform and coordinate the project activities
International			
Justification for Travel, if any:			
For Technical Assistance			
Local			
academician	500	1 person 5 week	Review of current situation (i.e. existing institutions and stakeholders with regard to implementation of NBF in Turkey, gaps and needs for regional harmonization and consistency where there is potential for reciprocal (transboundary) movement, ext)
academician	500	8 person 4 week	Preparation of guidelines, methodologies and manuals for risk assessment, risk management and socio-economic evaluation Standardization of detection methods used in mandated laboratories Preparation of operational manual with checklists for LMO inspectors Preparation of guidelines and rules for emergency and accidental releases Preparation of guidelines for customs control purposes Preparation of guidelines for monitoring environmental effects of LMOs
International			
	5,000	4 person 1 week	Training of trainer technical staff on handling of requests, risk assessment and risk management
	5,000	2 person 1 week	Training of inspectors on inspection procedures for activities involving LMOs
	4,000	2 person 1 week	mid-term monitoring and evaluation of the project
Justification for Travel, if any:			

* Provide dollar rate per person week. ** Total person weeks needed to carry out the tasks.

ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

A. EXPLAIN IF THE PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED THROUGH THE PPG ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN.
N/A

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

C. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Approved</i>	<i>Implementation Status</i>	<i>GEF Amount (\$)</i>				<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>
		<i>Amount Approved</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>	<i>Uncommitted Amount*</i>	
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
Total						

* Any uncommitted amounts should be returned to the GEF Trust Fund. This is not a physical transfer of money, but achieved through reporting and netting out from disbursement request to Trustee. Please indicate expected date of refund transaction to Trustee.

ANNEX E: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up) N/A

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)

ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT USING GEF RESOURCES

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ person week*</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks**</i>	<i>Tasks to be performed</i>
For Project Management			
Local			
International			
Justification for Travel, if any:			
For Technical Assistance			
Local			
International			
Justification for Travel, if any:			

* Provide dollar rate per person week. ** Total person weeks needed to carry out the tasks.

ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

A. EXPLAIN IF THE PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED THROUGH THE PPG ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN.

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

C. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Approved</i>	<i>Implementation Status</i>	<i>GEF Amount (\$)</i>				<i>Co- financing (\$)</i>
		<i>Amount Approved</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>	<i>Uncommitted Amount*</i>	
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
Total						

* Any uncommitted amounts should be returned to the GEF Trust Fund. This is not a physical transfer of money, but achieved through reporting and netting out from disbursement request to Trustee. Please indicate expected date of refund transaction to Trustee.

ANNEX E: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS

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