

## Annex F. UNDP Social and Environmental and Social Screening Protocol (SESP)

### Project Information

<b>Project Information</b>	
1. Project Title	Addressing Invasive Alien Species Threats at Key Marine Biodiversity Areas
2. Project Number	ATLAS Project ID: 00101497; UNDP PMIS: 5733; GEF PIMS: 9233;
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Turkey

### Part A. Integrating Overarching Principles to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability

#### QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Overarching Principles in order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?

##### **Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams the human-rights based approach**

This GEF funded project has been developed in full compliance with a human-rights based approach to development, which is among the main approaches applied to improve the practice of conservation of globally important biodiversity. The project is fully in-line with and supportive of Turkey's UN Development Cooperation Strategy 2016-2020. Through improved management and control of marine IAS the project will strengthen human rights related to access and use of marine ecosystems and species. The project will contribute to the sustainable development of communities neighboring marine ecosystems, which fundamentally enhances human rights. Although the project is not expected to have any negative implications for human rights in any way, project activities, especially at the site level, will be carried out with due process and consultation with neighboring communities. In particular the project will work closely with fishing communities that have a vested interest in the sustainability and ecological condition of marine resources. The location of the proposed project demonstration sites within Turkey means that no refugee populations will be affected in any way.

All government partners at the national and local level will be included in capacity development activities related to the management and control of marine IAS. All capacity development activities will ensure attention to any potential link between the control and management of marine IAS and human rights related issues. Any regulations, policies, management plans, or other such documents produced by the project at the national or local level will retain awareness of any possible effect (none anticipated) on the ability of human rights duty bearers to fulfill their duties or on human rights holders to claim their rights. The project's pilot fiscal incentive schemes for the control and removal of marine IAS have also been designed to ensure the mainstreaming of a human-rights based approach, as relevant. For example, the fiscal incentive schemes are designed to allow equal access for participation by all interested parties, and will also ensure that any marine IAS control and management measures do not adversely affect populations of native biodiversity, particularly economically important species.

All the above mentioned human-rights based activities will be supported by national and local level advocacy and awareness raising campaigns on the management and control of marine IAS, which inherently promotes human rights including the universal basic right for a clean and sustainable environment for this and future generations.

##### **Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women's empowerment**

This project document has been developed in compliance with the corresponding "Guide to Gender Mainstreaming in UNDP Supported GEF Financed Projects". Thus, gender equality aspects will be considered as appropriate while developing capacities on the systemic, institutional and individual level. For this, a project gender mainstreaming action plan will be developed and annually updated within the project implementation period. Particularly, on the national level, women will be involved in the improvement of the enabling framework on biodiversity conservation relating to the management and control of marine IAS, and supported to incorporate gender smart solutions, where relevant. For

example, the project will ensure representative participation by women in all capacity development activities, in accordance with the actual staffing of government partners. In other words, any women employees in relevant positions in partner institutions will participate in capacity development activities.

UNDP and the government partner institutions will also ensure appropriate gender balance and representation in project staffing, including staffing of the project management unit, and the hiring of technical experts. In addition, the UNDP Turkey Country Office maintains a gender specialist, who will monitor the implementation of the project to identify any opportunities or risks related to gender mainstreaming.

**Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams environmental sustainability**

This GEF funded and UNDP implemented project has the direct effect of mainstreaming environmental sustainability, as the specific objective of the project is to improve the status of Turkey’s marine biodiversity. This will be mainstreamed through strengthening the capacity of relevant government partner institutions at the national and local levels to manage and control marine IAS in Turkey’s coastal waters. Furthermore, the project activities include education and awareness measures targeting local government institutions, local communities, and other stakeholders. The education and awareness campaign will increase the understanding and awareness of the threat from marine IAS, and contribute to improved implementation of management and control measures. For example, local boat operators and diving clubs will have improved understanding about measures they must take to avoid introducing or spreading marine IAS in Turkey’s coastal waters. The project will also work with the private sector shipping industry to increase this awareness and understanding of management and control of marine IAS, in support of implementation of the Ballast Water Convention.

**Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks**

<p><b>QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?</b></p> <p><i>Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 – Risk Screening Checklist (based on any “Yes” responses). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Questions 5 and 6 not required for Low Risk Projects.</i></p>	<p><b>QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?</b></p> <p><i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i></p>			<p><b>QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?</b></p>
<p><b>Risk Description</b></p>	<p><b>Impact and Probability (1-5)</b></p>	<p><b>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</b></p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p>	<p><b>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.</b></p>
<p>Risk 1: “Standard 1.2 Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (e.g.</p>	<p>I = 1 (negligible) P = 5 (expected)</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>	<p>One of the four proposed project demonstration sites in Ayvalik Islands includes the territory of the Ayvalik Islands Nature Park. This is an IUCN class V protected area, covering 19,624 hectares, includes 13,969</p>	<p><b>NOT REQUIRED FOR LOW RISK PROJECTS</b></p>

<p><i>nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities? – YES”</i></p> <p>Three of the four proposed project demonstration sites (Ayvalik Islands, Igneada, and Hatay-Samandag) include or border protected areas, or other critical habitats / environmentally sensitive areas. The fourth site, Marmara Islands, currently does not have any particular protected status or regime, but the area is being considered for potential future protection status.</p>			<p>hectares of marine habitat and approximately 112 hectares of coastal habitat. The goal of the project activities will be to improve the condition of biodiversity at the site through the control of notable IAS, and through improvement to the general ecosystem conditions in the protected area in order to strengthen native biota’s resistance to alien species invasions. No negative impacts to critical habitats or environmentally sensitive areas are foreseen as a result of project activities (in fact, the contrary is expected).</p> <p>Another proposed project demonstration site, in Igneada, is immediately adjacent to the terrestrial Igneada Floodplain Forest Natural Park (IUCN class V protected area). However, considering that the proposed project activities are targeted for the marine ecosystem, no impact is foreseen on the critical habitats and environmentally sensitive areas of the Igneada protected area. The project may work to address some land-based threats (e.g. water pollution / runoff) to the marine ecosystem in order to strengthen the natural resilience of the native biota to alien species invasions, but if the project is successful in these efforts it is only expected that there would be positive impacts on the neighboring protected area.</p> <p>A third proposed project demonstration site includes the beach and coastal area of Hatay-Samandag. This area does not have formal protected status, but there are some protective regulations in place that are intended to conserve the beach as a nesting site for endangered sea turtles. Again, in this instance, all project activities targeted at addressing IAS are only expected to improve the condition of critical habitats and environmentally sensitive areas of Hatay-Samandag.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

<p>Risk 2: “Standard 1.7 Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? - YES”</p> <p>The project will involve the control of invasive alien marine species, including fish, mollusks, and echinoderms.</p>	<p>I = 1 (negligible) P = 5 (expected)</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>	<p>In each of the four demonstration sites (as well as at the national level, more broadly) the project aims to demonstrate IAS control measures in the marine environment. All activities in this respect are intended to benefit the condition of populations of native marine species. The project activities will naturally involve the likely reduction of populations of IAS species in the targeted areas. For example, in Hatay-Samandag, the project will work to control invasive lionfish (<i>Pterois</i> spp.) and balloon fish. In Igneada and Marmara islands the project will work to control invasive veined whelk (<i>Rapana venosa</i>). In Marmara the project will work to control invasive north Atlantic sea stars (<i>Asterias rubens</i>). The control measures for IAS will not involve the “production” or “harvesting” of these species for economic use, with a few possible minor exceptions. The veined whelk is considered an economically valuable species (although it is an IAS species), and therefore the veined whelk individuals removed from the ecosystem may be sold for commercial purposes by the local fishers who harvest them based on the incentives proposed by the project. In addition, the lionfish can be consumed by people, although a market for it does not currently exist in Turkey; therefore the project may work to incentive the harvesting and commercial sale of this species.</p>	<p><b>NOT REQUIRED FOR LOW RISK PROJECTS</b></p>
<p>Risk 3: “Standard 2.2 Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change? - YES”</p> <p>The long-term status of both native species populations and IAS populations could be affected by climate change in the future. For example, there are suggestions that a warming of certain marine ecosystems in Turkey’s coastal waters, such as the northern Aegean sea, could facilitate the expansion of IAS into areas they cannot currently colonize.</p>	<p>I = 2 (minor) P = 2 (not likely)</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>	<p>Although climate change is a certainty, its possible effect on the biodiversity (native, and alien) of Turkey’s marine ecosystems is not clear. There is no question that climate change is occurring and affecting Turkey’s coastal and marine ecosystems. Currently the rate of change is not so great as to catalyze ecosystem changes that would potentially supersede the project’s results. In any case, climate change would not be expected to affect the project’s <u>outcomes</u>, it would only have possible effects at the <u>impact</u> level. In this regard however, the project results would be expected to <u>improve</u> the potential climate resiliency of Turkey’s native marine biodiversity, and potentially reduce the resiliency of some IAS, due to control measures. Nonetheless, the</p>	<p><b>NOT REQUIRED FOR LOW RISK PROJECTS</b></p>

			project will mitigate this risk by tracking some climate change indicators in the project demonstration sites (e.g. water temperature trends), and will continually assess if climate change is leading to any catastrophic changes in relation to the colonization and expansion of marine IAS. If it is identified that catastrophic changes are occurring, the project will re-direct and re-plan project resources and activities, as appropriate, to address these challenges. The Project Board will make any decision along these lines, with technical input from the project Technical Advisory Group.	
	<b>QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?</b>			
	<b>Select one (see <a href="#">SESP</a> for guidance)</b>		<b>Comments</b>	
	<i>Low Risk</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All identified potential SESP risks are considered “low” significance. The overall project is considered low risk with respect to SESP issues. The objective of the project specifically includes improvement of environmental and social conditions in the target area, including improved gender mainstreaming.	
	<i>Moderate Risk</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<i>High Risk</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<b>QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?</b>			
	Check all that apply		<b>Comments</b>	
	<i>Principle 1: Human Rights</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NOT REQUIRED FOR LOW RISK PROJECTS	
	<i>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NOT REQUIRED FOR LOW RISK PROJECTS	
	<i>1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NOT REQUIRED FOR LOW RISK PROJECTS	
	<i>2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NOT REQUIRED FOR LOW RISK	

		PROJECTS
	3. <i>Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions</i>	NOT REQUIRED FOR LOW RISK PROJECTS
	4. <i>Cultural Heritage</i>	NOT REQUIRED FOR LOW RISK PROJECTS
	5. <i>Displacement and Resettlement</i>	NOT REQUIRED FOR LOW RISK PROJECTS
	6. <i>Indigenous Peoples</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT REQUIRED FOR LOW RISK PROJECTS
	7. <i>Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT REQUIRED FOR LOW RISK PROJECTS

**Final Sign Off**

<i>Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
QA Assessor 	Mr. Atila Uras, Assistant Resident Representative Environment Program, UNDP Turkey Country Office	UNDP staff member responsible for the Project, typically a UNDP Programme Officer. Final signature confirms they have "checked" to ensure that the SESP is adequately conducted.
QA Approver 	Mr. Claudio Tomasi, UNDP Country Director (CD) in the Republic of Turkey	UNDP senior manager, typically the UNDP Deputy Country Director (DCD), Country Director (CD), Deputy Resident Representative (DRR), or Resident Representative (RR). The QA Approver cannot also be the QA Assessor. Final signature confirms they have "cleared" the SESP prior to submittal to the PAC.
PAC Chair		UNDP chair of the PAC. In some cases PAC Chair may also be the QA Approver. Final signature confirms that the SESP was considered as part of the project appraisal and considered in recommendations of the PAC.

## SESP Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

<b>Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks</b>		<b>Answer (Yes/No)</b>
<b>Principles 1: Human Rights</b>		
1.	Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?	No
2.	Is there a likelihood that the Project would have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups? <sup>1</sup>	No
3.	Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups?	No
4.	Is there a likelihood that the Project would exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?	No
5.	Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project?	No
6.	Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	No
7.	Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process?	No
8.	Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	No
<b>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment</b>		
1.	Is there a likelihood that the proposed Project would have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?	No
2.	Would the Project potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	No
3.	Have women’s groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process and has this been included in the overall Project proposal and in the risk assessment?	No
4.	Would the Project potentially limit women’s ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? <i>For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being</i>	No
<b>Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability:</b> Screening questions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below		
<b>Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management</b>		
1.1	Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services?  <i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i>	No
1.2	Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities?	Yes

<sup>1</sup> Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to “women and men” or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender people and transsexuals.

1.3	Does the Project involve changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5)	No
1.4	Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species?	No
1.5	Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species?	No
1.6	Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?	No
1.7	Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?	Yes
1.8	Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? <i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i>	No
1.9	Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)	No
1.10	Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?	No
1.11	Would the Project result in secondary or consequential development activities which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects, or would it generate cumulative impacts with other known existing or planned activities in the area? <i>For example, a new road through forested lands will generate direct environmental and social impacts (e.g. felling of trees, earthworks, potential relocation of inhabitants). The new road may also facilitate encroachment on lands by illegal settlers or generate unplanned commercial development along the route, potentially in sensitive areas. These are indirect, secondary, or induced impacts that need to be considered. Also, if similar developments in the same forested area are planned, then cumulative impacts of multiple activities (even if not part of the same Project) need to be considered.</i>	No
<b>Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</b>		
2.1	Will the proposed Project result in significant <sup>2</sup> greenhouse gas emissions or may exacerbate climate change?	No
2.2	Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change?	Yes
2.3	Is the proposed Project likely to directly or indirectly increase social and environmental vulnerability to climate change now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)? <i>For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding</i>	No
<b>Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions</b>		
3.1	Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities?	No
3.2	Would the Project pose potential risks to community health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)?	No
3.3	Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads, buildings)?	No
3.4	Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)	No
3.5	Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions?	No
3.6	Would the Project result in potential increased health risks (e.g. from water-borne or other vector-borne diseases or communicable infections such as HIV/AIDS)?	No
3.7	Does the Project pose potential risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health and safety due to physical, chemical, biological, and radiological hazards during Project construction, operation, or decommissioning?	No

<sup>2</sup> In regards to CO<sub>2</sub>, 'significant emissions' corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources). [The Guidance Note on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides additional information on GHG emissions.]

3.8	Does the Project involve support for employment or livelihoods that may fail to comply with national and international labor standards (i.e. principles and standards of ILO fundamental conventions)?	No
3.9	Does the Project engage security personnel that may pose a potential risk to health and safety of communities and/or individuals (e.g. due to a lack of adequate training or accountability)?	No
<b>Standard 4: Cultural Heritage</b>		
4.1	Will the proposed Project result in interventions that would potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)	No
4.2	Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No
<b>Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement</b>		
5.1	Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement?	No
5.2	Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?	No
5.3	Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions? <sup>3</sup>	No
5.4	Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?	No
<b>Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples</b>		
6.1	Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?	No
6.2	Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.3	Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)?  <i>If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is “yes” the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.</i>	No
6.4	Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?	No
6.5	Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.6	Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?	No
6.7	Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	No
6.8	Would the Project potentially affect the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples?	No
6.9	Would the Project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?	No
<b>Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</b>		

<sup>3</sup> Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections.

7.1	Would the Project potentially result in the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or transboundary impacts?	No
7.2	Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	No
7.3	Will the proposed Project potentially involve the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous chemicals and/or materials? Does the Project propose use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs? <i>For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol</i>	No
7.4	Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health?	No
7.5	Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?	No

