

# Fisheries and Ecosystem Based Management for the Black Sea - (FishEBM BS)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10558

**Countries**

Regional (Georgia, Türkiye, Ukraine)

**Project Name**

Fisheries and Ecosystem Based Management for the Black Sea - (FishEBM BS)

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

11/26/2021

**Review completed by PM**

9/12/2022

**Program Manager**

Taylor Henshaw

**Focal Area**

International Waters

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF**   
**CEO Endorsement**

**Part I ? Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

SH (12.22.21): Yes, the project is well aligned with IW obj 1: Strengthening Blue Economy opportunities-catalyze sustainable fisheries management. Cleared.

**Agency Response NA**

**Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (12.22.21): Yes, cleared. The project design remains appropriate to advance fisheries EBM across the Black Sea. The anticipated strong coordination with planned WB and UNDP projects will further help advance project outcomes and GEF recommends that the project at the earliest possible stage (preferably prior to the project inception meeting) conduct coordination meetings and with a view towards developing an implementation plan that limits overlaps and enhances synergies.

**Agency Response NA**

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

### Agency Response NA

#### Co-financing

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.22.21):

Cofinance letters: some cofinancing letters lists cofinance that does not fall within the project implementation timeframe. Please note that for cofinance to qualify, it must fall within the project implementation timeline. Please revise cofinance letters as needed and adjust the project cofinance number.

6th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Partly addressed. The Table C Republic of Turkey co-financing indicates "In-Kind/Recurrent Expenditures", yet the co-financing letter indicates the type of co-financing is in-kind/investment mobilized. Please revise the co-financing letter to clarify this co-financing is either in-kind/recurrent expenditures or grant/public investment / investment mobilized.

27th of July 2022 (thenshaw):

a. Bulgarian Academy of Sciences: grant (staff who are assigned to the GEF project) ? this needs to be reported as ?in-kind & recurrent expenditures?. Please remove this line and add the amount in the other line.

b. EAFA (Ministry of Agriculture Food & Forestry): public investment (ministry staff who are assigned to the work contributing to the GEF project) ? same as above. This needs to be reported as ?in-kind & recurrent expenditures?. Please remove this line and add the amount in the other line.

6th of September 2022 (thenshaw):

a. Addressed.

b. Addressed.

## Agency Response

### **FAO Responses 20-August-22**

a. the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences grant contribution defined as "staff who are assigned to the GEF project" was reported as "in-kind & recurrent expenditures".

b. the EAFA (Ministry of Agriculture Food & Forestry): co-financing defined as "ministry staff who are assigned to the work contributing to the GEF project" was reported as "in-kind & recurrent expenditures".

### **FAO Responses 10-June-22**

1) After consultation with the Republic of Turkey, we confirm that the entire co-financing is to be classified as in-kind/recurrent expenditures.

### **FAO response 29 Apr 22:**

The timelines of each co-financing letter has been reviewed. Those that did not match the project's timeline were excluded.

The co-financiers that are not included in the resubmission will still be engaged in the project execution, providing their inputs and contributions during stakeholders meetings, steering committees, workshops, etc.

For ease reference, a compilation of the letters of co-financing who are still included has been uploaded in the roadmap of the submission.

### **GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (12.22.21): Cleared.

## Agency Response NA

### **Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (12.22.21): Cleared.

## Agency Response NA

### Core indicators

#### **7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.22.21):

- Corporate Indicator 7.4: please adjust from 1 to 3.

- The indicator 8 fisheries details section states "Out of this overexploited tonnes amount, it is assumed that the proposed project will be addressing roughly 80% at the PIF stage which adds up to the total in Table F." The above text indicates a change in tonnage numbers between PIF and CEO End stage, however, the tonnage numbers entered into the portal CI 8 has not changed between PIF and CEO End stage. Please either introduce clarifications in the CI 8 fisheries details sub-section/ Summary of changes in alignment with the project design with the original PIF section, or revise the CEO End CI 8 number entered.

- Corporate Indicator 8: Please include in the Fisheries details section the source of the estimate of tonnage, and a justification for including the fisheries to be considered overexploited.

- Specific to indicator 8, please address the following comment from Germany and introduce into the project document a better description of the methodology applied.

Germany comment: "Related to this, core indicator 8 proposes overexploited tonnes as the metric to assess that overexploited fisheries move to more sustainable levels. Overexploitation has decreased in the Black Sea in the last years, but remains a widespread concern, as it is highlighted in the proposal itself. As there seem to be stock assessments available for priority species, F/FMSY, B/BMSY or other common reference points would appear to be a more meaningful metric than landings. Germany requests to either adapt the core indicator 8 or to include an explanation why landings instead of reference points from stock assessments have to be used and how the project will improve such assessments in the future."

6th of June 2022 (thenshaw):

- Regarding CI 7.4: Addressed.

- Regarding CI 8: Addressed.

Agency Response

**FAO response 29 Apr 22:**

- **Regarding CI 7.4**, was set to 3 as requested.

- **Regarding CI 8**, upon reading the GEF Sec comments, and re-assessing the PIF and PRODOC it became evident that the commented text (page 35 of the PRODOC) was not clear, and has been significantly revised to explain that during the PPG phase, consultations with experts who took another approach to analyse which fisheries to include in the project, **confirmed the original list and volumes of fish (as indicated in the PIF)** that will move to more sustainable management and under adaptive management were indeed appropriate for project execution.

Re to the source of information in CI8. This publication (<https://www.fao.org/3/cb2429en/online/cb2429en.html>), provides a description of the source of the estimate of tonnage, and a justification for including the fisheries mentioned in this indicator as overexploited

- The comment of **Germany** has been addressed by the ProDoc as explained at the end of Annex B after the comments of the STAP.

#### **Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.22.21): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response NA

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.22.21):

- Portal Baseline section: Please expand the baseline description to include baselines (ongoing national projects and relevant national legal context) specific to each GEF eligible country participating in the project.

- Portal Baseline section: specific to the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan (BS-SAP), please expand the baseline section and include information specific to the series of GEF supported projects leading to the endorsement of the SAP.

6th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

## Agency Response

### **FAO response 29 Apr 22:**

The text has been expanded accordingly in connection with the BS-SAP. Conversely, on ongoing national projects and national legal contexts on fisheries, these have simply not been done in the past. There is a huge vacuum in the Black Sea when it comes to addressing fisheries through such projects, and part of this is because also the GEF never funded fisheries projects for the beneficiary countries in the region. This vacuum is one of the key underlying reasons for the GEF intervention via the project.

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (12.22.21):

- Some outputs featured in the RF include bullets listing the anticipated deliverables, while others don't. GEF notes that the workplan lists all output specific deliverables, however, please ensure uniformity in the way outputs are presented in the RF.

- In both the portal submission and the PRODOC, please introduce text that describes how the anticipated project deliverables may help advance sust. fisheries across all Black Sea countries ? e.g., what broad dissemination mechanisms are in place towards securing uptake of standards and best practice?

- In addition to the above point, please explain if the project during PPG has sought to coordinate with non-GEF eligible Black Sea countries, and if project co-finance contributions from such countries has been explored?

6th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

**FAO response 29 Apr 22:**

Amendments were made to the RF and the descriptions of the components to account for the comments made on deliverables. On the involvement of non-GEF eligible countries, given the geopolitical situation in the region, it was considered more appropriate not to liaise further. However, it's worth noting that some contributions were received from Bulgarian national stakeholders via the co-financing letters lodged.

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.22.21): Cleared.

Agency Response NA

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.22.21): Overall yes, however, please consider if a more elaborate mapping of co-finance against project outputs can be produced and inserted into this section.

6th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

**FAO response 29 Apr 22:**

Given the numerous sources of co-financing, breaking down the funding each source buy outputs was not feasible, and attributing funds to individual outputs was also not feasible since co-financing is not to that level of detail over the different letters. However, the sources were grouped as per the Table in section 5)  
Incremental/additional cost reasoning and

expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF. A relative ranking of those sources of funding were assigned to each output.

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.22.21): Cleared.

Agency Response NA

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.22.21): Cleared.

Agency Response NA

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.22.21): Cleared.

Agency Response

NA

**Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response NA

## Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?  
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.22.21): Overall yes, however, please include information if NGOs or CSOs were engaged during PPG? GEF notes that the ongoing COVID situation has provided limited scope for in country meetings during PPG, but that the GFCM institutional mechanism has enabled a structured engagement with governments.

6th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

**FAO response 29 Apr 22:**

Yes, NGOs or CSOs were engaged in, particularly, within the process leading to the signature of their co-financing letters after information was reported to them on the project in relevant GFCM sub-committees that took place during the PPG phase.

Furthermore, bilateral consultations were entertained with those NGOs/CSOs interested and the result of those is embodied in co-financing letters signed. Some text to describe this process has been added to the submission.

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

27th of July 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Good reflection of gender perspectives in the section on gender equality and women's empowerment. As a good gender mainstreaming practice, Agency is requested to reflect these gender perspectives in section B. Project description summary - Project component table. Very relevant for this project include: Output 1.1 (specify gender-disaggregated data collection); Output 3.4 - refer to gender-responsive training programmes and case studies; Output 4.3 - Gender-responsive outreach and communications strategy developed.

6th of September 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

**FAO Responses 20-August-22**

The wording of the outputs indicated by GEF SEC has been consistently updated along the submission to include the gender elements pointed out by the reviser.

**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.22.21): Overall yes, the project does a good job at positioning the private sector to deliver against the project objective. However, table 2 lacks detail. Are there no planned targeted activities/engagement models that can be described in further detail?

6th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

**FAO response 29 Apr 22:**

Table 2 was developed in this way on purpose. This project provides a first-time opportunity to engage systematically with the private sector in the BS. This would be the first time ever that a framework is in place to engage the private sector officially in GFCM activities. The project will represent a unique opportunity to test engagement models, relative to the different private sector actors that can be involved with the various components. The model developed by the project can be (hopefully will be) replicated in future by other GEF investments within and outside the region.

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.22.21):

- Please explain how climate adaptation is incorporated into the project activities?
- The CCM Rio Marker has been adjusted to 1. Please provide a justification specific to how CCM forms an integral part of the project objective and subsequent expected deliverables? Otherwise please readjust the CCM Rio Marker back to 0.

6th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

**FAO response 29 Apr 22:**

- Several paragraphs were added to the submission to explain how CCA is incorporated in the project.

- **Re to the CCM Rio Marker, it was a mistake made by us in the submission through the GEF Portal since the project does not incorporate CC mitigation. Rio Marker adjusted again to 0.**

#### **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
SH (12.22.21):

Please revise the project organization structure figure to clearly indicate the flow of funds to countries and the clear firewall between IA and EA.

6th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

#### Agency Response

#### **FAO response 29 Apr 22:**

The project organization structure figure has been reviewed and update accordingly.

#### **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
SH (12.22.21): Cleared.

#### Agency Response NA **Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.22.21): Cleared.

Agency Response NA

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.22.21):

- Table 4 seems incomplete and should be updated.

- GEF notes that the project has been rated "low risk". Please provide and include as an annex the environmental and social assessments carried out, and any Environmental and Social Management Plans or the equivalent.

- In the portal submission the Environmental and Social Risk Classification is listed as low?, while the accompanying text states Based on the conducted climate risk screening, the project, the countries of interest and systems targeted by the project are categorized as moderate risk?. Please explain the difference in ratings and ensure alignment between the Environmental and Social Risk Classification and the following text.

6th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

**FAO response 29 Apr 22:**

- The Environmental and Social Risk Classification has been uploaded in the Portal's section 11. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks

- Kindly note the Environmental and Social Risk Classification lists the project as 'low' risk overall. The ESS looks at many elements. One of these is the risk (i.e. negative impacts) that the project may eventually cause in terms of capacity of the countries/region to adapt and/or mitigate climate change effects. For this specific element, the ESS assesses the risks associated to the Project as low too.

- The conducted climate risk screening, instead, assesses the climate change risks of the region/topics associated to the project. This risks are independent of the project itself because depends on the geography of the region. In this case, the climate risk screening identifies the Black Sea as one moderate risk hot spot for climate change over the next years. This is something our project cannot tackle because it is IW and not SCCF or LDCF.

- In conclusion, the FAO ESS (generating the uploaded Low-risk certificate) and the climate risk screening, assess two different situations; therefore their conclusion should not be compared.

#### **Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
SH (12.22.21): Cleared.

Agency Response NA  
**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
SH (12.22.21): Cleared.

Agency Response NA  
**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.22.21):

Overall comment specific to budget table: Project staff (e.g. project technical manager, Finance/Administrative Officer etc.) are charged across components and PMC. Per Guidelines, project staff should be charged to the GEF and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC ? please charge these personnel also to the co-financing portion.

Refer to comment specific to the ESS screening.

6th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

The Project Technical Manager (\$206,952 charged to technical components. Ratio is 34% PM: 66% technical). The Annex N ToR includes the following technical duties and responsibilities for the Project Technical Manager: Backstop the coordination and close monitoring of the implementation of project activities assigned to GFCM, including overseeing the technical execution and development of technical products, and providing technical support to assessing the outputs produced and the products generated in the implementation of the project; ? Identify priorities, problems and issues to be addressed in the course of project implementation and proposes corrective and follow-up actions in liaison with relevant parties; ? Support a high level of collaboration among participating institutions and organizations at national and local levels, including through coordination with relevant initiatives, such as other GEF projects in the region and co-financing partner projects; ? Provide constant liaison across the related technical activities of the germane FishEBM-BS and FishEBM-Med projects to ensure good coordination and efficient resource planning towards common objectives; ? Promote consistency and technical coordination in the areas of data collection along the value chain, including the socio-economic issues, certification of selected fisheries, market and trade requirements taking also into consideration the role of women in the fishing sector; ? Support and assists in the development of activities toward the progress on regional standards for Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) and related risk analysis with the objective to fight against IUU fishing in the GFCM area of application in line with the GFCM Regional Plan of Action for the fight against IUU fishing (RPOA-IUU); ? Participate in the development of Integrated ecosystem based management tools and ecosystem approach to biodiversity protection and sustainable fisheries with the support of the GFCM and UNEP partners including the development of adaptation strategies to climate change formulated and cope with the negative effects of non-indigenous species on biodiversity; ? Coordinate the dissemination of technical material on GFCM and UNEP approach in aligning different national and regional priorities including the preparation of a complete communication plan covering the activities of the germane FishEBM-Med and FishEBM-BS projects. Key deliverables: ? Relevant technical products produced as a result of project outputs; ? Documentation (meeting reports and summaries, etc.) of partner coordination; ? Organisation of trainings on data collection on the fisheries value chain and fish quality/sanitary requirements; ? Develop technology platforms to perform IUU risk analysis and surveys

for the identification of illegal gears and MCS national needs; ? Technical surveys to assess an innovative gear and ocean noise levels for target countries including implementation of pilot studies (e.g. fishing for litter, etc.) ; ? IW:LERN material and knowledge-sharing tools (e.g. communication tools, audiovisual material)

The Finance/Administrative Officer (\$121,137 charged to technical components. Ratio is 52% PM: 48% technical). The Annex N ToR includes the following technical duties and responsibilities for the Finance/Administrative Officer: Support the Project Technical Manager in the overall coordination of project activities through a variety of performance-based assessments aiming to align project implementation of technical activities with FAO and GEF rules and procedures, including maintaining appropriate monitoring of executed actions vis-?-vis the Project Results Framework indicators and results-based management targets. Ensure this monitoring mechanism is maintained and duly documented with the aim to facilitate the reporting of project results and the preparation of annual revisions of workplans and budgets, as appropriate; Participate in PSC annual meetings and related preparation works. Under the direct guidance of the PTM, support the elaboration of work programs and ad-hoc technical reports and materials to showcase project results during PSC sessions. Collect relevant inputs, assist the elaboration of annual reports and undertake appropriate ex-post follow-ups; Identify priorities, problems and issues to be addressed in the course of project implementation and proposes corrective and follow-up actions in liaison with relevant parties; Support a high level of collaboration among participating institutions and organizations at national and local levels, including through coordination with relevant initiatives, such as other GEF projects in the region and co-financing partner projects; Support decision-making of the PTM and involved technical staff for the identification of operational needs relating to the execution of field surveys and research activities to improve knowledge on stock status and dynamics, including surveys-at-sea and exploratory surveys (outputs 1.1.3). Further support the PTM in implementing assigned oversight responsibilities over internal control and compliance issues pertaining alignment of mentioned performances with agreed work plans and expected results; Participate in the design of field activities through participating in the process of identification of technical requirements and national specificities to deploy tracking devices (VMS, gear sensors, etc) to GEF-eligible Black Sea countries in support of the testing and application of tailored MCS technologies at sub-regional level. Run feasibility assessments vis-?-vis adopted work plans and take the lead in setting up effective monitoring mechanisms to identify the progress of mentioned field activities and include achieved results/performances in appropriate reports, spotting any potential risk or bottleneck and propose corrective actions. Disseminate the findings of mentioned analysis to leading technical officers and undertake appropriate follow-ups with relevant technical staff (output 2.4.1); In line with adopted strategies, participate in the planning, organization and monitoring of relevant technical actions and activities, by supporting the Project Technical Manager in transversally coordinate different teams within the GFCM and across the EAs, providing technical inputs, contributing to the development of relevant materials and drafting of reports (outputs 1.1, 2.4 and 2.5); Collaborate in the strategic

planning of field surveys to assess the status of vulnerable benthic ecosystems protected or to be protected by FRAs in selected GEF-eligible Black Sea countries, including participation to selected field missions (output 3.1.2); Support and assist during the design of pilot study/ies for the application of EBFM in the Black Sea, including through technical advice on operational requirements, feasibility matters and compliance with adopted strategies (output 3.2.3)

## Agency Response

### **FAO response 29 Apr 22:**

-The project co-financing allocated to the PMC reflects funds already allocated by the project partners to either: a) staff that will indirectly support the execution of the GEF project over its lifespan; b) material, data and tools that will be used to execute several activities (as explained at the end of the co-financing table). The staff costs charged over the technical components reflect technical work done by the staff instrumental to the execution of technical actions and the achievement of the project's objectives. These tasks have been duly justified by detailed ToR included **in the newly developed Annex N** of the Agency ProDoc. The **Annex N has been also uploaded** in the roadmap of the submission as standalone file for ease reference.

Annex N also includes the following text to explain the joint execution arrangements of this project and the 10560 FishEBM MED:

"One of the values added for the GEF and the countries of investing in the FishEBM-BS (and its sister project, GEF ID 10560 FishEBM-MED), is the support provided by the Secretariat of the GFCM, who provides a well established entry points with the countries, their decision-making processes and machineries. Moreover, the Secretariat provide a solid administrative and financial framework supporting the execution of the two projects. This allows the establishment of a join Programme Management Unit (PMU) composed by two Staff members for the execution of the two projects. The PMU will be hosted by GFCM.

Specifically, the FishEBM-BS project will operate under the overall supervision of the Executive Secretary of the GFCM, who will support the execution of the project with its staff, processes, meetings and communication channels with the relevant ministries, regional and national services and supranational organization who deal with sustainable fisheries in the Mediterranean.

The GFCM Project Technical Manager will perform a variety of technical and managerial tasks and will coordinate the Project Management Units (PMUs) of the Black Sea (FishEBM-Black Sea) and GEF Mediterranean (FishEBM-Med) projects with a view to promote efficient use of GEF resources; avoiding duplication of functions and

costs and to ensure full coordination between these two sister projects who have been support by the GEF under the GEF7 replenishment.

The PMU of the Black Sea (FishEBM-Black Sea) and GEF Mediterranean (FishEBM-Med) projects will be composed by a Project Technical Manager (PTM), assisted by a full-time Finance/Administrative Officer. The remaining staff will be engaged as consultants providing made on measure support to the needs of the two projects, backstopping the activities to be implemented vis-?-vis the adopted Project Results Framework (Annex A1) and workplan (Annex H)"

- The Environmental and Social Risk Classification has been uploaded in the Portal's section 11. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks.

### **Project Results Framework**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

SH (12.22.21): Overall yes, however, please address the previous comment on creating uniformity when describing RF output deliverables.

6th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

27th of July 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Kindly include in Annex A the Core Indicators 8 and 11 and associated targets used. This will help ensure internal consistency in the project document, highlight that Core Indicators are part of the logical framework

6th of September 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

#### **Agency Response**

##### **FAO Responses 20-August-22**

The Core Indicators 8 and 11 and associated targets were included at the beginning of the Log Frame (Annex A). The relevant targets, i.e. 326,860 tonnes for CI 8 and 23,000 direct beneficiaries for CI 11, are clearly referred to in Annex A.

##### **FAO response 29 Apr 22:**

Done - kindly refer to previous GEF's comments and FAO's responses on this matter.

#### **GEF Secretariat comments**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

Agency Response NA

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.22.21): Please expand annex B to include council comments and responses.

6th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

**FAO response 29 Apr 22:**

**Done - Annex B now includes responses to the council's comments.**

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (12.22.21): Cleared.

Agency Response NA

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request No comments received.

Agency Response NA

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request No comments received.

Agency Response NA

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request No comments received.

Agency Response NA

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (12.22.21): Cleared.

Agency Response NA

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (12.22.21): Cleared.

Agency Response NA

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

NA

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response NA

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response NA

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
SH (12.22.21): Please address comments and resubmit.

6th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

27th of July 2022 (thenshaw): Please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

6th of September 2022 (thenshaw): Yes

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

<b>First Review</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**