

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

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10558

Countries

Regional (Georgia, Turkey, Ukraine)

Project Name

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

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

3/23/2020

Review completed by PM

4/17/2020

Program Manager

Steffen Hansen

Focal Area

International Waters

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

April 21, 2020

No response required

April 9 2020

No response required

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

1. Note that while it can be acceptable to have more generic outputs at PIF stage, it remains important to select some basic indicators per outcome at PIF stage and to provide tangible targets per output when feasible and as part of the table B description (e.g. for management plans there might be a current baseline of zero and the target could then be e.g. management plans in x number of countries; for investment plans the current baseline might be zero and the target could then be x number of investment plans developed; for area-based management tools identified and applied to reduce over-exploitation of fisheries and enhance ecosystem productivity the baseline might be zero number of hectares/or countries and the target might then be area based management tools applied in x amount of hectares and/or x countries etc. Please carefully go through each table B output, access the baseline, and be more specific on tangible targets per outputs.

SH (4.9.2020): Not cleared. Thanks for the edits. Please note that the wording of Table B Output 4.2 needs refinement. Likewise, while the substance in principle is there, the Proposed Alternative Scenario PIF Component 4 description needs to be shortened, while the text needs refinement.

SH (4.16.2020): Cleared.

2. With the project seeking to advance regional fisheries governance, please explain what limitations (data sharing, coordination, national level coordination etc.) might be encountered given that Georgia and Ukraine are cooperating non-Contracting Parties to the GFCM? Also, please explain if a dialogue is ongoing towards having the two non-contracting parties become full members and if there is a demand from countries towards seeking support from the project and with the purpose of advancing such a process?

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

April 21, 2020

No response required

April 9, 2020

1. Indicators, including baselines and targets, added directly to Table B.
2. Action taken accordingly. Section 1 of the PIF revised to include requested information.

April 15, 2020

1. Action taken accordingly on Component 4.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

Table C:

1. The “describe how any investment mobilized was identified” section should include a 1-2 lines description per investment mobilized stakeholder. This then implies 1-2 lines specific to each country, agency, and specific to each CSO. Please note that it is not sufficient to state that this information can be found throughout the PIF.

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

2. For a PIF that contains a Theory of Change with significant private sector involvement, it is to be expected to see private sector co-finance committed under the project. Please add to table C the co-finance commitments from the private sector.

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

SH (4.16.2020): Please have a careful look at Table C and the categorizations of project cofinance. Currently, under "Type of Co-financing", the project has selected only the "Public Investment" category. Please consider if the category "In-kind-Cofinancing" is more appropriate for many of the Table C columns. Finally, please explain if GFCM and UNEP-MAP will provide cofinance in the form of operating costs, overhead costs, fixed costs, and salaries? Such contributions are recurrent costs and should not be listed as investment mobilized.

SH (4.17.2020): Cleared.

SH (4.21.2020): Co-financing from GFCM (executing partner) cannot be listed as "GEF Agency" co-financing. Please use "Donor Agency" as the source of this co-financing.

Agency Response

April 21, 2020

Point taken. GFCM is marked as donor agency

April 9 2020

1. Action taken accordingly via the inclusion of additional information under Table C of the revised PiF.
2. Concerning commitments from the private sector in table C, at this early development stage, only a general interest has been expressed by some private sector actors, but none have come forward with actual commitments that could be added under table C. The Agency, having regard to the current covid-19 related emergency and how this has been having an impact on the business operations of the private sectors, prefers to exert caution at the PIF stage. Consultations with the

private sector will be resumed throughout the PPG phase, during which more precise inputs (such as usage of monitoring equipment, etc.) will be reflected as private sector commitments under table C, leading to fruitful partnerships supported by signed co-financing letters. Section 4 in the PIF on private sector engagement has been revised (pages 24 and 25).

April 17, 2020:

Types of co-financing have been adjusted. They appear as in-kind, grant and public investment.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion SH (3.31.2020): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

April 21, 2020

No response required

April 9 2020

No response required

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response NA

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion SH (3.31.2020): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

April 9 2020

No response required

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response NA

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response NA

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response NA

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response NA
Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion SH (3.30.2020): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
April 9 2020

No response required

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.20):

1. Output 3.1 states “Area-based management tools identified and applied to reduce overexploitation of fisheries and enhance ecosystem productivity.” Please explain if this project will deliver against Core Indicators 2 or 5? The correct of the two Core Indicators should then be populated in the portal.

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared. Please revisit this question at CEO endorsement stage and with the intent of evaluating if the project should be reporting against either of the two indicators.

2. No entry has been made into Core Indicator 7 and its sub-indicators. Please populate this indicator and note that a TDA/SAP exists.

SH (4.9.2020): Please explain why the value 3 has been chosen for core indicator 7.1 and 7.2?

SH (4.16.2020): Cleared.

3. Core Indicator 8: Please note that in the indicator description it is not enough to state the name of the fisheries along with a tonnage number. Subsequently, please include a description of the applied methodology when reaching the cumulative 326,860 metric tons.

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

4. No entry has been made into Core Indicator 11. Please enter a number and note that at this stage the # entered can be based on a rough estimate of stakeholders targeted per intervention/anticipated pilot sight. Also, the envisioned capacity building activities (meetings etc.) at the national/regional levels should be counted.

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

5. **Rio Markers:** Rio Markers is a mandatory tag for all GEF-financed projects. Indicate whether the project targets climate change adaptation and/or climate change mitigation using the OECD DAC Rio Markers: 0=does not target; 1=targets as a significant objective, 2=targets as the principal objective. Please refer to the OECD DAC Handbook for further details: https://www.oecd.org/dac/environment-development/Revised%20climate%20marker%20handbook_FINAL.pdf

The project has selected CCM #0 and CCA #0. Yet, the PIF speaks of development of a regional/Black Sea adaptation strategy to cope with potential effects of climate change. Provided that CCA is integrated into the fisheries EBM approach, then please consider if the CCA # should be adjusted?

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

6. **Project Objective:** The PO also contains Core Indicator descriptions. Note that indicator descriptions should be captured under the PIF Core Indicator section and not the PO description.

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

April 21, 2020

No response required

April 9, 2020

1. The project will not deliver against core indicators 2 and 5 which are expected to be addressed by UNDP and the World Bank in their respective projects for the Black Sea under the IW focal area, and which are germane interventions to this project. Concerning area-based management tools, consistent with the GFCM mandate, some of such tools are used by the GFCM to improve the conservation of fisheries. These are in particular fisheries restricted areas. Having regard to ongoing talks within CBD on the need to expand the use of OECMs (other effective area-based conservation measures), so as to include among others spatial measures adopted by RFMOs, the Agency considers important to pursue output 3.1. Furthermore, in the context of GFCM management plans adopted in the past for some Mediterranean fisheries, spatial measures are at times included in the provisions of such plans (e.g. fisheries restricted areas in given zones where certain fish populations are known to be more vulnerable and therefore require such action).
2. Action taken accordingly on CI 7 (please refer to relevant GEF portal section and PiF).
3. Action taken accordingly (please refer to relevant GEF portal section and PiF) on the insertion of the applied methodology.
4. Action taken accordingly on CI 11.
5. Rio Markers updated as follows: CCA #1, this is, the Project targets climate change adaptation as a significant objective.
6. Action taken accordingly—Core indicators removed from PO description

April 15, 2020

2. Action taken accordingly. Additional information to clarify the selected rating was added under the core indicators in the portal.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. **Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

Yes, however, this section has a ABNJ tag, however, it is not clear if the Black Sea contains areas beyond the national EEZs. Please amend the taxonomy, as needed.

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

April 21, 2020

No response required

April 9, 2020

Taxonomy amended in Annex C (no ABNJs in the Black Sea)

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.20):

1. The meaning of the below text sections is unclear. Please revise and make sure to reference the relevant regional management frameworks etc.

“High as this is though, the trend has slightly decreased since 2014 (see figure 7 below), in connection with the formulation of the first regional management measures to be ever adopted for Black Sea fisheries; after several decades of limited cooperation on fisheries management in the region, the GFCM has been promoting a concerted approach which, coupled with the understanding of how alarming the current exploitation trends are, has represented a watershed event. These initial GFCM measures may prove to be insufficient without further investments management plans from the littoral States and the building of an adequate level of capacity in the fishery sector at the national level.”

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

2. **Figure 2:** can it really be true that only 187 people are employed on Bulgarian Black Sea fishing vessels? Or are there perceived gaps in the GFCM data-sets?

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

April 21, 2020

No response required

April 9, 2020

1. Action taken accordingly (page 10 of the PiF refers).
2. The Agency acknowledged that there was an error in file when running the data. Figure 2 has now been updated in the PiF with the correct data according to the source cited (SoMFi 2018 - employment onboard vessels in Bulgaria is 1590). Please note that these data are based on official data submitted to the GFCM and account only for employment onboard fishing vessels. There still exist important gaps in the official data, however, relating to pre- and post-harvest employment in the fisheries sector, something foreseen to be remedied with the support of this project through interventions on value chain.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

April 9, 2020

No response required

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.20):

1. The proposed alternative scenario: please note that following sentence in the current PIF “This will allow in particular to avoid fragmentation and ensure consistency in the implementation of GEF policies.” Please edit this sense so that it goes along the line of.... “this will allow in particular to avoid fragmentation and ensure consistency in the implementation of GEF projects”.

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

2. The project description should clearly state that the GFCM activities will work in full coordination with the anticipated WB regional Project and its national level blue economy policy legal reforms. The WB agenda is centered towards pollution, but also looks at mainstreaming marine intersectoral planning frameworks, and for which the GFCM fishery activities/area based management tools approach needs to be logically embedded and in order to advance the integrated role of fisheries as part of a comprehensive spatial plan approach for the marine environment. Please consider adding text in the PIF, which explains these anticipated synergies. Please also consider adding text, which shows how such synergies potentially can lead to some of the same synergies as expected under the FAO Med Sea fisheries NAP+ pilot. Perhaps this text could be inserted in the “proposed alternative scenario” section and be directly linked to the description of the FAO’s Blue Growth Initiative framework. Finally, the project should make note of the anticipated UNDP TDA/SAP update project and state that coordination should be sought with its expected activities.

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

3. Theory of Change: Please insert the ToC into the actual the PIF.

SH (4.9.2020): Not cleared. Please upload to the project a PDF version of the ToC. When clicking the current uploaded file a "server error" notification appears.

SH (4.16.2020): Cleared.

4. The proposed alternative scenario PIF section, component 3: Please include text specifying that the WB CCRES MPA and area-based management toolkit will be assessed as one of several options towards advancing this output.

SH (4.9.2020): Not cleared. Per upstream discussion, please have another look and make sure that the inserted sentence is formulated in a clear way.

SH (4.16.2020): Cleared.

5. The proposed alternative scenario PIF section, component 4: This component needs significant work as the current list of outputs do not justify the use of 500,000 USD GEF resources. As an example, please note that many of the suggested outputs do not differ from what normally would be expected from the projects use of 1 % of the IW grant towards IW:LEARN activities. This output needs to be much more precise on which platforms it will target? E.g. exactly how will public and private partnerships be advanced as part of output 4.1? Also, how will FAO use this component to solidify results across stakeholders specific to the Black Sea? As an example, will this component directly support the integration of fisheries activities into the wider policy and legal reform frameworks planned by the World Bank project? If yes, resources towards a targeted collaboration with the BSEC is merited. Also, how exactly will FAO use this project to advance uptake of lessons learnt across other of its IFMOs?

SH (4.9.2020): Please see comments specific to review sheet Part I, box 2.

SH (4.16.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

April 21, 2020

No response required

April 9, 2020

1. Action taken accordingly (page 16 of the PiF refers).
2. Action taken accordingly (page 17 of the PiF refers).
3. Theory of Change Image has been added. It is also uploaded as a separate document in the roadmap section of the GEF portal with better quality.
4. Action taken accordingly (page 19 of the PiF refers).
5. Action taken accordingly. The total budget under component 4 has been decreased for a total of 200.000 USD, which were reshuffled under components 1 and 2. The wording in the outputs in Table B has been amended and the text in the PiF was revised (pages 19 and 20 refer). The Agency draws the attention of the GEF Secretariat that, given the ongoing submission of three proposals for the Black Sea (FAO, WB and UNDP), and while efforts to foster coordination among all three expected proposals are foreseen under this component, at this PiF stage it is not yet confirmed which projects will be funded by the GEF Council and when their

implementation will start. Moreover, the final projects proposals will depend on the screening and review process within the GEF as well as on the consultations expected during the PPG phase, that should also bring about more close discussions with the other Agencies. Consequently, the Agency suggests that this component be retained, for the time being, as revised, including the proposed budget. As the final picture on the various projects will be available, this component and its related budget can be revised accordingly as of the PPG phase already.

April 15, 2020

3. Action taken accordingly. The file was uploaded again into the portal. The image remains in the text.
4. A revised sentence on the CCRES has been added
5. Action taken accordingly in connection with the comment in Part I, box 2

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

April 9, 2020

No response required

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

Please note that when reading the incremental / additional cost reasoning PIF section it becomes unclear if some of the co-finance listed in table C has not been confirmed. Please have a look at the second para of the section and make corrections to the text as needed. Further, this section should be much clearer on how the listed co-finance adds value specific to the anticipated component and outputs under the project. This information could be added via the insertion of a table.

SH (4.9.2020): Not cleared. Thanks for inserting the table. Per upstream discussion, please edit the text which accompanies the table.

SH (4.16.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

April 21, 2020

No response required

April 15, 2020

Action taken accordingly.

March

The language in the incremental cost reasoning section has been amended. Also, a table with the indicative breakdown of co-financing by source and component has been added in this section (page 21 in the PIF refers).

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

April 9, 2020

No response required

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

- **innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up PIF section:** This section should include info specific to the synergies harnessed via the coordination with and subsequent full integration of fisheries as part of multi-secretarial frameworks under the anticipated WB Black Sea regional/national level project reform activities. This section should also be stronger on how the project will enable the private sector to become a driver of sustainable fisheries.

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

April 21

No response required

March

Action taken according in the revised PIF (page 22 refers).

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

April 9, 2020

No response required

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

1. The project has ticked the “Civil Society Organizations” and “Private sector” boxes. Subsequently and per GEF policy, please provide as part of the submission a description of the consultations with civil society organizations, Indigenous Peoples and Private Sector, which happened in the formulation of the project. Please also provide a description of consultations with relevant national/regional stakeholders. Citing the Policy: ‘Agencies provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development...’

SH (4.9.2020): cleared.

2. Please provide a table describing the stakeholder's anticipated future roles in the project, and with information pertaining to how those stakeholders will be engaged (through which means). Citing the policy: "Agencies provide... as well as information on how Stakeholders will be engaged in the proposed project activity and means of engagement throughout the project/program cycle". Please consider structuring this information on an output by output basis.

SH (4.9.2020): Not cleared. An example has been sent to FAO to showcase how such a table could look.

SH (4.16.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

1. A clarification is needed on indigenous people. As per footnote 25, the PIF specifies that that there are currently no indigenous peoples reported to live in the Black Sea region.

2. The section has been amended, including the insertion of a table on stakeholders involvement.

April 15, 2020:

2. Action taken accordingly. The table was added to the stakeholders section.

April 21

No response required

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

Please consider adding text describing the how women are involved in the targeted fisheries sectors? Are they labor force on boats, involved in processing or do they have other functions? Any stats etc. that can be added would be valuable in that it provide a baseline from which the project can address in a holistic and strategic the advancement of women empowerment across the sector.

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response Action taken accordingly in the PIF (pages 24 and 25 refer).

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

Private sector engagement PIF section: This section contains the same information as listed in the gender section. Please provide an description of how the project will engage the private sector to advance sustainability and impact.

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response Information submitted in the portal corrected. There was a material mistake in copying from the right section into the portal.

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

1. Environmental and Social Safeguards: The GEF's updated Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards (SD/PL/03) is applicable to all new projects and programs, including the PIFs/PFDs for potential inclusion into the June Work Program. Please in the risk section (Part II, Section 5) provide information on Environmental and Social Safeguards and/or indicate the relevant project documents.

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

2. "Bureaucratic obstacles in the implementation of certain activities": this risk seems generic across most GEF projects and hence irrelevant.

SH (4.9.2020): Not cleared. It is noted that this risk needs to be captured. With reference to upstream discussion, please consider some slight edits to the text.

SH (4.16.2020): Cleared.

SH (4.21.2020):

3. The PIF, section 5, includes information that ESS screening has taken place and FAO has attached the FAO's Project Risk Clarification. Please note that FAO should provide a complete risk screening report prior to CEO endorsement including information on the type and rating of risks and information on any ESS assessments and measures to address identified risks and potential impacts.

Agency Response

April 21 2020:

No response required. We take note of the request to submit ESS assessment at PRODOC stage

April 15, 2020:

2. Action taken accordingly. The text in the risks section was edited.

March

1. Please note that the result of the ESS risk level is now available in the Roadmap section of the Portal. Explanation has been added to the text in the portal and document too.

2. The Agency recalls previous comments by the GEF Sec requesting adjustments to the PiF to account for the need to coordinate with the forthcoming projects in the Black Sea to be implemented by the World Bank and UNDP (also under the IW focal area). This is likely to be the first time that three IW related projects for the same LME will be requested to coordinate their activities so closely. Given the lack of a formal framework of cooperation among the relevant agencies, such as a tripartite memorandum of understanding, and the crucial importance of a smooth and coordinated approach to the execution of the projects, the Agency hence recommends that the risk, as revised in the PiF, is maintained in the table (pages 27 and 28 refer).

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

1. Please consider offering the anticipated WB and UNDP projects an observer position at PSC meetings and to mention the importance of securing coordination as part of the PIF coordination section. Please also consider if there is a need to dedicate specific resources towards enabling this coordination during project implementation and add text which specifies which existing platforms are well-suited towards facilitating this coordination?

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

2. Since many of the activities are identical, please consider to add text in the coordination section and highlight how the GFCM will be (co) executing anticipated fisheries projects in both the Black Sea and Med Sea and that synergies and lessons learnt will be facilitated across the GFCM Black Sea and Med Sea GFCM platforms to enhance impact from what essentially are a very similar set of activities.

SH (4.9.2020): Not cleared. Per upstream discussion, please amend the inserted text specific to the needed coordination between the potential Med Sea and Black sea FAO projects.

SH (4.16.2020): Not cleared. please have a careful look at the PIF coordination text. Right now it is written as if the PSC members will only have an advisory role, which of course is not correct.

SH (4.17.2020): Cleared. Please produce and submit as part of CEO endorsement package the ToR for the PSC.

Agency Response

Both comments have been duly taken into account in the revised PiF (including in the previous section on component 4 as relating to the budgetary aspect and overall coordination).

April 15, 2020:

2. Action taken accordingly. Please refer to the revised text in the Coordination section.

April 17, 2020:

PIF revised accordingly based on the same methodology followed for the Mediterranean GEF project to which reference is made in the narrative part under the section.

April 21, 2020

No response required. We take not and will include TOR for the PSC with the PRODOC

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

This section should include a table, which briefly describes the needed alignment with all relevant national plans per country.

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

Action taken accordingly in the PIF focusing in particular on fisheries and aquaculture given that these are the areas primarily targeted by the project. A table has been added, mapping specifically these national strategies (page 29-30 in the revised PiF refers).

April 21 2020

No response required

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

Please mention that 1 % of the IW grant will be used for IW:LEARN specific activities, including participation in global/regional events and the production and sharing of project experience notes.

SH (4.9.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

The reference to the 1% made available for IW-Learn has been added in the PIF.

April 21 2020

No response required

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

1. Note that LOEs from Turkey and Ukraine are missing. Please note that any potential recommendation of the project for technical clearance cannot happen until all LOEs have been submitted.

SH (4.9.2020): note that the LOE from Turkey is missing. Please note that any potential recommendation of the project for technical clearance cannot happen until all LOEs have been submitted.

SH (4.16.2020): Cleared.

2. **PIF part 1, Project information:** Please note that all participating countries should be listed. Currently this section says “regional”.

SH (4.9.2020): cleared.

Agency Response

1- Letters of endorsement have been uploaded accordingly.

2- Participating countries have been listed.

April 15, 2020:

1- All letters have now been uploaded into the portal

April 21 2020

No response required

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

NA

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.31.2020):

Please address comments and resubmit.

SH (4.9.2020):

Please address comments and resubmit.

SH (4.16.2020): Please address comments and resubmit.

SH (4.21.2020): Please address comments in the review sheet Part I box 3 and in the "Risks" box and resubmit.

SH (4.21.2020): Project is recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Background: The Black Sea, with a total coastline of 4340 km, is bordered by Bulgaria, Georgia, Romania, the Russian Federation, Turkey and Ukraine. It is connected to the Mediterranean Sea by the narrow Turkish Straits. The littoral States, and most notably Turkey, have a very long tradition in fisheries with industrial, semi-industrial and small-scale fisheries coexisting in the basin. The Black Sea, unlike many other marine areas in the world, is fully delimited, with the six littoral States having concluded agreements among them to set extended maritime boundaries.¹[1] Also, beyond a certain depth, the Black Sea is anoxic, one of the peculiar characteristics of this basin. The previous Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis specific to Black Sea reported the primary causes for the decline of fisheries to be linked to IUU fishing and use of destructive harvest techniques, loss of valuable spawning and nursery habitats, eutrophication and pollution and the lack of an effective regional cooperative fisheries management. Nonetheless, and although almost all commercially exploited fisheries in the Black Sea are a unit stock shared by the littoral States, the need to ensure strong cooperation in the elaboration and implementation of common fisheries management plans has remained a pending priority for many years. Yet, with a reported annual production currently amounting to roughly 400,000 tons of fish per year, the importance of the fishery sector can hardly be overlooked.

The project: A move to more resilient, productive and sustainable fisheries entails an increased focus on the development of value chains, controls (including IUU), integrated management plans (fisheries integrating into the environment agenda) and other tangible measures that have the potential to mobilize both public and private investments. This project contains the following components: Component 1: Strengthened capacity to manage commercial fisheries, with particular focus on SSF; Component 2: Enhanced integration of emerging monitoring, control and surveillance technologies in the fight against IUU fishing 3: Integrated ecosystem based management tools and ecosystem approach to fisheries; Component 4: Knowledge management and outscaling.

The project will deliver the following GEBs: 326,860 tons of over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels.

Innovation, sustainability and scaling up: Innovations will come from integrating fisheries into a multi-sectoral blue economy framework, in particular, through leveraging coordination with other relevant GEF interventions expected to be implemented within the region, including those under the World Bank supporting regional and national level reforms. Innovative new technology and market-based instruments will also be harnessed, in collaboration with relevant private sector firms, to introduce new incentives and control mechanisms for sustainable fisheries management. Furthermore, the proposed project will focus on putting in place enabling conditions to facilitate investment, including by the private sector. Sustainability is connected to promoting investment as part of a well-functioning institutional framework. To this end, the proposed project will seek to build capacity at the national level, strengthening scientific and technical know-how, facilitating

proper database management and the use of modern collection and analysis tools, and engaging fisheries stakeholders themselves in governance/in the development of projects for investment to the maximum extent possible. Such enabling conditions will ensure continuity of results beyond the project's implementation and will lay the groundwork for further private sector investment in sustainable fisheries activities as part of the scaling up of project activities.