

Implementing Ecosystem Based Management approaches in the Black Sea LME

Basic Information

GEF ID

10725

Countries

Regional (Georgia, Turkey, Ukraine)

Project Title

Implementing Ecosystem Based Management approaches in the Black Sea LME

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6590

GEF Focal Area(s)

International Waters

Program Manager

Steffen Hansen

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

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

2nd of October 2020 (cseverin): Submission has been carried out without any Letters of Endorsement. Please submit these

2nd December 2020 (shansen): Note that all LOEs must be signed by the GEF Operational Focal Point, however, the Ukrainian LOE has been signed by the Political Focal Point Ms. Iryna Stavchuk. Please submit a new LOE signed by the Operational Focal Point.

31st of March 2021 (shansen): Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 30/10/2020

Letters of Endorsement are uploaded.

UNDP Response 22/12/2020

Letter of Endorsement for Ukraine with new OFP is uploaded.

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

2nd December 2020 (shansen):

1. Table B: please insert indicators specific to each output.
2. Table B: Please consider if output Output 1.1.2 can be shortened/made more concise.

31nd of March 2021 (shansen): Note cleared.

- Please note that the PIF component 4 description includes an outcome 4.2, while the table B component 4 does not feature an outcome 4.2. Please ensure alignment between table B component 4 and the subsequent component 4 description.

20nd of April 2021 (shansen): Not cleared. The PIF submission table B component 4 is still lacking an outcome 4.2. Please address.

29nd of April 2021 (shansen): Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 22/12/2020

Outcome and output indicators are already included in Table B (below the Project Component title)

Output 1.1.2 shortened to: *Agreed **national** Blue Economy Strategies available to guide EBM policy reforms*

UNDP Response 13 April 2021

The last versions of the PIF have addressed this point. The text in Table B and narrative are consistent.

UNDP Response 27 April 2021

Table B will be adjusted in the GEF portal.

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

2nd December 2020 (shansen): Yes

SH (4.26.21): Please address the below comments.

- Co-financing from European Union is from "donor Agency".
- Please provide indicative information/name for "other donors". The proposal should provide some indicative information on these "project by other donors". Otherwise, please remove this co-financing from the PIF, and it can be added at later stage.

29nd of April 2021 (shansen): Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 27 April 2021

EU is changed to Donor Agency and justification added as footnote to the table
'Other donors' have been deleted from Table C (reducing CF to 13.5 M) to be identified at a later stage as requested in this review sheet.
(these changes are reflected in Table A and B)

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 2nd December 2020 (shansen): Yes

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 2nd December 2020 (shansen): Yes

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

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

2nd December 2020 (shansen): In the PIF portal submission table E, the project preparation grant (PPG) is listed as USD 100,000 while in the LOEs the PPG is listed as USD 150,000. Please correct the PIF portal submission.

31nd of March 2021 (shansen): Cleared. The 150,000 PPG requested is within the allowable cap and the portal entry has been corrected.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 22/12/2020

Agency request to increase the PPG from \$100K to \$150K is based on the necessity to organize close consultations with the other two GEF agencies – two WB and FAO in order to agree on the joint actions, establishment of the coordination mechanism in the Black Sea region between the three GEF projects and extensive consultations between a number of stakeholders in the Black Sea.

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2nd December 2020 (shansen):

A) Core Indicator 2: In the explanatory text it is stated that HA 418 k MPAs will be strengthened. Following this logic, please consider adjusting Core Indicator 2 so that all MPAs that will be strengthened are recorded under Indicator 2.2 "Marine Protected Areas Under improved management effectiveness".

20nd of April 2021 (shansen): Cleared.

B) Core Indicator 7:

7.0: Please select the "Black Sea" under shared water ecosystems.

7.1: Note that countries have already developed and signed a TDA/SAP, which will be updated by the project. The selected rating should reflect this past work.

7.2: Please factor in the Bucharest Convention and the Black Sea Commission, which is operational. The selected rating should reflect this baseline.

7.3: Please select a rating.

7.4: Please select the rating # 1

31nd of March 2021 (shansen):

Not cleared.

- Thanks for updating the indicator Work Sheet. However, in the portal submission the Notes section specific to the Portal Core Indicators states that 418,243 HA of MPA's will be strengthened, not created. At the same time Core Indicator 2.1 states that 418,243 hectares of MPAs will be created. Please update Core Indicator 2.

20nd of April 2021 (shansen): Cleared.

- Please delete "Barents Sea" from indicator Core Indicator 7.1 and adjust the count to 1.

20nd of April 2021 (shansen): Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 22/12/2020

Annex B has been replaced with revised information in new template

UNDP Response 13 April 2021

This has been addressed, the current version contains these core indicators.

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

2nd December 2020 (shansen): Please add "private sector".

31nd of March 2021 (shansen): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 22/12/2020

Annex C has been replaced with revised information in new template

art 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

2nd December 2020 (shansen):

COVID 19 should have a stronger description included, including reflections regarding challenges/opportunities for the project to reach its objectives. Please address.

31nd of March 2021 (shansen):

Not cleared. Please note that UNDP project ID 10805 is a good example of how a project specific to this region intends to advance SAP implementation by considering potential synergies specific to the European Green Deal. Similar language may be incorporated into this project, including by describing the potential synergies between the implementation of the anticipated revised SAP and the Green Deal and as part of the overall ambition of integrating the water agenda into the wider agenda of greening the national and local economies.

20nd of April 2021 (shansen): Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 22/12/2020

COVID related issues are discussed in multiple sections of the PIF but additional concerns have been added to the 'Barriers' section to indicate that COVID restrictions and the adoption of social-distance procedures are likely to add to the barriers in the short-medium term

UNDP Response 13 April 2021

Text inserted on page 18-19 to reflect the Green Deal interests and relevance to the proposed project

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2nd December 2020 (shansen): Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2nd December 2020 (shansen): Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2nd December 2020 (shansen): Yes

Agency Response

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

2nd December 2020 (shansen): Yes, this project will work both to advance EBM and update the existing TDA/SAP, while providing important coordination and subsequent glue across existing GEF projects specific to the Black Sea.

Agency Response

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

2nd December 2020 (shansen):

Rio Markers: The envisioned TDA SAP update along with EBM strategies etc. factor in climate change aspects. Please adjust the Adaptation Rio Marker.

31nd of March 2021 (shansen): Cleared, thank you for revising the Adaptation Rio Marker.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 22/12/2020

The positive benefits of improved MPA management are noted in the second to last paragraph in the GEB section of the PIF. The Adaptation Rio Marker has been adjusted.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2nd December 2020 (shansen):

The ToC figure mentions increased effectiveness of the BSC secretariat as a project outcome. Please explain how an UNESCO IHP executed project will enhance the capacity of the BSC Sec? Why was BSC not chosen as the main executing partner and will the commission be a co-executing partner? How will sustainability of results be insured, including funding for continued national data collection and reporting?

31nd of March 2021 (shansen): Cleared.

Building of country and BSC capacity is an important priority for GEF and part of the longer term project sustainability. By CEO Endorsement, additional clarity should be provided regarding how UNESCO IOC will build national level capacity by involving national agencies and black sea commission centres in the execution of project activities.

By CEO Endorsement, the Theory of Change will need to be further refined by adding and describing the causal linkages between the foreseen activities and the outcomes.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 22/12/2020

Please note that the project will be executed by UNESCO IOC – Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, the leader in marine global agenda and not by UNESCO IHP – Intergovernmental Hydrological Program – a freshwater branch. UNESCO IOC has several decades of successful work in the Black Sea supporting the countries on different aspects of marine management data centers support and executing several international projects in the region.

The issue of the execution of the project was discussed with the BSC Sec and a lack of capacity was identified as the Sec is now operating with only 3 staff members. Sustainability of project results will be ensured through the support of the BSC Sec activities centers in the Black Sea countries that are within the national and regional frameworks and activities, The BSC Sec will be actively involved in the project implementation, support will be directly provided to the work of the BSC Sec and effectiveness assured.

Additional text has been added to the ToC section (and is emphasized in the Co-ordination section introduction of the PIF)

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

2nd December 2020 (shansen): Yes

Agency Response

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

2nd December 2020 (shansen):

Under the stakeholder section the project has “ticked” the Indigenous people’s box. If indeed the project will be working with or influencing the lives of Indigenous peoples, then this group needs to be added to the Stakeholders table and their role described. Note that Indigenous peoples have not been mentioned in the Social and Environmental Risks screening.

31nd of March 2021 (shansen): Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 22/12/2020

This was ticked in error – corrected in the updated PIF.

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

2nd December 2020 (shansen):

PIF gender section: Please consider if there is gender baseline data available specific to the participating countries and which can be added to the gender section?

PIF gender section: Please insert language specifying that the project will develop and implement a gender action plan.

PIF gender section: Please describe if the project will seek to incorporate gender considerations into future policy reform work?

31st of March 2021 (shansen): Not cleared.

- Thanks for including text that a gender analysis will be completed prior to CEO endorsement. Please note that GEF highly encourage that an explicit draft gender action plan is developed during PPG and to be validated by project stakeholders by project inception. Please include language in the PIF gender section to this effect.

20th of April 2021 (shansen): Cleared.

- In the PIF gender section, please include preliminary information on gender related to the project components 1-3. This information can be specific to any identified gender differences and gaps and potential gender differentiated impacts and risks relevant to the project activities.

SH (4.26.21):

It is well note that UNDP provided some additional information on its plans improve the understanding of the role women and men in coastal and MPA governance during the PPG, including analysis to develop a gender baseline within and gender action plan. The submission, however, still lacks any preliminary information related differential roles of women and men, gender differentiated risks or impacts (e.g. women's barriers to participation) related to the governance of the Black Sea. It is also noted that the submission has, as of yet, not listed any specific references to any women organizations/interest groups to consulted during project preparation e.g. the Black Sea Women's Club (BSWC). Please provide further details in line with comments above.

29th April 2021 (shansen): cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 22/12/2020

Text reflecting these issues has been added to the Gender section in the PIF

UNDP Response 13 April 2021

Further edits were made to the Gender section.

UNDP Response 27 April 2021

Additional text on BSWC and other projects underway identifying information on gender is included in the gender section.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2nd December 2020 (shansen): Yes. Please note that it will be especially important for the project to factor in the work of private sector partners specific to the FAO/WB projects currently under development.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 22/12/2020

Addressed and additional text included in the private sector section of this PIF

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

2nd December 2020 (shansen):

A) Please better describe if COVID-19 poses a risk to the long sustainability (including financial sustainability) of the project results and how such risks may be mitigated?

B) Climate Change Risk Screening is not uploaded nor reflected upon. Please address.

31nd of March 2021 (shansen):

Cleared, thanks for uploading a climate risk type assessment. GEF notes that the revised TDA/SAP envisioned under this project will include climate risk scenarios and recommendations specific to the Black Sea. However, for future climate risk assessments please be more concrete and reflect on how the project (components, outcomes and outputs) addresses the identified climate risks. As part of this analysis please note that STAP as part of their PIF screening will seek answers specific to:

- Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?
- How will the project be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impacts been addressed adequately?
- Have measures to address the risks been considered? How will these risks be dealt with?
- What technical and institutional capacity, and information is needed?

Agency Response

UNDP Response 22/12/2020

Additional text added in the risk matrix with respect to COVID

The SESP include information on CCM and CCA. It is unclear what additional CC risk screening is required for uploading. (text relating to CCM and CCA is included in the GEB section of the PIF). The Taxonomy Annex has been modified as requested (above) for the Adaptation Rio Marker

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

2nd December 2020 (shansen):

Please confirm that during the PPG phase this project will closely coordinate with the the FAO (GFCM) and WB projects approved at the June 2020 council meeting?

31nd of March 2021 (shansen): Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 22/12/2020

Under 'Co-ordination' with other GEF Projects (Section Co-ordination) the following text is already included: *The recently approved GEF/World Bank and GEF/FAO projects will work closely with the proposed UNDP project to ensure co-ordination and minimise duplication specifically on the Blue Economy and EBM approaches. These projects will be invited to participate in the UNDP project's PSC and the three projects will endeavour to combine appropriate national and regional capacity development activities.*

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

2nd December 2020 (shansen): Yes

Agency Response

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

2nd December 2020 (shansen): Yes, the project is well positioned to disseminate results via the Black Sea Commission platform while dedicating 1 % of the GEF grant to the [IW:LEARN](#) platform. The project will also play a strong regional coordination role specific to other ongoing/planned GEF IW projects.

Agency Response

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2nd December 2020 (shansen): Yes

Agency Response

art 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

2nd December 2020 (shansen): refer to comment in review sheet part 1, box 1.

31nd of March 2021 (shansen): Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 22/12/2020

Letters of Endorsement for Ukraine, Georgia and Turkey are uploaded.

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

EFSEC 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

2nd of October 2020 (cseverin): No, LOEs missing

2nd December 2020 (shansen):

1. The LOE from Ukraine must be signed by the OFP.
2. Please address all other comments.

31nd of March 2021 (shansen):

Please address comments and resubmit.

SH (4.26.21): Please address the below comments and resubmit:

- The PIF submission table B component 4 is still lacking an outcome 4.2. Please address.
- Co-financing from European Union is from "donor Agency".
- Please provide indicative information/name for "other donors". The proposal should provide some indicative information on these "project by other donors". Otherwise, please remove this co-financing from the PIF, and it can be added at later stage.
- It is well note that UNDP provided some additional information on its plans to improve the understanding of the role women and men in coastal and MPA governance during the PPG, including analysis to develop a gender baseline within and gender action plan. The submission, however, still lacks any preliminary information related to differential roles of women and men, gender differentiated risks or impacts (e.g. women's barriers to participation) related to the governance of the Black Sea. It is also noted that the submission has, as of yet, not listed any specific references to any women organizations/interest groups to consulted during project preparation e.g. the Black Sea Women's Club (BSWC). Please provide further details in line with comments above.

SH (4.29.21): PM recommends 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

Building of country and BSC capacity is an important priority for GEF and part of the longer term project sustainability. By CEO Endorsement, additional clarity should be provided regarding how UNESCO IOC will build national level capacity by involving national agencies and black sea commission centres in the execution of project activities.

By CEO Endorsement, the Theory of Change will need to be further refined by adding and describing the causal linkages between the foreseen activities and the outcomes.

Review Dates

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

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Background: The intensification of coastal and maritime activities in the Black Sea requires an integrated planning, effective decision-making and additional efforts at the regional scale, including transboundary coordination to achieve sustainability and improved management. Additionally, the large marine ecosystem is facing increasingly significant stress from climate change, habitat destruction and overexploitation; thus, the loss of biodiversity and ecosystem resilience threatens to undermine the economic activities that rely upon these resources.

Scope of project: The GEF is funding interlinked projects in the region to provide key inputs to supporting regional blue economy approaches (through the World Bank), improving fisheries management (through FAO) and this project will play a crucial role in addressing EBM and providing additional co-ordination of these three GEF projects and between the GEF projects and other donor/national financed projects.

The project is expected to contribute to a range of outputs that will contribute to enhancing understanding on:

- Enhanced MPCA management;
- Application of national/regional EBM approaches;
- National strategies for blue economy to enhance livelihoods of coastal communities dependent on ecosystem services;
- Improved regional guidance documents submitted for approval by the BSC;
- Support to national government's Association Agreement activities;
- Updated TDA and SAP that will guide the countries and the BSC for the next 10 years providing up-to-date information for decision makers
- Enhanced inter-project co-ordination, integrating results and lessons more effectively

Sustainability and impact: The updating of this SAP will be a key innovative and pragmatic means of ensuring that SAPs are supported by the latest findings. The project will promote an innovative approach to adopting EBM approaches within MPCA management that will also deliver the first key national strategies on Blue Economy' considerations. The expected endorsement of the revised SAP and the central role of the Black Sea Commission are key sustainability elements beyond the lifespan of the project.

COVID-19 and the projects contribution toward the building back better agenda: The green agenda is being considered by Ukraine and Georgia largely through their interest in the EU Green Deal, publicly unveiled in December 2019. Mainstreaming of these issues in the project countries is being ensured through the current update of the EU association agreements (started in February 2021), and the Eastern Partnership (started in June 2020, to be planned in details in the upcoming summit in spring 2021). Ukraine announced aligning its commitment to join the EU Green Deal in January 2020. Such strong political

commitments strengthen the project aim and objectives; moreover, authorities' interest in this topic (other than environment and water ones) is highly relevant and important, as it contributes to ensuring an even stronger country ownership of the Project results and offers opportunities to align green investments with that of the agreed upon TDA/SAP findings.