

Blueing the Black Sea (BBSEA)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10563

Countries

Regional (Georgia, Moldova, Turkey, Ukraine)

Project Name

Blueing the Black Sea (BBSEA)

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

3/23/2020

Review completed by PM

4/14/2020

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 (3.27.20):

Yes, the project is aligned with the IW Objective 1, Strategic Action 3. However, please note the following:

- The PID is missing. Please note that the PID needs to be submitted prior to any potential recommendation of the project for technical clearance.

SH (4.6.20): The PID has been circulated as part of the decision meeting package. Please consider if the PCN "*Figure 1: BBSEA Program Overview*" can be incorporated into the PID? Along with the rest of the package, the final PID version should be uploaded to the GEF portal following the PCN decision meeting.

SH (4.11.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

041020

Thank you, requested change was made in the PID - new version of the document is uploaded in the portal.

040220

Thank you, noted. PID is uploaded in the GEF portal

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 (3.27.20):

1. Refer to questions in box 2, part I.

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

2. Please upload to the portal a fully populated GEF datasheet.

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared. Per the below comment the uploaded GEF word data sheet is now obsolete, however, there is no need to upload yet another GEF word data sheet version.

3. The listed outcomes per component in the PIF data sheet should be identical to the Components and Outcomes listed in the PCN and PID. Please correct.

SH (4.6.2020): Not cleared. An easier way to address this issue is by adhering to the following logic: Currently, the PCN and PID Component titles sound more like project Outcomes. Subsequently, in the PCN and PID, please add new Component titles and relabel the old Component titles as Outcomes (in line with the information presented in the PCN *Figure 2: Theory of change* / PID *Figure 1: Theory of change*). The subsequent changes to the PCN and PID should be captured as part of a revised GEF portal data sheet. Note that the current Outcome titles in the GEF portal data sheet can be deleted.

SH (4.11.2020): Cleared, however, please explore if edits can be applied to the GEF data sheet and in order to clarify the Component, Outcome and Output structure. Per below response from the WB, by GEF CEO Endorsement stage the Components, Outcomes and Outputs should be clearly defined and duly reflected in the PAD, PID and GEF Portal data sheet.

4. PIF data sheet: please provide an annex or equivalent displaying the anticipated national level cofinance and confirm that the cofinance currently listed across the two project components in the PIF data sheet (\$290 M) is truly aligned with project objective? Currently, this information does not feature as part of the submission.

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

041320

3. outcomes in the GEF datasheet are redefined, thank you for suggestion

041020

3. The team would rather avoid changing the titles of the component as it is imperative that all the project documents (ESRS, PID, Datasheets, etc) are aligned. Any change in the PCN and PID documents would trigger updates in the safeguard assessment. The team will work with the GEF while preparing the PAD in addressing the requested changes, while staying within the intended scope and outcomes.

040220

1. Changed in the PIF

2. Done

3. Done

4. Updated in the PIF as well as in Annex to the PIF

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 (3.27.20): please address comments in box 2. Further, please note that following:

1 . Text provided in the PIF table C under the "Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified" heading is not clear. This may be partly due to the fact that a Theory of Change has not been submitted, which should frame the GEF grant within context of the larger program. In addition, please note the following comments specific to the PIF Table C text:

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

2. It is difficult to determine if indeed the entirety of the BBSEA Program is made up of the 6 M GEF grant and 400 K from PROBLUE?

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

3. Note that it is a requirement that the PCN/PID include a theory of change - preferably via a figure with accompanying text. The Theory of Change should make clear GEFs role as part of the larger program, and explain exactly how the dynamics and linkages between the regional/national levels (including lending operations) will happen and how the GEF contribution will contribute towards a long term transformations change.

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040220

The PIF Data Sheet has been updated accordingly. In Annex 3 of the PCN, the team has identified the potential synergies for investments from the on-going planned WB projects in the Black Sea countries. The role of the GEF operation within the broader Program has been added in the PCN and a Theory of change was also prepared to clarify the expected achievement of the GEF operation and of the Program. The BBSEA Program is broader than the PROBLUE and GEF operations. The Program is made of all the national IBRD investments.

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 (3.27.20): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response thank you

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion SH (3.27.20): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response thank you

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 SH (3.27.20): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response thank you

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 (3.27.20):

GEF indicators:

- Indicator 5 “Number of Large Marine Ecosystems with reduced pollution and hypoxia: Please provide a rough estimate of the expected nutrient load stress reduction delivered by component 2 at large and the IW grant specifically during the lifespan of the project? These tentative stress reduction numbers should be included in the PCN/PID.

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

- Indicator 7.1: Please select a value, while noting that there is an existing regional SAP in place..

SH (4.6.2020): not cleared. The black Sea basin already has a SAP signed at Ministerial level. Please consider changing the value to 4.

SH (4.11.2020): Cleared.

- Indicator 7.2: Please select a value, while noting that there is a regional water institution in place.

SH (4.6.2020): not cleared. The Black Sea already has fully functional management institutions. Please consider changing the value to 4.

SH (4.11.2020): Cleared.

- Indicator 7.3: Please select a value.

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

- Indicator 7.4: Please adjust the value to 1.

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

- Indicator 11: Please populate indicator 11 and make sure to provide gender aggregated numbers. At PIF stage this can be a conservative number and in general you should focus on the pilot areas specific to the GEF grant, while also factoring in capacity building activities at national/regional level.

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

041020

- Indicator 7.1:

Thank you, the value is changed as advised.

040220

The Core indicators were estimated as suggested, appropriate changes are made. Annex 1 of the PCN provides the estimation for indicator 5.2. The methodology for both indicators 5.2 and 11 are available in the GEF Core Indicator file.

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 (3.27.20): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response thank you

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 (3.27.20):

1. As part of Component 2, considerations should be made if the IW grant can integrate with and pilot innovative aspects of WB national nutrient reduction investments, and which otherwise would not be financed by countries as part of their loans?

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

2. Please be more specific in the PCN/PID will GEF grant under component 1 or 2 also be used for policy, legal or institutional reforms at the country level? At a minimum, the work under either component 1 or 2 should directly influence the national level legal, policy and institutional reform agendas. Otherwise, it seems likely that the project risks operating within the constraints of existing barriers and not contributing towards a true transition towards a low pollution future.

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

3. As noted in the PCN, FAO and the GFCM will tackle fisheries issues, focusing on strengthening capacity to manage commercial fisheries (focus on small-scale fisheries) and enhancing the integration of emerging monitoring, control and surveillance technologies for Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing. In the PCN and PID, please be specific and integrate new text detailing how the envisioned national/regional blue economy multi-sector activities will integrate fisheries and reinforce the GFCM anticipated activities?

SH (4.6.2020): Not cleared. Well noted that the WB has had a constructive dialogue with FAO and UNDP during project development and that there will be no overlap of activities. However, there is significant potential for synergies by continuing a the dialogue during implementation. This necessitates a structured approach, which goes beyond the [IW:LEARN](#) mechanism and its services. Please incorporate text into the PCN and PID, which speaks to the needed ongoing coordination with the FAO/UNDP projects, including via e.g. quarterly coordination calls and an observer seat for the FAO/GFCM project at the Regional Project Steering Committee meetings.

SH (4.11.2020): Cleared. By CEO endorsement, the PAD should contain specific and costed coordination activities towards securing a structured dialogue - both on technical and political levels and throughout implementation - with the anticipated GEF UNDP and FAO Black Sea projects.

4. **Theory of change:** The response to the above questions should integrate into the PID/PCN, including by incorporating a Theory of change (via a figure with accompanying text). Please note that a ToC is not a reorganization of the log frame, but rather a well thought out theory of change that articulates why and how project outputs and outcomes will address barriers and will result in the ultimate goal of providing a healthy black sea environment.

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

041020

3. thank you for your comment. The team will use the pre-existing cooperation mechanisms put in place in the Black Sea region, whether it is through the BSEC, the BSC or the CMA. The project is also closely coordinated with UNDP & FAO (cf. para 31). The executing entity (BSEC) will make sure to optimize the organization

of the Regional Steering Committee, conducting back to back session with relevant events, and being as inclusive as possible in terms of partners/stakeholders. Specific details on collaboration will be identified during project preparation

040220

1. As outlined in Annex 3 of the PCN, the competitive grant allocation in component 2 will work with the WB agricultural projects to pilot innovation not already financed under these projects. This is one of the cooperation modalities with WB that through to be the most effective.
2. Yes, Sub component 1.1 “Assessment of the current national policy and legal framework”, 1.2 “ Development of national plans for pollution reduction and circular economy”, 1.3 “strengthened framework for Blue Economy”, 2.3 “Eco-Business Competition and Grants” and 2.4 “Public Private Partnership (PPP) investment preparation” are at national level for Georgia, Moldova, Turkey and Ukraine.
3. In agreement with FAO and UNDP, this proposal is no longer overlapping: fisheries related activities have been removed. Paragraph 31 of the PCN outlined the division of tasks and scope between the 3 GEF agencies. Knowing that UNDP is taking the lead on cross-sectoral coordination in the maritime space, the proposed sub-component 1.3 “ Strengthened framework for blue economy” is executed at national level and will be further refined to avoid overlap with UNDP supported activities
4. This has been integrated accordingly.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.27.20): PCN baseline description: Please be more specific, what on-going and planned national/regional investments for wastewater treatment and rivers basin and coastal zone management etc. will the project build on and coordinate with?

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040220

This has also been added in the PCN text (cf. Para 18) and in the annex 3 of the PCN

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.27.20):

1. PIF Component 1 states the following outcome “National and regional plan for pollution reduction and circular economy through dialogue for compliance with relevant regional and international instruments”. Has this outcome been discussed and agreed with the Black Sea Commission? The GEF grant will directly support the BSEC, however, it remains unclear if the BSC mandate is closer aligned with the PDO?

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

2. Further to the above, the PIF component 1 has the following outcome “Strengthened regional cooperation between BSC, BSEC and GFCM and Enhance BSEC performance (financing of activities, transparency, participation) including through IW LEARN platform”. Please provide a matrix (in the form of an annex) that shows the distinct mandates of the respective regional institutions and how this project will help support not only the BSEC but other regional organizations. As one concrete example, please explain if this project directly will be supporting the update of a Black Sea commission Information System (BSIS) with all new relevant data, or if it will attempt to establish a new system? Likewise, the current project is envisioning a pollution control system, but it is not clear where such a system might be anchored?

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

3. Please make sure that there is consistency in terms of the GEF grant listed in the PCN document and that of the GEF PIF datasheet.

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040220

1. This has been clarified in the PCN. The project components have been presented to the BSC and the BSEC. Aligning with the PDO, the geographical coverage and considering the institutional capacities of both institutions, the BSEC was identified as the most suitable partner. See explanation in the implementation arrangement section in the PCN
2. This has been clarified in the PCN, in particular through the implementing arrangement. BSEC as the executing entity is responsible for the overall coordination of the project implementation. The Regional Steering Committee, providing technical guidance on the selection and implementation of activities will include the beneficiary countries and the BSC too. In agreement with UNDP, monitoring system including BSIS are not covered in this proposal to avoid overlapping.
3. Done
4. **Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.27.20): Yes, however, please insert specific text in the PCN/PID which speaks to IW alignment.

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040220

See Paragraph 21 “Alignment with GEF-7”

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 (3.27.20): Refer to questions in review sheet Part 2, box 1.

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040220

addressed, thank you

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 (3.27.20): Refer to comments in part I, box 6.

SH (4.6.2020): cleared.

Agency Response

040220

addressed, thank you

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.27.20): Awaiting the submission of a Theory of Change.

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040220

addressed, thank you

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

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 (3.27.20):

1. The project has ticked the box “Civil Society Organizations” box. Subsequently and per GEF policy, please provide a description of the consultations with civil society organizations during the formulation of the project. Citing the Policy: ‘Agencies provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development...’

SH (4.6.2020): Not cleared. If there has been no national level civil society or private sector engagement during the PCN development phase, then please "un-click" the GEF data sheet Stakeholder section boxes specific to "Civil Society Organizations" and "Private Sector". Subsequently, and to complement the existing information in the data sheet, please add an additional para that explains why this regional project has not yet liaised with national level CSO/private sector.

SH (4.11.2020): Cleared.

2. Please provide a table describing the stakeholder’s 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".

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

041020

1. Noted. The proposed changes are made in the datasheet. The following information is added in the relevant section: " Consultations took place with Focal Point but the travel restriction due to COVID-19 and the short time for project preparation left no time for national level consultation. Virtual consultations will take place before appraisal."

040220

1. CSOs and others stakeholders will be involved starting from early stages of preparation, in particular through citizen engagement activities and the ESF, which are WB requirement
2. Addressed, thank you. Specific details on means of engagement will be added during project preparation.

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 (3.27.20):

As available, please include in the PIF data sheet and in the PCN/PID indicative information regarding women's socio-economic standing, associated barriers and measures to address these. This information should also be reflected in the PCN/PID.

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040220

Specific gender analysis will be conducted during project preparation and will include all participating countries. It will address women's roles and address gender equality where relevant.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (3.27.20):

Comments are specific to the PIF Private sector engagement section and PCN component 2:

- It is unclear how/if the GEF grant directly will blend with loans/grants provided under component 2? It sounds as if the main activities are studies, competitions and trainings for financial institutions etc. What is the evidence that such activities will contribute towards any significant dent in regional nutrient pollution?

SH (4.6.2020): cleared.

- Finally, regarding the anticipated Public Private Partnership (PPP) investment preparation, will this investment be integrated into country lending? Have any consultations happened with private sector to date? Will it be in alignment with the SAP priorities? Please add text to the PCN/PID specifying these elements.

SH (4.6.2020): cleared.

Agency Response

040220

1. See the response above. This GEF operation is a first step within the BBSEA Program. It builds on previous engagement (see Lessons learned section) and the articulation with the current WB projects is provided in Annex 3. Besides the project has several scale-up mechanisms with the market place and the PPP activities.

2. It is indeed our intention to integrate the PPP support within pipeline operation to the extent possible. Consultations with the private sector will take place during preparation. Alignment with the SAP will be secured and addressed during project preparation stage, reflected in the PAD.

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 (3.27.20): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

040220

thank you

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 (3.27.20): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

040220

thank you

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 (3.27.20): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

040220

thank you

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 (3.27.20):

1. Please specify that 1 % of the IW grant will be used for IW learn activities, including the attendance in IW regional/global meetings and the production of experience notes to be shared with IW.

SH (4.6.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040220

We have allocated 200,000 to this subcomponent, as discussed. Relevant information is included in the PCN and PIF datasheet

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 (3.27.20): please note that LOEs from Moldova and Turkey are missing. Further, please confirm that the electronic signature in the Ukrainian LOE is provided by the Ukrainian OFP. Per GEF policy, all LOEs should be signed by the OFP. Note that any potential recommendation of the project for technical clearance cannot happen until all LOEs have been submitted.

SH (4.6.2020): Thank you for sending the updated LOE from Ukraine. Note that the LOE from Turkey is missing. Per GEF policy, all LOEs must be submitted in order for a project to be considered for GEF work program inclusion.

SH (4.11.2020): Note that the LOE from Turkey is missing. Per GEF policy, all LOEs must be submitted in order for a project to be considered for GEF work program inclusion.

SH (4.16.2020): The LOE from Turkey has been submitted, however, the LOE from Moldova is non eligible. Please provide a new LOE from Moldova.

Agency Response

041320

Turkey LOE is uploaded and the package will be resubmitted

041020

LOE from Turkey will be submitted

040220

LOE from Moldova and updated letter from Ukraine are uploaded in the GEF portal. LOEs from Turkey is expected before the PCN date

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

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 (3.27.20): Please address comments and resubmit.

SH (4.6.2020): Please address comments and resubmit.

With the exception of the GEF portal data sheet, please note that the GEF review dated 4.6.20 has been made on the basis of the PCN decision meeting package circulated via email on Wednesday, March 25, on behalf of *Bérengère Prince (WB TTL)*. Following the PCN decision meeting scheduled 4.9.20, the project should be returned to the GEF via the portal, containing review sheet responses to GEFs comments, and with the final versions of all GEF documents uploaded. Also, the decision meeting summary should be shared with GEF following the decision meeting.

SH (4.11.2020): The LOE from Turkey is missing. Please upload the LOE and resubmit.

SH (4.16.2020): Please note that the LOE from Moldova is non eligible. Please submit a new LOE. Finally, please make sure to populate the "submission date field" as part of the resubmission.

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)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval