**Terms of Reference**

**International Consultant – Evaluation Expert for EU/UNDP Black Sea Projects:**

**“****Improving Environmental Monitoring in the Black Sea, EMBLAS-II and EMBLAS-Plus”**

**Type of Contract:** IC (Consultant)

**Languages Required:** English required and working knowledge of Russian is an asset.

**Duratio**n: estimated 11 February – 28 February 2019 (approximately 10 working days).

**Location:** home based, with travels no travels.

The beneficiary countries to be covered are the members of the Black Sea Synergy[[1]](#footnote-2), with a primary focus on the Black Sea coast countries Georgia, the Russian Federation[[2]](#footnote-3) and Ukraine.

**1. Background**

The Black Sea is one of the most vulnerable regional seas in the world given its limited exchange of water with the open oceans and the large area of continental Europe from which it receives the drainage. The four strongly interlinked priority trans-boundary problems of the Black Sea are eutrophication - nutrient enrichment, changes in marine living resources, chemical pollution (including oil), and biodiversity/habitat changes, including alien species introduction - as well as the underlying root causes like industrial activities, agriculture, domestic wastewater, sea transport (oil spills, ballast water), and coastal zone degradation (urbanisation, tourism). The Convention on the Protection of the Black Sea against Pollution (Bucharest Convention) addresses these problems through enhanced cooperation among its signatories. The development/improvement of a monitoring network and data collection to provide for ecosystem-based and knowledge-based decision-making is considered to be a management target of high priority. Further coordination in policies and legislation between the Black Sea countries is of common interest in the region and specifically to the EU's partners countries, which are also members of the Black Sea Commission (BSC). The proper monitoring influences ability of the EU Accession countries to comply with EU legislation and policies, notably the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and the EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD).

In order to help its Eastern neighbors to improve the protection of the Black Sea environment, the EU has provided support to specific activities on the ground. The Project "Improving Environmental Monitoring in the Black Sea" (EMBLAS) is one of such activities, which is being implemented in three phases (EMBLAS-I: 1 January 2013 – 31 March 2015, EMBLAS-II: 1 April 2014 and has ended 31 May 2018 and EMBLAS-Plus: 5 March 2017- 30 September 2020).

The EMBLAS I project has been a preparatory phase for a follow-up large scale monitoring programme in the BS region – EMBLAS II, followed by recently launched EMBLAS-Plus, which are further addressing the overall need for support in the protection and restoration of environmental quality and sustainability of the Black Sea Basin.

The EMBLAS-II specific objectives were as follows:

1. improve availability and quality of Black Sea environmental data in line with needs outlined in the EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) and the Black Sea SAP (2009);
2. improve partner countries' ability to perform marine environmental monitoring along MSFD principles, taking into account the Black Sea Diagnostic Report II[[3]](#footnote-4) recommendations on capacity building.

The following activities were carried out in the Phase 2 of the project – EMBLAS-II:

PA 1. Support at the implementation of countries’ obligations under the Bucharest and other related Conventions and Agreements.

PA 2. National Pilot Monitoring Studies (NPMS) - Development and implementation of NPMS for testing and harmonisation of developed by EMBLAS-I drafts of cost-effective National Black Sea Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programmes (N-BSIMAPs) in accordance with reporting obligations under the WFD, MSFD and BSIMAP.

PA 3. Large scale implementation of training and intercomparison programmes on monitoring methods and quality assurance adhering to the ISO 17025 standard.

PA 4. Joint Open Sea Surveys (JOSS) - Implementation of the Joint Black Sea Surveys methodology along the lines of the MSFD, WFD and BSIMAP.

PA 5. Upgrade and operation of the web-based Black Sea Water Quality Database.

PA 6. Dissemination of knowledge and best practices, public awareness and visibility.

PA 7. Management and coordination of the project.

The EMBLAs-II Project was prepared by UNDP Regional Centre for Europe and the CIS [[4]](#footnote-5) in 2013 following demand from countries and submitted for financial assistance to EC DG/DEVCO in the context of the ENPI[[5]](#footnote-6) East Regional Programme (see Strategy Paper 2007-2013[[6]](#footnote-7)).

The EMBLAS-II Project has been financed by the European Union and co-financed by UNDP with total budget of EUR 2,723,800 (estimated at $2,832,421.16 ), as per EC-UNDP Contribution Agreement no ENPI/2013/313-169. The Project implementation started on 1 April 2014 and has ended 31 May 2018, thus having duration of 50 months (including 8 months of no cost extension approved by EC, from October 2017 to May 2018).

The EMBLAS-II project has been designed in the frame of the UNDP RBEC Regional Programmme Document (2014-2017) and thus the project was linked to the Outcome 1:  Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded / Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.

Following the EC Implementing Decision on the ENI East Regional Action Programme 2017 (27 November 2017)[[7]](#footnote-8) a follow-up phase of the project has been designed: EMBLAS-Plus, with the following objectives:

1. Improve availability and sharing of marine environmental data from the national and joint regional monitoring programmes aligned with the MSFD and WFD principles and the Black Sea Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme (BSIMAP);
2. Support joint actions to reduce river and marine litter in the Black Sea basin;
3. Raise awareness on the key environmental issues and increase public involvement in the protection of the Black Sea.

A number of activities will be implemented in the following components of EMBLAS-Plus project:

1. Implementation of National and joint regional monitoring programmes;

2. Joint monitoring and reduction of marine litter;

3: Conducting Environmental public awareness and educational campaigns;

4. Management and coordination of the project.

The EMBLAS-Plus project will be implemented in the context of the ENI Regional East Strategy Paper (2014-2020)[[8]](#footnote-9); Regional East Multiannual Indicative Programme (2017-2020)[[9]](#footnote-10) and the Joint Operational Programme for the Black Sea Basin 2014-2020[[10]](#footnote-11). The project is part of the ENI East Regional Action Programme 2017, Part 2: Support to the Implementation of the Eastern Partnership Multilateral Dimension and the Implementation of the Northern Dimension and the Black Sea Synergy.

The EMBLAS-Plus Project is financed by the European Union and co-financed by UNDP with total budget of $1,827,315.16, as per EC-UNDP Contribution Agreement no ENI/2017/389-859. The Project implementation started on 5 March 2018 (retroactive start) and will end on 5 Sept 2020, thus having duration of 30 months duration.

The EMBLAs-Plus has been designed within the UNDP RBEC Reg programe 2018-2021, thus corresponding to the Regional plan outcome 1. Accelerating structural transformations through more effective governance systems / Output 1.6. Solutions and regulatory frameworks to address conservation, sustainable use and equitable benefit-sharing of natural resources, developed in line with international conventions and national legislation through regional and cross-regional initiatives.

More information can be found at the project website: www.emblasproject.org

**2. Evaluation purposes, scope and objectives**

This Evaluation is initiated by the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH) for Europe and CIS as the coordinator of the three phases of the EU-UNDP project: Improving Environmental Monitoring in the Black Sea.

The objective of this Evaluation is to:

* review and assess the EMBLAS-II project (results, efficiency, stakeholder involvement, sustainability) in relation to the stated project objectives
* produce recommendations for the next phase of the already ongoing EMBLAS-Plus project, activities of which are mostly building –up on the results of the EMBLAS-II phase.

The results of the evaluation will be considered for further planning of the EMBLAS-Plus project and where relevant incorporated into the project workplan and inception report.

The Evaluation will include the assessment of the achievements of the project EMBLAS-II, measured against planned outputs set forth in the Project Document and the assessment of features related to the process of achieving those outputs, as well as the impacts the project. The evaluation will also review the planning & design of the follow-up phase (EMBLAS-Plus) and its linkages to the previous phase.

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the EMBLAS-II Project Logical Framework (included in the Project Document), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification.

**3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions**

The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: a) relevance; b) effectiveness; c) efficiency; d) sustainability.

Ratings must be provided on the selected performance criteria as indicated in the Annex 2, following the provided recommended rating scales.

The scope of the Evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The evaluator will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. The evaluation will also look at the planned activities of the new project and assess the linkages with the previous project and its results.

The evaluation will also review the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency.

Project evaluation sample questions:

Relevance:

* To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme’s outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs, as well as regional policies?
* To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project’s design (e.g. evaluation of the previous phase)?
* To what extent were perspectives of the key stakeholders taken into account during the project design processes?
* To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country or in the region?

Effectiveness

* To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities, as well as regional strategies?
* To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
* To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
* What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
* In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
* In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
* What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project’s objectives?
* Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
* To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
* To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
* To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

Efficiency

* To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
* To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
* To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
* To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
* To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
* To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

Sustainability

* Are there any risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs (financial, social, political risks)?
* To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
* What are the results transferred to the beneficiaries?
* What is the risk that the level of stakeholders’ ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
* To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?
* To what extent do stakeholders support the project’s long-term objectives?
* What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

**4. Methodology**

The evaluation will be home based and carried out as a desk review. The evaluator is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the Project document, Final Project report, Scientific Reports and any other material that s/he may consider useful for evidence-based assessment. The evaluator will receive a detailed briefing from the UNDP EMBLAS-II project team. Interviews with the national stakeholders are optional (representatives of the national partner organizations, national focal points, Black Sea Commissioners, etc.).

**5. Evaluation products (deliverables)**

The key product expected from this terminal evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should follow the outline attached in Annex 1. The Terminal Evaluation Report will be stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide to UNDP complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings.

The Evaluation Expert prepare the following documents, within the following time frame and payment schedule:

* Draft evaluation report – by 18 February 2019 (50% of payment)
* Final evaluation report – by 28 February 2019 (50% of payment

**6. Implementation arrangements and time frame**

The consultant will work under the supervision of UNDP IRH Regional Technical Advisor (RTA) for International Waters, in close cooperation with the Coordination / Quality Assurance Team and overall oversight by IRH Manger.

The report shall be submitted to the UNDP RTA: [Vladimir.Mamaev@undp.org](mailto:Vladimir.Mamaev@undp.org), with copy to UNDP IRH Senior Program Coordinator: [Ekaterina.Paniklova@undp.org](mailto:Ekaterina.Paniklova@undp.org) and UNDP IRH Manger: [Gerd.Trogemann@undp.org](mailto:Gerd.Trogemann@undp.org). The finalized Evaluation Report is expected on 28 February 2019. The time frame of the deliverables may be adjusted considering the actual start of the contract.

The timeframe and duration of activities are estimated to be broken down as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Time frame | Deadlines |
| Desk review | 4 days |  |
| Draft evaluation report – to be submitted to UNDP for review and comments | 3days | 18 February |
| Final Terminal Evaluation Report | 3 days | 28 February 2019 |
|  |  |  |

**7. Competences of the Evaluation Expert**

**Functional competencies:**

* Excellent communication and management skills and demonstrable capacity to lead a multi-national team and to work with governmental institutions;
* Demonstrated ability to develop strategies and work plans to accomplish objectives, empower others to translate visions and efforts into results, identify strategic issues, opportunities and risks and devise timely and effective responses;
* Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback;
* Ability to work under pressure and stressful situations;
* Strong analytical, reporting and writing abilities.

**Corporate Competencies:**

* Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Respects and promotes international law, including with regard to territorial integrity;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
* Treats all people fairly without favoritism;
* Fulfills all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

**8. Qualifications of the Evaluation Expert**

The Evaluator **must be independent** from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of activities in question, i.e. he/she must not have participated in the preparation and/or implementation of the assessed project and must not be in a conflict of interest with project-related activities.

Academic Qualifications/Education:

* Preferably PhD, or minimum Master Degree in chemistry, chemical oceanography, hydrobiology, environmental/natural sciences or environmental engineering.

Specific Experience:

* At least 7 years of professional experience in the field of integrated water resources management, experience with EU water related legislation is an advantage;
* Experience with UNDP projects in relevant field;
* Experience and/or knowledge of relevant projects and activities in the Black Sea Region is an advantage
* Knowledge of UNDP’s results-based evaluation policies and procedures
* Knowledge and practical experience in evaluation of international donor driven development projects, experience with EU funded projects is an advantage;
* Knowledge of MS Word, Excel and email communication software;

Language skills

* Excellent writing, editing and oral communication skills in English;

**9. Evaluation ethics**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

**10. Annexes**

Annex 1: Suggested Table of Content of the report

Annex 2: Selected performance criteria and rating

Annex 3: List of documents to be provided

Annex 4: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Annex 1**

**Evaluation Report: Sample Table of Contents for Final Project Evaluation**

1. Title and opening pages:

* Name of the evaluation intervention.
* Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report.
* Countries of the evaluation intervention.
* Names and organizations of evaluators.
* Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation.
* Acknowledgements.

1. Project and evaluation information details (as one page in the following details:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Project / outcome information | | |
| Project/outcome title |  | |
| Atlas ID |  | |
| Corporate outcome and output |  | |
| Country |  | |
| Region |  | |
| Date project document signature |  | |
| Project dates | Start | End |
| Project budget |  | |
| Project expenditures at the time of evaluation |  |  |
| Funding source |  |  |
| Implementing party[[11]](#footnote-12) |  |  |
| Evaluation type (Project/outcome /thematic / country programme etc.) |  |  |
| Final/midterm review/ other  Period under evaluation | Start | End |
| Evaluators |  |  |
| Evaluator e-mail address |  |  |
| Evaluation dates | start | Completion |

1. **Table of contents** (incl. boxes, figures, tables and annexes)
2. **List of acronyms and abbreviations**
3. **Executive summary** (4 page max) - A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should briefly describe the evaluated project, purpose of evaluation, evaluation methodology, summarise the key findings, conclusions, recommendations and include evaluator’s ratings.
4. **Introduction** – describe the purpose of the evaluation, why at this point of time, primary audience, expectations from the evaluation, scope & methodology and report structure.
5. **Project description** and **development context** – describe the project being evaluated, duration, problems/issues the project is addressing, objectives, indicators, expected results, project’s linkages with the national/regional priorities, UNDP regional program, implementation arrangements, significant changes/issues of implementation, key partners / stakeholders involved and their roles, cross-cutting issues if any addressed through project, scale of the implementation (size of the project, activities), resources used (human, budget), point out design weaknesses if any or other implementation constraints (e.g., resource limitations).…
6. **Evaluation scope and objectives, approach and methods** - explanation of the evaluation’s scope (evaluated period, evaluated components, what is not evaluated), primary objectives (for what the evaluation will be used), evaluation criteria and ratings, evaluation questions, methodological approach, data and information sources, background info in evaluator.
7. **Findings** - presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data for both projects – EMBLAS-II and EMBLAS-Plus. They should be linked with the evaluation questions and reflect on:   
   **- the project design** (LogFrame, risk and assumption, planned stakeholders involvement, replicability, links with other projects and initiatives, gender, cross-cutting issues)  
   **- project implementation** (adaptive management, partnerships, use of M&E activities, coordination and operational issues, finances)  
   **- project results** (overall results - attainment of objectives, relevance, effectiveness & efficiency, country ownership, mainstreaming, sustainability),
8. **Conclusions** – describe and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the project, responding to the key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision-making of users of this evaluation, including issues in relation to women’s empowerment.
9. **Recommendations –** provide practical, actionable and feasible recommendations for the users of the evaluation report (what actions / decisions to take). The recommendations should be supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions and address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, providing specific advice for future or similar projects or programming, addressing also women’s empowerment issues and priorities for action to improve these aspects.
10. **Lessons learned.** Where relevant, include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.
11. **Report annexes**. Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:
    * TOR for the evaluation.
    * List of supporting documents reviewed.
    * Code of conduct signed by evaluators,
    * Etc..

**Annex 2**

**Selected performance criteria and rating**

**Performance criteria to be rated**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency |  |
| **Overall quality of M&E** |  | **Overall quality of Implementation/Execution** |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| **Overall Project Outcome Rating** |  | Environmental: |  |
|  |  | **Overall likelihood of sustainability:** |  |
| **5. Impact** | **rating** |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Overall impact** |  |  |  |

**The recommended rating scales**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for***  ***M&E, I&E Execution, Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency,*** | 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings  5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems |
|
|
|
| ***Relevance ratings*** | 2. Relevant (R)  1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| ***Sustainability ratings:*** | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability  3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks  2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks |

**Annex 3**

**List of documents to be provided**

UNDP Project Document for EMBLAS-II

Inception Report for EMBLAS-II

Final Donor Report for EMBLAS-II and Annexes (all technical/scientific reports)

UNDP Project Document for EMBLAS-Plus

EC Implementing decision (based on which the EMBLAS-Plus is financed)

Black Sea Basin ENI Cross-Border Cooperation Programme 2014-2020

**Annex 4**

**Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form**

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[12]](#footnote-13)**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at ………………………..*place* on …………….*date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Countries participating in the Black Sea Synergy: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Georgia, Greece, the Republic of Moldova, Turkey, Ukraine, Romania and the Russian Federation [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. As recognised by international law. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Produced by EMBLAS-I, providing analysis of achievements and gaps in the field of Black Sea monitoring/data collection and assessments. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. The UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre has been relocated to Istanbul in July 2014, it is now named Istanbul Regional Hub for Europe and the CIS  - IRH. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. The strategy was adopted by EC in March 2007 (see: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/regional-cooperation/enpi-east/index\_en.htm). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. <https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/eni_2017_c20177963_regional_action_programme_part_2.pdf>; <https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/eni_2017_040350_support_to_the_implementation_of_the_eastern_partnership_northern_dimension_and_the_balck_sea_synergy.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. <http://eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/enp/pdf/financing-the-enp/regional_east_strategy_paper_2014_2020_and_multiannual_indicative_programme_2014_2017_en_.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. <http://eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/enp/pdf/financing-the-enp/regional_east_summary_of_the_strategy_paper_2014_2020_and_multiannual_indicative_programme_2014_2017_en.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. <http://blacksea-cbc.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/ENI-CBC-Black-Sea-Basin-JOP-final.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. [www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-13)