



Project is financed
by the European Union



Terminal Evaluation Report

ANNEXES

Improving Environmental Monitoring in the Black Sea – EMBLAS Phase 1

PROJECT ID: 71597

OUTCOME ID: 84971

Mrs. Stephanie Hodge – International Evaluation Specialist
March 21-May 31 2015

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| ANNEX 1 –Terms of Reference | 3 |
| ANNEX 2 – Itinerary and Evaluation Program | 9 |
| ANNEX 3 – Evaluation Matrix and Questionnaires Used..... | 10 |
| ANNEX 4 – List of Persons Interviewed..... | 25 |
| ANNEX 5- List of Documents Reviewed..... | 26 |
| ANNEX 6 – Existing Framework for International Regional Cooperation (MISIS Project Brochure)..... | 27 |
| ANNEX 7 – Who is Who in Project –March 2015..... | 29 |
| ANNEX 8 – EMBLAS-I Meetings and Trainings | 31 |
| ANNEX 9 - Experts | 35 |
| ANNEX 10 – Status of Project Outputs - LOGFRAME | 36 |

ANNEX 1 –Terms of Reference

EU-UNDP Project: Improving Environmental Monitoring in the Black Sea – EMBLAS Phase 1

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Consultant for independent terminal evaluation of the project

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Type of Contract: | Individual Contract |
| Languages Required: | English, Russian is an asset |
| Duration: | estimated March 2015 – May 2015 (estimated 26 working days) |
| Location: | Home based with mission(s) to Istanbul, and potentially to Ukraine, Russia, Georgia |
| Payment schedule: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First payment: 25% of the total fee upon acceptance of the workplan by UNDP Regional Technical Advisor for International Waters (IW RTA) ; - Second payment 50% of the total fee upon submission and acceptance of the draft Evaluation Report and acceptance by the UNDP IW RTA - Final payment: 25% of the total fee upon submission and acceptance of all deliverables, including the Evaluation Report approved by UNDP IW RTA |

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 – being also members of the Black Sea Commission (BSC) - in so far it influences their own ability to comply with EU legislation and policies, notably the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and the EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD).

The overall objective of this EC/UNDP project is to set up initiatives that will help improve the protection of the Black Sea environment. The project is addressing the overall need for support in protection and restoring the environmental quality and sustainability of the Black Sea.

The specific objectives are as follows: i) Improve availability and quality of data on the chemical and biological status of the Black Sea, in line with expected MSFD and Black Sea Strategic Action Plan needs; ii) Improve partner countries' ability to perform marine environmental monitoring along MSFD principles, taking into account Black Sea Diagnostic Report.

The following activities are carried out: i) Review of the national monitoring systems and tools for assessing data obtained from monitoring activities; ii) Support to implementation of countries obligations under the Bucharest and other related Conventions and Agreements; iii) Development of cost-effective and harmonised biological and chemical monitoring programmes in accordance with reporting obligations under multilateral environmental agreements, the WFD and the MSFD; iv) Assessment of needs regarding laboratory infrastructure, equipment, and training, promotion of the recommendations;

v) Elaboration and implementation of the comprehensive training programme on monitoring methods and quality assurance aiming at adhering to ISO 17025 standard, promotion; vi) Prepare methodology for Joint Black Sea Surveys; vii) PA7: Development of the web-based Black Sea Water Quality Database prototype.

The project will strengthen capacities of the respective national authorities for biological and chemical monitoring of the Black Sea, taking into consideration the requirements of EU water related legislation (EU WFD and MSFD). Significant effort will be put into training and other capacity building activities. In order to promote ownership, engagement of local experts and organisations is foreseen.

The implementation period of the EMBLAS I project is 1 January 2013 – 31 March 2015 and the project should be seen as a preparatory phase for a follow-up large scale monitoring programme in the BS region – EMBLAS II.

The project has been designed in the frame of the UNDP RBEC Regional Programme Document 2011-2013. In this context the project is related to the UNDP Outcome 2: By 2013, regional, national and sub-national levels have improved capacity for sustainable conservation and management of ecosystems and natural resources (linked to the Focus Area 1: Environment and Energy).

In 2014, a new RPD (2014-2017) has been approved 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.

This Terminal Evaluation is initiated by the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub for Europe and CIS as the coordinator of the EU-UNDP project: Improving Environmental Monitoring in the Black Sea – phase I (EMBLAS I). The objective of the evaluation is to review and assess the project results, its efficiency, stakeholder involvement, sustainability and to provide recommendations on the follow-up of the project EMBLAS II – 2nd phase of the project (2014-2017).

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

2. DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

This evaluation is to be undertaken in line with the Evaluation policy of UNDP <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.htm>.

The objective of this Terminal Evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objectives, and to produce recommendations for the next phase of the EMBLAS project, that is already ongoing, and its activities are building –up on the results of the first phase.

The report will have to provide to the recipients a complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings. The consultant should prepare specific ratings on all aspects of the project, as described in the 'Reporting' section of this Terms of Reference.

The Evaluation will include the assessment of the achievements of the project, measured against planned outputs set forth in the Project Document in accordance with rational budget allocation, and the assessment of features related to the process of achieving those outputs, as well as the impacts the project. The evaluation will also address the underlying causes and issues contribution to targets not adequately achieved.

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework (Annex 2), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification.

The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the selected performance criteria as indicated in table in Annex 3, following the provided recommended rating scales.

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained.

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. It will evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency.

Products expected from the evaluation

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.

Special attention shall be paid to the lessons learnt as well as to the recommendations for the follow-up project. The Terminal Evaluation Report will include a separate chapter on Lessons Learnt and Recommendations, providing recommendations for replication and transfer of the experience related mainly to:

- project results on the national level;
- support to transboundary cooperation;
- potential impact on the regional level (considering the follow-up phase of the project)
- recommendations from the project stakeholders for planning of future interventions.

The report together with the annexes, shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format.

Responsibility for Expenses and their Reimbursement

The Consultant will be responsible for all personal administrative and travel expenses associated with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationary, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. For this reason, the contract is prepared as a lump sum contract.

The remuneration of work performed will be conducted as follows:

- First payment: 25% of the total fee upon acceptance of workplan by UNDP RTA for Intl. Waters;
- Second payment 50% of the total fee upon submission and acceptance of the draft Evaluation Report and acceptance by the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor for the International Waters
- Final payment: 25% of the total contract upon submission and acceptance of all deliverables, including the final version of the Evaluation Report by the UNDP RTA for Intl. Waters.

Evaluation approach

An outline of an approach for the review is provided below; however it should be made clear that the consultant is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes must be cleared by UNDP before being undertaken by the consultant.

The review must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and informative to UNDP related to issues for future programming.

The evaluation will be home based with potentially 1 mission to beneficiary country: Ukraine, Georgia and Russia, with approx. 2-3 days per country and to UNDP IRH Turkey-Istanbul. It is recommended that the evaluator attends the Stakeholder workshops planned in each country, where s/he would have possibility to meet with the representatives of project partner organizations, national experts and the project team or alternatively attend other joint events. If additional need to visit the countries will emerge, the travel costs will be covered separately.

The evaluator is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports, project budget revisions, interim reports, project files, and any other material that s/he may consider useful for evidence based assessment.

The evaluator is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at minimum:

UNDP project team, National Focal Points, representatives of Project Partner Organizations, Black Sea Commissioners of the beneficiary countries.

The methodology to be used by the evaluator should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

- Documentation reviewed
- Interviews
- Field visits;
- Questionnaires;
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

The Evaluator is expected to follow the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system (Annex 4).

Although the Consultant should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP or the project management.

The Consultant should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the assignment. The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH). UNDP IRH and the Project Manager will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the project partners, etc.

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

| Deliverable | Time frame | Deadlines |
|--|------------|-----------|
| Desk review, questions, analysis | 2 days | |
| Detailed Project Workplan and Table of Contents for Assignment | 1 days | |
| Interviews | 3 days | |
| Field visits, interviews, questionnaires | 8 days | |
| Draft evaluation report – to be submitted to UNDP for review and comments / circulated to key stakeholders as needed | 6 days | |
| Final Terminal Evaluation Report | 6 days | May 2015 |
| | | |

The report shall be submitted to the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub, Istanbul, Turkey - Regional Technical Advisor for Intl. Waters, Project Manager with copy to other relevant UNDP IRH staff (details to be provided in due course).

Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be submitted for comments to UNDP and the stakeholders. The finalized Evaluation Report is expected on **31 May 2015**. The time frame of the deliverables may be adjusted considering the actual start of the contract.

If any discrepancies have emerged between impressions and findings of the consultant and the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

3. COMPETENCIES

Functional competencies:

- Excellent communication and management skills and demonstrable capacity to lead a multi-national team and to work with government 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;
- 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.

4. QUALIFICATIONS

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:

- Master degree at least in one of the fields of chemistry, biology, environmental science or equivalent experience.

Experience:

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

Language skills:

- Excellent English writing and communication skills
- Working knowledge of Russian

5. EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the **combination of the applicants' qualifications and financial proposal**.

The award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical (P11 desk reviews) and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Only the highest ranked candidates who would be found qualified for the job will be considered for the Financial Evaluation

Technical Criteria - 70% of total evaluation – max. 70 points:

- Academic background: 10
- Proven experience in the field integrated water resources management, water quality monitoring, EU water related legislation, in particular EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive and/or Water Framework Directive projects: 20
- Experience with water related projects in the Black Sea Region: 10
- Knowledge of evaluating programmes/projects, in particular for UNDP including knowledge of UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures, experience with EU funded projects: 10
- Proven evaluation expertise with international organizations (knowledge and practical experience in development evaluations) – max points: 10
- Language skills – English and Russian: 10

Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation – max. 30 points

6. APPLICATION PROCEDURES

Qualified candidates are requested to apply online via this website. The application should contain:

- **Cover letter** explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the advertised position and a **brief methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work (based on or commenting on the requirements indicated in this TOR). Please paste the letter into the "Resume and Motivation" section of the electronic application.
- **Filled P11 form** including past experience in similar projects and contact details of referees (blank form can be downloaded from http://europeandcis.undp.org/files/hrforms/P11_modified_for_SCs_and_ICs.doc); please upload the P11 instead of your CV.
- **Financial Proposal*** - specifying a total lump sum amount in USD for the tasks specified in this announcement. The financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (number of anticipated working days – in home office/ number of work days on mission/ travel costs – international and local, per diems and any other possible costs). Please note that you are free to decide in your offer to take 1 or 2 missions to Istanbul that would amount up to approx. 4 days in total.

Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials

ANNEX 2 – Itinerary and Evaluation Program

Mission included:

- Participation at Ukraine Stakeholders meeting March 22 -24, 2015, meeting with the Project Manager, national stakeholders, EMBLAS II Team leader
- Mission to Istanbul UNDP Regional Hub – meeting with the management of IRH and members of the project team, 26 – 30 March 2015
- Participation at the meeting of the Black Sea Commission Advisory Group 30 March – 2 April 2015 personal interviews with representatives of project partners, experts, national focal points, etc.

ANNEX 3 – Evaluation Matrix and Questionnaires Used

Evaluation Question Matrix

| Evaluative Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|--|--|---|--|
| Relevance - Project Design/Strategy/Formulation. To what extent has the project been designed appropriately and strategy relevant to regional priorities, include assessment of regional and country ownership, risk assessment, replication approach, linkages (sustainability) and the best route towards expected results (Goal and objectives - Goal - Improve protection of the Black sea environment -Objectives - 1. improve availability and quality of data on the chemical and biological status of the black sea in line with MSFD and BSSAP and 2. to improve partners countries abilities to perform environmental monitoring along with MTSD principles, taking into account the BSDR)? | | | |
| (include evaluative question(s)) | (I.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.) | (I.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTE mission, etc.) | (I.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, and interviews with stakeholders, etc.) |
| Project Strategy Is project aligned with the international, multi-lateral, regional and national environmental conventions, laws and policies? Is the project relevant to EU and UNDP outcome goals? MEA international conventions Laws of the SEA? MTFD, WFD, UNDP SP2016-2020. Does the design support international, regional and national conventions objectives in particular those dealing with international waters, biodiversity and climate change coastal zone adaptation? Does the design support the UNDP and EU marine biodiversity focal area and related SHD strategic priorities? Is the project design relevant to the BSC member countries environmental monitoring and sustainable development objectives/strategic plans capacities to implement and or mandate? | In line with priorities and whether areas of work are incorporated in project design. Level of implementation of the three MEA conventions in country and contribution of the project priorities and areas of work of other conventions incorporated in project design Extent to which the project is actually implemented in line with incremental cost argument | Project documents National policies and strategies to implement the conventions, or related to environment more generally International convention web sites | Documents analyses Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners |
| | Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and EU and UNDP expected outcomes? | Project Documents UNDP EU focal areas strategies and documents Expert's Interview reports. | Documents analyses EU UNDP website Interviews with UNDP/EU Project teams. |
| | | Project documents | Documents analyses |

| Evaluative Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|---|---|--|--|
| Does the design take into account previous activities concerning monitoring of the Black Sea ¹ | Degree to which the project supports regional and national environment and international waters related objectives. | National policies and strategies Key project Partners. | Interviews with Pound project partners |
| Regional / Country Ownership Assessment Does design adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional capacity needs and policy? Does the project reinforce or support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Country? Is this project Country- driven? | Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and Implementation to national realities and existing capacities | | |
| Project Formulation Assessment What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design and implementation? Consider how this project has influence EMBLAS 2 design. Assess the level of stakeholder ownership in design and Implementation? Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and Implementation? | Level of Involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-AFB Criteria | | |
| Stakeholder Assessment Is the project design addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the international, national and local areas? How does the project support the priority development needs of relevant stakeholders? Are there an adequate mix of technical, NGO/CSO/private sector (public advocacy role and also role in monitoring i.e..ppp) and government institutions in place? | Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders. Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation | Project partners and stakeholders Needs assessment studies Project documents | Document analysis Interviews with all relevant stakeholders |
| Logical Framework Assessment Is the project design coherent and logical? Are there Logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of Resources etc)? | Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach. | Programme and Project documents Key project stakeholders | Document analysis Log frame Analysis .Key interviews |

¹ iGEF on TDA-SAP for BSIS (Black Sea Information System) and BSIMAP (Black Sea Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Program) to provide reliable and consolidated data for "state of the environment" reporting, "impact assessments" of major pollutant sources, "trans boundary diagnostic analysis" and SAP implementation reports (BSSAP process) in view of decision-making needs in the Black Sea region. The sites, parameters and monitoring frequencies also reflect data requirements for compliance with relevant national and international legislation and agreements.

| Evaluative Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|---|---|--|---|
| Is the timing /length of the project sufficient to achieve Project expected outcomes? | | | |
| <p>Risk Assessment and Management</p> <p>How have and are risks and is risk mitigation managed?</p> <p>How well were the project risks, assumptions and impact drivers managed? i.e... was there a risk assessment undertaken?</p> <p>Assess the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient or not? Are they institutionalized for future learning and cooperation?</p> <p>Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?</p> | <p>Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design</p> <p>Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues</p> <p>Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed</p> | <p>Project documents</p> <p>UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders</p> | <p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p> |
| <p>Linkages /Synergies /Value Added</p> <p>Does the UNDP EU funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors?</p> <p>How UNDP EU does funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors?</p> <p>Is there coordination and complementarity between donors corporate objectives and implementation frameworks.</p> | <p>Degree to which the project was coherent and complementary to other relevant activities nationally and regionally</p> | <p>Documents from other donor supported activities</p> <p>Other donor representatives</p> <p>Project documents</p> | <p>Documents analyses</p> <p>Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders</p> |
| <p>Replication approach</p> <p>Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences, strengthen capacities for other similar projects in the future?</p> <p>Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?</p> | <p>Documents, existence of workshops and evaluation reports detailing experience for scale up to other three countries?</p> | <p>Data collected throughout evaluation</p> | <p>Data analysis</p> |
| <p>UNDPs Comparative advantage</p> <p>Why is UNDP a good partner for this initiative regionally and nationally? Programme of measure are a case in point i.e. capacity strengthening work can be reinforced.</p> | <p>Is UNDP a neutral convener or no - capacity building approach – is the this work owned by the commission – UNDP is building capacity of national institutions and experts to deliver the results - UNDPs neutrality for partnerships - politicians are replaced by experts.</p> <p>i.e. The diagnostic report on monitoring of black seas is a far reaching target for environmental results as it conducted assessment of environmental monitoring in each country useful for basis for improving general environmental monitoring systems which will</p> | | |

| Evaluative Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|---|--|---|---|
| | inherently improve development /environmental outcomes in countries. TDA SAP –Bridge between EU and on similar work of GEF. | | |
| Effectiveness – Efficiency Project Implementation / Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented for results including cost-effectively, with ability for course correction and to adapt to changing circumstances /conditions i.e. conflict and in line with local capacities needs and gaps is a good example? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation? | | | |
| Project Governance / Management Arrangements Has the project management and governance been adequate and or effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives? Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? | See indicators in project document results framework and log frame. Regional programme changed or been realigned. | Project documents Project team and relevant stakeholders Data reported in project reports | Document analysis Interviews |
| Adaptive management /Capacity Building approach Has this project built in mechanisms for adaptive management and consider adaptive management as an expected result in and of itself (for marine ecosystems management) imbedded in this project results. How is the national capacity being strengthened for sustaining the project results? | Project design and monitoring approach National capacity building approach for adaptive ecosystem integrated resources management. Precautionary principle Risk assessment Review the Regional programme monitoring frameworks and processes Interviews with Regional programme staff –Has project made room for course correction in the event of events impacting on original strategy. | Project documents National policies and strategies Key project Partners. | |
| Human Resources Operational Implementation Is HR sufficient for the fiduciary and technical oversight and the IWRM Monitoring systems projects substantive implementation? Has the project the correct mix of technical vs managerial inputs for implementation and results | Assess HR per expected results Assess HR per operational implementation requirements. | Project documents National policies and strategies Key project Partners. | |
| Financial Arrangements (Efficiency/cost effectiveness) Timely and transparent information on available funds Timely disbursements | Assess delivery against what was planned Interviews Document analysis | Ministries, partners and or Local Governments, RTU Receiving agents: Local governments | Data collected throughout the evaluation Data analysis |

| Evaluative Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>Correspondence between information on funds, released and received amounts</p> <p>Well defined (and respected) payment triggers.</p> <p>Relation to other (government) funds</p> <p>How effectively have funds from the project been transferred to local implementing partners or governments</p> | | Association of NGOs | |
| <p>Monitoring and Evaluation</p> <p>Has a project monitoring and Evaluation plan been designed and adhered to? Is it sufficient or does it need to be amended for second phase?</p> | <p>Interviews</p> <p>Document analysis</p> | <p>Project documents</p> <p>National policies and strategies</p> <p>Key project Partners.</p> | <p>Document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, and interviews with stakeholders, etc</p> |
| <p>Partnerships Arrangements</p> <p>Has the Implementation of the project been inclusive of relevant partner stakeholders?</p> <p>Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners.</p> <p>Examples of supported partnerships</p> <p>Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</p> <p>Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</p> <p>Proportion of expertise utilized from management inputs international experts compared to national experts</p> <p>Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity</p> | <p>Assess the approach for capacity building – the technical results and the ability to engage in real cooperation between countries. Ask if <i>there is consideration of a knowledge network to support ongoing monitoring system or to support implementation.</i></p> | | |
| EFFICIENCY | | | |
| <p><i>UNDP financial support and oversight for implementation</i></p> <p>Was project support provided by UNDP in an efficient way? I.e. steps for transactions reduced or rationalized etc.</p> <p>Was adequate adaptive management in place to ensure efficient resource use?</p> <p>Did the project logical framework and work plans enable changes made to them for use as a management tool during implementation?</p> | <p>Availability and quality of financial and progress reports</p> <p>Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided</p> <p>Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</p> <p>Planned vs. actual funds leveraged</p> <p>Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations</p> | <p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>UNDP</p> <p>Project team</p> | <p>Document analysis</p> <p>Key interviews</p> |

| Evaluative Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Were accounting and financial systems in place and adequate for good project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?</p> <p>Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</p> <p>Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)?</p> <p>Did the leveraging of funds (co -financing) if relevant happen as planned?</p> <p>Were financial resources utilized efficiently?</p> <p>Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?</p> | <p>Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost</p> <p>Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)</p> <p>Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency</p> | | |
| <p><i>Cost effectiveness</i></p> <p>How cost effective and efficient are the partnership implementation arrangements – consider the transaction costs of project monitoring and results?</p> <p>To what extent have partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations /governments /CSO/PS been encouraged and supported?</p> <p>Describe the actual partnerships/linkages facilitated? Which ones are considered sustainable? Why?</p> <p>What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? Which methods were successful or not and why</p> <p>Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity during implementation?</p> <p>Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise and local capacities?</p> <p>Did the project taken into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?</p> <p>Was effective communications and collaboration between institutions made responsible for implementing the project?</p> <p>How effectively has project management implemented the work plans / updated plans to match modified conditions?</p> | <p>Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners.</p> <p>Examples of supported partnerships</p> <p>Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</p> <p>Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</p> <p>Proportion of expertise utilized from management inputs international experts compared to national experts</p> <p>Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity</p> <p>Cost effectiveness analysis</p> | <p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>Project partners and relevant stakeholders</p> <p>Project documents and Evaluations</p> <p>UNDP</p> <p>Beneficiaries</p> <p>Data collected throughout evaluation</p> <p>Programme reports, Work plans</p> <p>PMU</p> <p>NGO</p> | <p>Document Analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Data analysis</p> <p>Document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, and interviews with stakeholders, etc.</p> |

| Evaluative Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Achievements against targets (as set-out in the ProDoc and in the modified work plans if any)?</p> <p>How did project achieve efficiency and what lessons can be learnt from implementation regarding efficiency and effectiveness?</p> <p>Rate of delivery based on original project plan and on the annual work plans?</p> <p>How the project could more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc...)?</p> <p>What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?</p> | | | |
| Project Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far (include Log frame assessment) | | | |
| <p>Has two project main objectives been met?</p> <p>1. Improve availability and quality of data on the chemical and biological status of the Black Sea, in line with expected MSFD and Black Sea Strategic Action Plan needs;</p> <p>2. Improve partner countries' ability to perform marine environmental monitoring along MSFD principles, taking into account Black Sea Diagnostic Report.</p> | | <p>Project documents</p> <p>National policies and strategies</p> <p>Key project Partners.</p> | <p>Document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, and interviews with stakeholders, etc.</p> |
| <p>Has there been improvement /change in improvement of availability and quality of chemical and biological data to provide for integrated assessments of the Black Sea state of environment, including pressures and impacts</p> <p><i>Baseline: National monitoring systems are existing, additional technical assistance support for amendment to the relevant water legislation and administrative reforms is needed</i></p> <p><i>Indicators: Level of involvement of national organizations responsible for monitoring</i></p> | <p><i>Targets:</i></p> <p><i>Y1: Review on status of monitoring systems and assessment tools, gap analysis for each country</i></p> <p><i>Y1: Recommendations for the further development of monitoring systems and tools for each country</i></p> | <p>Project Activity 1: Review of the national monitoring systems and tools for assessing data obtained from monitoring activities</p> | <p>Document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, and interviews with stakeholders, etc.</p> |
| <p><i>Does project support implementation of Bucharest convention and other agreements, EU Marine Strategy</i></p> <p><i>Indicators: Availability of further developed compliance indicators and indicator based reporting aimed at strengthening the Bucharest Convention implementation;</i></p> | <p><i>Targets:</i></p> <p><i>Y1: Indicator based reporting indicator-based reporting scheme developed</i></p> | <p>Project Activity 2: Support to implementation of countries obligations under the Bucharest and other related Conventions and Agreements</p> | <p>Document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, and interviews with</p> |

| Evaluative Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|---|--|---|---|
| <i>Support provided to development of knowledge-based adaptive management and harmonization of approaches to environment protection</i> | <i>Y2: Support provided to the countries in harmonization of national policies, including common understanding of water quality</i> | | project stakeholders, etc. |
| <i>Has project supported a revision of national monitoring programmers are existing,; results from Project Activity 1 available, Indicators: Revised monitoring Programmes and developed/updated relevant guidelines</i> | <i>Targets: Y1: Recommendations for revision & extension of national monitoring Programmed, including parameters, monitoring network sites Y2:Guidelines for biological monitoring developed</i> | Project Activity 3: Development of cost-effective and harmonised biological and chemical monitoring Programmes in accordance with reporting obligations under multilateral environmental agreements, the WFD and the MSFD | Document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, and interviews with stakeholders, etc |
| <i>Has project made an assessment of regional networks technical capacities for monitoring Balc Sea? Network of Black Sea reference laboratories exists, assessment of their technical capacities is needed Indicators: Needs for laboratory infrastructure/equipment and training assessed</i> | <i>Targets: Y1: Analysis report on available equipment and needs and training necessities Y2: Recommendations to improve the efficient use of equipment and database on equipment availability</i> | Project Activity 4: Assessment of needs regarding laboratory infrastructure, equipment, and training, promotion of the recommendations | Document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, and interviews with stakeholders, etc |
| <i>Hass project provided sufficient capacity strengthening to existing Network of Black Sea reference laboratories that exists? Indicators: Strengthening the capacities of national reference laboratories, in terms of staff and methodologies; Monitoring-related training Programme elaborated and initial implementation started</i> | <i>Targets: Y1: Training Programme & material prepared, SOPs and QA/QC manuals Y2: Trainings organized and capacities of Laboratories strengthened</i> | Project Activity 5: Elaboration and implementation of the comprehensive training Programme on monitoring methods and quality assurance aiming at adhering to ISO 17025 standard, promotion | Document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, and interviews with stakeholders, etc. |
| <i>Has project help develop methodologies and plan Joint surveys that already exist and is being planned under other EU funded projects Indicators: Available methodology for Survey, including the list of parameters and sites.</i> | <i>Targets: Y1: Methodology for Black Sea survey developed, including the list of parameters, sites, and an outline for cooperation with joint surveys planned under another EU projects</i> | Project Activity 6: Prepare methodology for Joint Black Sea Surveys | Document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, and interviews with stakeholders, etc |

| Evaluative Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|---|---|--|---|
| <p><i>Has project supported web based system for Black Sea Water Quality database but not as web-based system</i></p> <p><i>Indicators:: Improvement of the Black Sea Water Quality database, Phytoplankton and Mnemiopsis components of BSIS</i></p> | <p>Targets</p> <p><i>Y1: Concept for Web-Based Database agreed, Programme and web portal tested</i></p> <p><i>Y2: Guidelines for the database use and data upload, concept for the long-term maintenance</i></p> | <p>Project Activity 7: Development of the web-based Black Sea Water Quality Database prototype</p> | <p>Document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, and interviews with stakeholders, etc</p> |
| Sustainability: How do the objectives of project relate to the objectives of EU/UNDP, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, National and national levels for sustainable Black Sea Monitoring System? | | | |
| <p>Is the project financial, politically and socially sustainable?</p> <p>Has the project been conducive to improved efficiency of ecosystems service delivery and infrastructure maintenance by Government, NGOs and or user groups?</p> <p>How will stakeholder be empowered (legal, technical and economic capacity) to maintain the project results and services?</p> <p>Does the project have an exit strategy? Yes Emblas 2 but will need to consider sustainable in EMBLAS 2.</p> <p>To what extent is biodiversity monitoring and integrated water resources management processes fully embedded (owned) at the local government LG level?</p> <p>Are stakeholder groups (legal, technical and economic capacity) empowered to access additional funding?</p> | <p>Evidence of sources of revenue to maintain the results of the interventions (user fees/ national budgets)</p> <p>Full integration of funds into local budgets</p> <p>National Treasury transfers</p> <p>Private-public partnerships, municipal bonds</p> <p>Evidence of planning, programming, funding and timely implementation of maintenance of infrastructure to maintain the system.</p> <p>Evidence of use of local sources of financing to maintain the results of the interventions (e.g. user fees)</p> <p>Evidence of active involvement of user groups in planning and management?</p> <p>Evidence of significant initiatives taken by NGOs after the intervention</p> <p>Evidence of government capacity to tap on other resources: pooled funds, private-public partnership, national transfers</p> | <p>Document analysis</p> <p>Observation on local budgets processes and revenue statistics</p> <p>Unit costs compared to other providers</p> <p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Budgeting, monitoring & planning document analysis</p> | <p>Ministry of Finance</p> |
| <p>Is the continued involvement of NGOs and local actors in planning and implementation likely?</p> | <p>Evidence of local actors engaged in the local management process after the intervention</p> <p>Improved working relations with service providers, institutions and citizens.</p> <p>Any pilot sites ?</p> | <p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p> | |

Questionnaire

Instructions: Please provide answers generally around the subject header - using guiding questions provided (give examples when possible), not all questions need to be responded. Be as brief or detailed as you wish / Submit by April 10, 2015 to shodge1@gmail.com

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| <p>Relevance/Effectiveness To what extent has the project been designed appropriately and strategy relevant to regional priorities, include assessment of regional and country ownership, risk assessment, replication approach, linkages (sustainability) and the best route towards expected results (Goal and objectives - Goal - Improve protection of the Black sea environment -Objectives - 1. improve availability and quality of data on the chemical and biological status of the black sea in line with MSFD and BSSAP and 2. to improve partners countries abilities to perform environmental monitoring along with MTSD principles, taking into account the BSDR)?</p> | |
| | <i>Comments /answers</i> |
| <p><i>Project Strategy</i></p> <p>Is project aligned with the international, multi-lateral, regional and national environmental conventions, laws and policies? Is the project relevant to EU and UNDP outcome goals?</p> <p>Multilateral Environment Agreements (UNFCCC, UNCCD, UNCBD), MSFD, WFD</p> <p>Does the design support international, regional and national conventions objectives in particular those dealing with international waters, biodiversity and climate change coastal zone adaptation?</p> <p>Does the design support the UNDP and EU marine water focal areas</p> <p>Is the project design relevant to the BSC member countries environmental monitoring and sustainable development objectives/strategic plans capacities to implement and or mandate?</p> <p>Does the design take into account previous activities concerning monitoring of the Black Sea i</p> | |
| <p><i>Regional / Country Ownership Assessment</i></p> <p>Does design adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional capacity needs and policy?</p> <p>Does the project reinforce or support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Country? Is this project Country- driven?</p> | |
| <p><i>Project Formulation</i></p> <p>What was the level of stakeholder participation in this projects design and implementation? Consider how this project has influenced EMBLAS 2 design.</p> <p>Give your assessment of the level of stakeholder participation in design and implementation?</p> <p>Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and Implementation?</p> | |
| <p><i>Stakeholder participation</i></p> <p>Is the project design addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the international, national and local areas?</p> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| How does the project support the priority development needs of relevant stakeholders? Are there an adequate mix of technical, NGO/CSO/private sector (public advocacy role and also role in monitoring i.e..ppp) and government institutions in place? | |
| <i>Logical Framework</i> Is the project design coherent and logical? Are there Logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of Resources etc)? Is the timing /length of the project sufficient to achieve Project expected outcomes? | |
| <i>Risk Management and Project Assumptions</i> How project are risks being managed? How well were the project risks, assumptions and impact drivers managed? i.e... was there a risk assessment undertaken? Assess the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient or not? Are they institutionalized for future learning and cooperation? Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project? | |
| <i>Linkages /Synergies /Value Added</i> Does the UNDP EU funding support activities and objectives that are not addressed by other donors? How UNDP EU does funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors? Is there coordination and complementarily between donors corporate objectives and implementation frameworks. | |
| <i>Replication approach</i> Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences, strengthen capacities for other similar projects in the future? Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives? | |
| <i>UNDPs Comparative advantage</i> Why do you think UNDP a good partner for this initiative regionally and nationally? Programme of measure are a case in point i.e. capacity strengthening work can be reinforced. | |
| Effectiveness – Efficiency Project Implementation / Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented for results including cost-effectively, with ability for course correction and to adapt to changing circumstances /conditions i.e. conflict and in line with local capacities needs and gaps is a good example? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation? | |
| <i>Project Governance Arrangements</i> Has the project governance arrangements been adequate and or effective in supporting the achievement of the expected outcomes and objectives? Why or Why Not? | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>Project Management Arrangements/Approaches</i></p> <p>Has the project management arrangements been sufficient and effective in supporting the steering committee for achieving its expected outcomes?</p> <p>Has the project management employed innovation as a working modality? Could this be improved? How?</p> <p>Has the project management been engaged in strategic knowledge management and communications for results? How or how can this be improved?</p> <p>The project management team is spread out across several localities does this work or what can be improved?</p> | |
| <p><i>Adaptive management /Capacity Building approach</i></p> <p>Has this project built in mechanisms for adaptive management and consider adaptive management as an expected result in and of itself (for marine ecosystems management) imbedded in this project results.</p> <p>How is the national capacity being strengthened with regards to sustaining the project results?</p> <p>Is the location of the project most suitable given the circumstances and recent developments between Ukraine and Russia?</p> | |
| <p><i>Human Resources (HR)</i></p> <p>Operational Implementation</p> <p>Is/ has HR been sufficient for the fiduciary and technical oversight and the project substantive implementation?</p> <p>Has the project the correct mix of technical vs managerial inputs for implementation and results? Provide some comments on technical capacities in the project team. What technical areas can be augmented for the second phase?</p> | |
| <p><i>Financial Arrangements (Efficiency/cost effectiveness)</i></p> <p>Timely and transparent information on available funds Yes /No?</p> <p>Timely disbursements</p> <p>Changes in political situation and how this has impacted the exchange rates and overall funding for activities?</p> <p>Do you have evidence to share on correspondence between information on funds, released and received amounts</p> <p>Discuss any defined (and respected) payment triggers.</p> <p>Relation to other (government) funds</p> <p>How effectively have funds from the project been transferred to local implementing partners or governments?</p> | |
| <p><i>Monitoring and Evaluation</i></p> <p>Has a project monitoring and evaluation plan been designed and adhered? Is it sufficient or does it need to be amended for second phase?</p> <p>Is there a structured system in place? Should there be changes for future monitoring?</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Partnerships Arrangements</p> <p>Who are the key partner and have they been adjusted based on needs and sustainability?</p> <p>Has the Implementation of the project been inclusive of the relevant partner stakeholders?</p> <p>Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners.</p> <p>Examples of supported partnerships</p> <p>Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</p> <p>Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</p> <p>Proportion of expertise utilized from management inputs international experts compared to national experts</p> <p>Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity</p> | |
| Efficiency - Cost effectiveness | |
| <p>UNDP financial support and oversight for implementation</p> <p>Was project support provided by UNDP in an efficient way? I.e. steps for transactions reduced or rationalized etc.</p> <p>Was adequate adaptive management in place to ensure efficient resource use?</p> <p>Did the project logical framework and work plans enable changes made to them for use as a management tool during implementation?</p> <p>Were the accounting and financial systems in place and adequate for good project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?</p> <p>Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</p> <p>Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)?</p> <p>Did the leveraging of funds (co -financing) if relevant happen as planned?</p> <p>Were financial resources utilized efficiently?</p> <p>Could financial resources have been used more efficiently</p> <p>Has the project sufficiently employed innovation for results and sustainability?</p> | |
| <p>Cost effectiveness</p> <p>How cost effective and efficient are the partnership implementation arrangements – consider the transaction costs of project monitoring and results?</p> <p>To what extent have partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations /governments /CSO/PS been encouraged and supported?</p> <p>Describe the actual partnerships/linkages facilitated? Which ones are considered sustainable? Why?</p> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? Which methods were successful or not and why</p> <p>Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity during implementation?</p> <p>Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise and local capacities?</p> <p>Did the project taken into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?</p> <p>Was effective communications and collaboration between institutions made responsible for implementing the project?</p> <p>How effectively has project management implemented the work plans / updated plans to match modified conditions?</p> <p>Achievements against targets (as set-out in the ProDoc and in the modified work plans if any)?</p> <p>How did project achieve efficiency and what lessons can be learnt from implementation regarding efficiency in relation to effectiveness?</p> <p>Rate of delivery based on original project plan and on the annual work plans?</p> <p>How the project could more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc...)?</p> <p>What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?</p> | |
| Results: Effectiveness - To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far (include Log frame assessment) | |
| <p>Has two project main objectives been met?</p> <p>1. Improve availability and quality of data on the chemical and biological status of the Black Sea, in line with expected MSFD and Black Sea Strategic Action Plan needs;</p> <p>2. Improve partner countries' ability to perform marine environmental monitoring along MSFD principles, taking into account Black Sea Diagnostic Report.</p> | |
| <p>Has there been improvement /change in improvement of availability and quality of chemical and biological data to provide for integrated assessments of the Black Sea state of environment, including pressures and impacts</p> <p>Baseline: National monitoring systems are existing, additional technical assistance support for amendment to the relevant water legislation and administrative reforms is needed</p> <p>Indicators: Level of involvement of national organizations responsible for monitoring</p> | |
| <p>Does project support implementation of Bucharest convention and other agreements, EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive</p> <p>Indicators: Availability of further developed compliance indicators and indicator based reporting aimed at strengthening the Bucharest Convention implementation;</p> <p>Support provided to development of knowledge-based adaptive management and harmonization of approaches to environment protection</p> | |

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Has project supported a revision of national monitoring programmes are existing;; results from Project Activity 1 available, Indicators: Revised monitoring Programmes and developed/updated relevant guidelines | |
| Has project made an assessment of regional networks technical capacities for monitoring Black Sea? Network of Black Sea reference laboratories exists, assessment of their technical capacities is needed Indicators: Needs for laboratory infrastructure/equipment and training assessed | |
| Has project provided sufficient capacity strengthening to existing Network of Black Sea reference laboratories that exists? Indicators: Strengthening the capacities of national reference laboratories, in terms of staff and methodologies; Monitoring-related training Programme elaborated and initial implementation started | |
| Has project help develop methodologies and plan Joint surveys that already exist and is being planned under other EU funded projects Indicators: Available methodology for Survey, including the list of parameters and sites. | |
| Has project supported web based system for Black Sea Water Quality database but not as web-based system Indicators: Improvement of the Black Sea Water Quality database, Phytoplankton and Mnemiopsis components of BSIS? | |
| Sustainability –Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness | |
| Is the project financial, politically and socially sustainable? Why or Why not? Evidence? Has the project been conducive to improved efficiency of ecosystems service delivery and infrastructure maintenance by Government, NGOs and or user groups? How will stakeholder be empowered (legal, technical and economic capacity) to maintain the project results and services? Does the project have an exit strategy? Yes Emblas 2 but will need to consider sustainable in EMBLAS 2. To what extent is biodiversity monitoring and integrated water resources management processes fully embedded (owned) at the local government LG level? Are stakeholder groups (legal, technical and economic capacity) empowered to access additional funding? | |
| Is the continued involvement of NGOs and local actors in planning and implementation likely? | |
| Lessons Learned | |
| What are the key lessons emerging from this project? In terms of the uniqueness of its Design, Implementation and approach, and Results. | Design Implementation Results |

ANNEX 4 – List of Persons Interviewed

| Country | Post | Expert name | Country / organization | Present at the meetings |
|---------|---|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | |
| Ukraine | National focal point | Tarasova Oksana | NFP | Yes |
| Russia | National focal point Expert for Monitoring, QA/QC and DQC in Russia | Korshenko Aleksandr | NFP | Y |
| Georgia | National focal point | Arabidze Marine | NFP | Y |
| Crimea | Expert for Monitoring and Data Management in Ukraine | Konovalov Sergei | MHI | Y |
| Crimea | Expert for Databases/Data Management and Satellite Monitoring in Ukraine | Stanichniy Sergei | MHI | N |
| Crimea | Expert for Monitoring and Databases/Data Management in Ukraine | Godin Eugen | MHI | N |
| Crimea | Expert for Quality Assurance/Quality Control in Monitoring, DQC, Databases and Data Management in Ukraine | Khaliulin Aleksandr | MHI | N |
| Ukraine | Expert for Data/Information Reporting Needs, DQC, Database and Data Management in Ukraine | Lisovsky Richard | UkrSCES | N |
| Ukraine | Expert on Monitoring and Data Management in Ukraine II | Denga Yuri | UkrSCES | Y |
| Russia | Expert on Data Collection and Management in Russia | Alyautdinov A. | SOI | N |
| Russia | National Expert on Monitoring and Data Management in RU – II | Mikaelyan A. | SIO-RAS | N |
| Russia | National Expert on Monitoring and Data Management in Russia | Shiganova Tamara | SIO-RAS | Y |
| Intl. | Project Technical Advisor | Velikova Violeta | | N |
| Intl. | EMBLAS II Team Leader | Slobodnik Jaroslav | | Y |
| Georgia | Legal expert for Georgia | Sharabidze Merab | | N |
| Ukraine | Legal expert for Ukraine | Karamushka Victor | | N |
| Russia | Legal expert for Russia | Krutov Anatoly | | N |

| | | | |
|-------|---|-------------------|------------------------|
| UNDP | Senior Program Coordinator | Panova Elena | UNDP Istanbul Reg. Hub |
| UNDP | Programme Monitoring Associate | Kihtir Pelin | UNDP Istanbul Reg. Hub |
| UNDP | Regional Tech. Advisor for Intl. Waters | Mamaev Vladimir | UNDP Istanbul Reg. Hub |
| UNNDP | Water and Sanitation Program Analyst | Fabianova Marcela | UNDP Istanbul Reg. Hub |

ANNEX 5- List of Documents Reviewed

- Marine Framework Strategy Directive
- Water Framework Directive
- Risk Assessment (prepared by UNDP upon request by EC)
- Progress report Jan – Dec 2013 (main report)
- List of stakeholders (anx to PR)
- Dissemination plan (anx to PR)
- Project leaflet
- Project newsletter
- Inception report (anx to PR)
- PA3 - Template for Revised Monitoring Programs
- Proposal for Revised Monitoring Program (Example – Georgia) – Project Activity 3
- Minutes from the last Steering Committee meeting
- Minutes from the Project Partner meeting
- UNDP Project Document – Phase 1
- Description of Action (anx to prodoc + part of the EC contribution agreement)
- EC contribution agreement + amendment
- LPAC and PPC meeting minutes (Phase 1)
- UNDP Project Document – Phase 2
- Description of Action – Phase 2
- FAFA – Framework agreement between UN and EC on project implementation
- Terms of Reference – initial for the full project (as per tender documentation in 2011)

ANNEX 6 – Existing Framework for International Regional Cooperation (MISIS Project Brochure)

By reason of the Trans boundary nature of the marine environment, coastal states realized that only through cooperation and coordination of their activities and developing and implementing common marine programs could ensure success of the rehabilitation and preservation of the Black Sea ecosystem. Thus, all six Black Sea countries signed in Bucharest, in April 1992, the Convention on the Protection of the Black Sea against Pollution (the Bucharest Convention), ratified by all six Black Sea countries in early 1994. The signing of Bucharest Convention, followed closely by the first Black Sea Ministerial Declaration (the Odessa Declaration) in 1993, inspired the GEF to support the region in implementing the Odessa Declaration and to formulate the longer-term Black Sea Strategic Action Plan (BS SAP). The 1996 BS SAP was a groundbreaking document for the Black Sea region which established specific targets and timetables for implementing the objectives of the 1992 Bucharest Convention.

The 2009 BS SAP has been formulated through careful consideration of inter alia the 1996 SAP, the "The Bucharest Convention provided the legal basis for cooperation of the BS countries in protecting the Black Sea" 2007 BS TDA and the 2007 BS SAP Gap Analysis. It aims to help resolve the trans boundary environmental problems of the Black Sea and is a joint effort between the six Black Sea countries. In implementation of the Convention the Black Sea Commission (BSC) was established, which provided the basis for proper marine monitoring via an integrated monitoring and assessment program for the Black Sea region (BSIMAP). The collection of data/information under the umbrella of the Bucharest Convention started in 2001. Presently the Black Sea Information System (BSIS) and Black Sea Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Program (BSIMAP) have the purpose to provide reliable and consolidated data for "state of environment" reporting, "impact assessment" of major pollutant sources, "trans boundary diagnostic analysis" and Strategic Action Plan.

Implementation reports in view of decision-making needs in the Black Sea region. Later on a number of international, European and regional legislative documents entered into force. They also require monitoring, controlling and reducing pressures and impacts on the Black Sea environment. One of them - Water Framework Directive (EC WFD) - establishes a framework for Community action in the field of water policy, which should "contribute to the progressive reduction of emissions of hazardous substances to water" with the ultimate aim "to achieve the elimination of priority hazardous substances (PHS) and contribute to achieving concentrations in the marine environment near background values for naturally occurring substances". The WFD postulates achieving Good Ecological status of marine coastal environment by 2015. Another two EC Directives - Birds Directive and Habitat Directive – are related to wildlife and nature conservation, including marine ones.

The Council Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds (Birds Directive) was adopted in November 2009. Replacing the Council Directive 79/409/EEC of 2 April 1979, this new Directive contains the most up to date annexes, adapted on a number of occasions in response to scientific and technical progress and to the successive enlargements of the European Union, including the accession of Bulgaria and Romania. The Directive recognizes that habitat loss and degradation are the most serious threats to the conservation of wild birds. It therefore places great emphasis on the protection of habitats for endangered as well as migratory species, especially through the establishment of a coherent network of Special Protection Areas (SPAs) comprising all the most suitable territories for these species. Since 1994 all SPAs form an integral part of the NATURA 2000 ecological network.

The Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (Habitats Directive), adopted in 1992, fostered the setting up of a network of Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), which together with the existing SPAs form a network of protected sites across the European Union called NATURA 2000.

Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) Three important reports produced by the Black Sea Commission, among them State of the environment of the Black Sea (2001-2006/7), recognized that the restoration of the ecosystem is a long-lasting process that depends on the accomplishment of the conservation, protection and related management measures both at national and regional level. Moreover, this study indicated some gaps in our knowledge due to the lack of sufficiently comprehensive monitoring data. For all EU Seas, even though the European Commission appreciated that progress had been made in certain areas, e.g. in reducing nutrient inputs or pollution from hazardous substances, in particular inorganic trace elements (heavy metals), it was also clear that the state of the marine environment had been significantly deteriorating over recent decades (European Commission, 2005) and that the existing policy framework had not delivered the high level of protection of the marine environment that was expected.

After a long development and approval process, the European Commission issued a new Directive establishing a Framework for Community Action in the field of Marine Environmental Policy. On June, 17 2008, the **Marine Strategy Framework Directive or MSFD (Directive 2008/56/EC)** was adopted aiming to install a strong, integrated EU policy on marine protection in order to achieve a good environmental status of marine ecosystems by the year 2020 at the latest.

Therefore, in conformity with the provisions of this Directive, each Member State is to *develop proper marine strategy for its marine waters in accordance with the plan of action*. First step consists of an *initial Assessment of their marine waters, taking into account existing data (Chapter II: Art. 8)*. By reference to the initial assessment, the next steps are: 1/ the determination of a set of characteristics for good environmental status (Article 9), 2/ the establishing a comprehensive set of environmental targets and associated indicators for their marine waters so as to guide progress towards achieving good environmental status in the marine environment (Article 10), and 3/ the establishing and implement Coordinated monitoring programs for the ongoing assessment of the environmental status of their marine waters (Article 11).

ANNEX 7 – Who is Who in Project –March 2015

Vladmir Mamaev – UNDP Regional Technical Advisor for Intl. Waters, he is seated in Istanbul – UNDP Regional Hub. His role in the project is an overall oversight. He is not doing the management of the project, he is providing some strategic advises if needed. He is also a member of the Steering Committee.

Vasiliy Kostitushin – UNDP Project Manager – responsible for a daily management of the project. He is seated in the project office in Odessa.

Violeta Velikova – Technical Advisor of the project – dealing primarily with the substantive part of the project, but also supporting coordination of the project.

Lilia Spasova – Project assistant, located in Odessa.

Oksana Tarasova – National Focal Point (NFP) for Ukraine

Alexander Korshenko – National Focal Point for Russia

Marine Arabidze – National Focal Point for Georgia

In short, the role of NFP in the project is to support the project implementation at the national level, liaise with the relevant environmental ministry and in particular the national Black Sea Commissioner, closely cooperate with the project manager, all other relevant national experts, partner organizations, other key national stakeholders and support dissemination of information about the project results and support visibility of the project at national level.

Marcela Fabianova – UNDP Water Program Analyst – dealing with formal part of the project, particularly reporting towards EC and at UNDP level, including procurement and recruitment.

Jaroslav Slobodnik – Team leader of the 2nd phase of the project.

Jarmila Makovinska – technical expert in the 2nd phase of the project.

The project has 10 Partners – 9 national and 1 international organizations. All national organizations are involved in the monitoring of water quality.

The international partner is the Black Sea Commission Permanent secretariat. At the same time the Black Sea Commission is the project beneficiary, and the Black Sea Commissioners from Russia, Ukraine and Georgia are the members of the Steering Committee.

Natalia Tretiakova – Black Sea Commissioner of Russia (sometimes Anatoly Krutov or Katia Antonidze are participating in meeting on her behalf)

Nino Tskhadadze (Ms.) – BS Commissioner of Georgia

Oleksandr Bon – BS Commissioner of Ukraine

Nino Antadze (Ms.) – UNDP Georgia, Team Leader of Energy & Environment Unit – member of the Steering Committee

Sergei Volkov – UNDP Ukraine, Head of Energy& Environment Unit – member of the Steering Committee

Laura Giappichelli – EC Project Manager, our project manager at EC level, member of the SC meeting

The Partner organizations are:

Marine Hydrophysical Institute (MHI) – Ukraine, Sevastopol (Crimea), represented by Sergei Konovalov. Sergei is at the same time one of the national experts. His colleagues Evgeni Godin and Alexander Khaliulin are working on the project as national experts as well.

Odessa National University I.I.Mechnikov (ONU) - Ukraine, Odessa, - represented by Vladimir Medinets. Olga Konareva is sometimes attending events on his behalf.

Ukrainian Scientific Center of Ecology of the Sea (UkrSCES) - Odessa, Ukraine – represented by Nikola Berlinsky, but the national experts working on the project are Yuri Denga and Richard Lisovski.

A.O.Kovalevskiy Institute of Biology of Southern Seas (IBSS) - Sevastopol, Ukraine (Crimea) – represented by Alexander Boltachev

Odessa Branch, Institute of Biology of the Southern Seas, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (OB-IBSS) – Ukraine, Odessa – represented by Borys Alexandrov

Iv.Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University (TSU) – Georgia, Tbilisi – represented by Kakha Bilashvili (Mr.)

National Environmental Agency “Black Sea Monitoring Center” (NEA) – Georgia, Tbilisi and Batumi – represented by Marine Arabidze, she is also the project National Focal Point

State Oceanographic Institute (SOI) – Russia, Moscow – represented by Alexander Korshenko and Alexander Postnov. Alexander Korshenko is also Russian national expert and project National Focal Point

P.P.Shirshov institute of oceanology Russian Academy of Sciences (SIO-RAS) - Russia, Moscow – represented by Tamara Shiganova and Aleksander Mikaelyan. Both are national experts in the project

Permanent Secretariat of the Black Sea Commission (BSC PS) – international, seated in Istanbul – represented by prof. Halil Ibrahim Sur and Irina Makarenko (she is PMA officer and mostly communicating with the project) and Kiril Iliev, who is also project expert in the phase 1 and phase 2.

ANNEX 8 – EMBLAS-I Meetings and Trainings

| # | Name of event | Dates | Q-ty of participants | Objective of the event | Outcomes |
|---|---|-----------------|----------------------|--|--|
| 1 | Inception workshop/1st Steering Committee Meeting (Odessa, Ukraine) | 10-11 June'2013 | 29 | To summarize the activities which have been undertaken in the frame of the inception phase and collect opinions of the participants in helping to steer directions the project should go in its implementation | Each activity of the project was reviewed and recommendations for further steps were incorporated into Inception report |
| 2 | EMBLAS experts Coordination Meeting (Batumi, Georgia) | 23-24 May'2014 | 28 | To focus on the EMBLAS I Project achievements and gaps in implementation | The work plan of the project for 2014 was discussed and where necessary accordingly adjusted and responsibilities of partners were re-visited |
| 3 | Workshop on Guidelines for biological monitoring (Zooplankton and Phytobenthos)- (Istanbul, Turkey) | 15-16 July'2014 | 17 | To facilitate revision/finalization of Guidelines for biological monitoring (for Zooplankton and Phytobenthos) | The Guidelines for Biological Monitoring were discussed by focus groups, it was agreed to finalize the activity by the end of the project in full |
| 4 | Training “Chemical Methods of Marine Environment Objects Analyses” (Batumi, Georgia) | 16-18 Sept'2014 | 24 | To study the methods of marine environment chemical monitoring and quality assurance/quality control, adhering to ISO 17025 standard | Practical exercises in sea water sampling, conservation methods, terms and conditions of samples storage were held in the first day of the Seminar. Hydro chemical analyses of marine water samples were performed in the laboratory of the Regional Department of Environmental Pollution Monitoring of the National Environment Agency of Georgia. Discussion was held with participants of the seminar and results obtained |

| # | Name of event | Dates | Q-ty of participants | Objective of the event | Outcomes |
|---|---|-------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| 5 | Joint Workshop on GES/monitoring revision (Istanbul, Turkey) | 01 October'2014 | 44 | To facilitate elaboration of Regional Water Quality (WQ)/GES Classification Methodology and testing in cooperation with the PMA AG | It was agreed that MISIS project will provide a List of Recommendations to BSC and based on this list BSC can continue finalizing the project's deliverables. Mr Boltachev offered to use Ichthyological monitoring as a part of activity of EMBLAS II. Mr B. Aleksandrov offered to use MES WATCH methodology in the monitoring of Black Sea biodiversity (to be considered in EMBLAS II). Mr V. Mamaev concluded that BSC should deposit all data related to Black Sea monitoring and share it with users |
| 6 | Joint Workshop BSC/EMBLAS on harmonization Black Sea standard chemistry/pollution research (Istanbul, Turkey) | 03 October'2014 | 14 | To work on harmonization of selected parameters sampling and processing | It was agreed that prior the field work under EMBLAS2, the Sampling Protocol is to be developed and observed during Pilots and JCs. The recommended SoPs and Guidelines for the BS region are to be used. Also it was a special proposal from Mr S. Konovalov agreed by others- to organize a special working group under EMBLAS-2 project with the following tasks: to analyze the reasons for differences in intercalibration results; to assess the testing biases; to give recommendations for unification of testing results (conversion factors where necessary to agree); to attend emerging needs and promote further harmonization. This proposal was appreciated and will be accounted in EMBLAS-2. |
| 7 | 2nd Steering Committee Meeting | 5 November'2014 | 19 | To focus on key decisions to be made regarding the project implementation (management, progress monitoring, budget approval, etc.) | SC approved a proposal for a 3 months no cost extension of the project until 31 March 2015, approved the work plan for the reminder of project, amended in order to fit the project's extension until 31 March 2015, approved the project budget for the reminder of project, amended in order to fit the project's extension until 31 March 2015, approved the proposal for a joint EU-UNDP evaluation of the project's results; agreed on the revision of the Description of Action for EMBLAS II. |
| 8 | EMBLAS I/II partner organisations/ experts coordination meeting (Istanbul, Turkey) | 5-6 November'2014 | 22 | To introduce the planned activities of the EMBLAS project 2nd phase. | This meeting showed linkages between the two phases, gave a back ground information to the Steering Committee for key decisions to be made regarding the project implementation. In addition, the |

| # | Name of event | Dates | Q-ty of participants | Objective of the event | Outcomes |
|----|---|------------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | new partners were involved to be able to get a brief insight on the project |
| 9 | Stakeholders Meeting (Tbilisi, Georgia) | 2 March'2015 | 28 | To discuss with stakeholders the proposed revision of Black Sea monitoring in Georgia, present other major EMBLAS I results, increase the project visibility, develop project ownership | The mutual dialogue with stakeholders in Georgia has taken place, main problems of the national monitoring and ways forward were discussed. Diagnostic Report (part 8) was disseminated among participants for clear understanding of the topic. |
| 10 | Stakeholders Meeting (Sochi, Russia) | 12-13 March'2015 | 56 | To discuss with stakeholders the proposed revision of Black Sea monitoring in Russia, present other major EMBLAS I results, increase the project visibility, develop project ownership | The mutual dialogue with stakeholders in Russia has taken place, main problems of the national monitoring and ways forward were discussed. Diagnostic Report (part 8) was disseminated among participants for clear understanding of the topic. |
| 11 | Stakeholders Meeting (Kiev, Ukraine) | 23-24 March'15 | 34 | To discuss with stakeholders the proposed revision of Black Sea monitoring in Ukraine, present other major EMBLAS I results, increase the project visibility, develop project ownership | The mutual dialogue with stakeholders in Ukraine has taken place, main problems of the national monitoring and ways forward were discussed. Diagnostic Report (part 8) was disseminated among participants for clear understanding of the topic. |
| 12 | CBD Advisory Group meeting (Istanbul, Turkey) | 31 March-01 April'2015 | 16 | To present the EMBLAS 1 products to CBD AG | The groups approved the „Black Sea Monitoring Guidelines“, „Phytoplankton Sampling and Analysis“, Guidelines for Quality Control of Biological data - phytoplankton“, „Manual or collection and treatment the soft-bottom macrozoobenthos samples“ for publication with ISBN number at BSC webpage. The groups recommended to continue the inter-comparison exercises initiated under the projects MISIS and EMBLAS for as many biological parameters as possible to ensure the harmonization of monitoring methodologies in the Black Sea region |

| # | Name of event | Dates | Q-ty of participants | Objective of the event | Outcomes |
|----|---|------------------|----------------------|--|---|
| 13 | PMA Advisory Group meeting (Istanbul, Turkey) | 02-03 April'2015 | 16 | To present the EMBLAS 1 products to PMA AG | The groups appreciated the information presented by Georgia on the BS NIEMAP developed under EMBLAS Project. The groups welcomed the information provided by EMBLAS Project at the organization of the Black Sea Surveys and Pilot Surveys. The groups agreed to share the experience with the EMBLAS Project and comment on the EMBLAS Black Sea Surveys methodology. The groups appreciated the web tool "The Black Sea Information System Prototype" developed within the EMBLAS Project and agreed to request the BSC PS to make the testing of the tool with PMA/LBS groups in June-July, 2015 and recommend the tool for consideration of the BSC. The groups supported further development of the Water Quality Database in UKRScES Odessa with the assistance of the EMBLAS Project; its extension for new modules accommodating all types of data collected within the EMBLAS surveys programme; implementation of the automated data quality check module as developed by the EAQC-WISE (EU FP6) project; harmonise the coding system of the BSC databases with that of the ICPDR's Water Quality Database. The groups encouraged the EMBLAS Project to test the use of new Data Collection Templates based on the guideline recommended by the DG ENV of the EC (IOW/INERIS, 2007) |

ANNEX 9 - Experts

Overview of experts working in EMBLAS I

| # | Country | Post | Expert name |
|----|---------|---|-----------------|
| | Ukraine | National focal point | Tarasova O. |
| | Russia | National focal point Expert for Monitoring, QA/QC and DQC in Russia | Korshenko A. |
| | Georgia | National focal point | Arabidze M. |
| | Ukraine | Expert for Monitoring and Data Management in Ukraine | Konovalov S. |
| | Ukraine | Expert for Databases/Data Management and Satellite Monitoring in Ukraine | Stanichniy S. |
| | Ukraine | Expert for Monitoring and Databases/Data Management in Ukraine | Godin E. |
| | Ukraine | Expert for Quality Assurance/Quality Control in Monitoring, DQC, Databases and Data Management in Ukraine | Khaliulin A. |
| | Ukraine | Expert for Data/Information Reporting Needs, DQC, Database and Data Management in Ukraine | Lisovsky R. |
| | Ukraine | Expert on Monitoring and Data Management in Ukraine II | Denga Yu. |
| 9 | Ukraine | National Expert on legislation/policy, governing Black Sea-related monitoring, in Ukraine | Karamushka V. |
| 15 | Ukraine | National Expert on legislation/policy, governing Black Sea-related monitoring, in Russia | Krutov A. |
| | Russia | Expert on Data Collection and Management in Russia | Alyautdinov A. |
| | Russia | National Expert on Monitoring and Data Management in RU - II | Mikaelyan A. |
| | Russia | National Expert on Monitoring and Data Management in RU | Shiganova T. |
| | Ukraine | Interpreter – editor for RU-ENG | Soltys I. |
| | Georgia | Expert on Georgian institutional policy and legislation | Sharabidze M. |
| | Georgia | Expert on Georgian environmental legislation | Makhuashvili E. |
| | Intl. | Expert for the development of the BS information system | Iliev K. |
| | Intl. | Technical Advisor for EU/UNDP Black Sea Project | Velikova V. |

ANNEX 10 – Status of Project Outputs - LOGFRAME

| PA | Name of deliverables. | Status / Date of finalization | Explanatory comments / PMU suggested next steps /recommendations | Evaluator comments |
|------|--|---------------------------------|---|---|
| PA 1 | Questionnaire (Part I and II) | completed (in 2013, early 2014) | The questionnaire was completed in Sept 2013, then it was filled in by stakeholders. No further steps are expected, the questionnaire was meant to help produce the DRII. | Completed – quality |
| PA 1 | List of Stakeholders (GE, RU, UA) | Completed (in 2013) | The list was actually finalized in late 2013, without consideration the Crimean change in the region. If Crimea is recognized as part of Russia, this list will be revised. So far, neither EC, nor UNDP recognize Crimea annexation, This is why revision of the list is not actually politically correct. | Completed. I did not see the active inclusion of user groups CBOs, NGOs or PS. I also did not see a strategy for process type results i.e. capacity development. |
| PA 1 | Diagnostic Report/Part I and II | Completed (in Feb 2015) | With delay according to the planning. The recommendations of this report should be handled and used in EMBLAS 2, both in work on monitoring, as well as in capacity building and harmonization issues. The DRII was a major piece of work, which will also become the basis for the EMBLAS 2 Monitoring Catalog (BSIS component). Experts working in EMBLAS 2 should have a good knowledge of the DRII and particularly the recommendations (Chapter 8). | Agree. This DRII must be a living working document... |
| PA 4 | Chapters in the Diagnostic Report on Infrastructure /equipment/ vessels (availability and needs) and needs in training | Completed (in 2014) | As for the other chapters of the DRII, these two should be carefully studied in EMBLAS 2. Check where sharing of IVE is possible, and use it in the EMBLAS 2 field work. The needs in training should be used to ensure proper capacity building. | This should be reflected in the projects capacity development plan. EMBLAS 1 must be guide by a clear overarching regional/ national/ local capacity development plan that takes into consideration three levels of capacity building, regional and national, and for dealing with key knowledge gaps identified in the report. |

| PA | Name of deliverables. | Status / Date of finalization | Explanatory comments / PMU suggested next steps /recommendations | Evaluator comments |
|------|--|--|--|---|
| PA 2 | Report on compliance indicators | Draft report is prepared, commented on but additional work is needed. | Need consensus and a better process for results, at the end the document will have a regional importance (not only for the project beneficiary countries). Substantial work is required to build the list of compliance indicators, basing it first of all on analysis of the BS SAP2009 indicators suitability, then proposing changes to them where needed. This should take into consideration the existing BSC AGs reporting and the capacity of the beneficiary countries to report on compliance or to foresee in EMBLAS 2 capacity building for incorporating newly proposed compliance indicators. | Can be revisited and completed in phase two. It should be consistent with national monitoring programmes. |
| PA 2 | Water Quality/GES Classification Methodology | Draft report is prepared, but has comments and additional work will be needed in EMBLAS (March 2015). | Various opinions on this document exist. The document should include a list of indicators, methods for their calculation and specification of monitoring to ensure for parameters used. The existing document is a compilation taken from the MSFD, while the BS region should also take into consideration the Bucharest Convention Ecosystem Quality Objectives, and try to group the WFD and MSFD indicators around them. A very practical document is needed in the region in order to produce assessments of BS status as well as to organize the WQ/GES database, which would calculate the GES indicators. | |
| PA 3 | Draft revised monitoring programmes | GE fully completed, UA and RU documents in draft versions, all to be taken over by EMBLAS 2 for finalization | These documents were not fully completed as initially intended. The monitoring programs were presented at stakeholder's consultation meeting. Further work is taken over by EMBLAS II. . As the monitoring programmes are not yet fully revised, this work will need a substantial effort to finalize the proposals on revision, have them agree upon at relevant level, and meanwhile to build pilots on them. The latter are meant to show how the revised monitoring can take place with the involvement of various organizations, seeking the best expertise, and building capacity in the | I have discussed this PA 3 substantively in the report. This work entails capacity building and intersect oral coordination on environment capacity building and mainstreaming This is strategic work for UNDP environment programmes and needs involvement of local UNDP country office .It can be linked to excellent programmes for future UNDP programmes nationally toward sustainable development and resilience goals. |

| PA | Name of deliverables. | Status / Date of finalization | Explanatory comments / PMU suggested next steps /recommendations | Evaluator comments |
|------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | beneficiary countries. The revision of monitoring is not meant to depend only on laboratories outside of the beneficiary countries, but EMBLAS 2 should build expertise in GE, RU and UA to ensure sustainability of the effort spent in the field of Black Sea monitoring. | |
| PA 3 | Electronic publication of regional guidelines (biological monitoring) on the web page of the project and if possible on the BSC web page as well | Finalized in March 2015: final formatting needed. | Publication at the BSC PS is next step after adoption of the guidelines by the BSC. By written procedure, first the AGs will endorse, then submit to the BSC and, after approval by the BSC, it can be published. EMBLAS 2 should deal with the finalization of guidelines for Macrozooplankton and Microphytobenthos. In addition, the already agreed guidelines (mesozooplankton and microzooplankton) should pass through a regional consultation, and then be delivered to the BSC for adoption as regional documents (with publication on the BSC web page). | Agreed. |
| PA 5 | Training Program | Completed (in 2014) | The training programmer was built on the basis of DRII, and it is only for chemistry. The training programme should be further developed in EMBLAS2, in its existing part (chemistry) and in the field of biology. | Training must be linked to a capacity development strategy .It needs carefully technical planning. This area needs technical assistance; regional and national institutional capacity development t. It can be linked to the national monitoring programmes that touch on cross-sector coordination at the national level. |
| PA 5 | Materials for trainings (as per training conducted if more than one training is organized) | Completed (in 2014) | These are the supporting materials of the single EMBLAS 1 training, which was organized in Batumi, Sept. 2014. This can be seen as a pilot training activity in the region The materials need wider distribution in the region, attracting attention to their usefulness. The web page of EMBLAS 1 is not much visited, visibility of project results need to be strengthened in EMBLAS 2 | |
| PA 5 | Set of SOPs, QA/QC and DQC Guidelines | List of SoPs available, QA/QC & DQC Guidelines from other projects are made available. No new ones are developed (in 2014). | This document needs to be constantly enriched, as new methods appear, and they have to be advertised. The existing compilation needs to be checked and corrected, where necessary. EMBLAS II should review the list produced and regularly update it. | |

| PA | Name of deliverables. | Status / Date of finalization | Explanatory comments / PMU suggested next steps /recommendations | Evaluator comments |
|------|---|--|---|--|
| PA 5 | Trainings evaluations | Completed | This is about the single Batumi training on chemical methods. No follow-up is expected, but the form for evaluation can be used in other training. | Training must be attached to a broader capacity development plan for regional monitoring. |
| PA 6 | Final version of the JC Methodology | Completed (Feb 2015) | This is a living document and may change in EMBLAS 2, taking into consideration new challenges. In any case, it should be proposed as a component of the revised regional BSIMAP. The idea is to make the joint surveys a regular event in the region, supported by the BSC and other donors –optimistically every 2 years. | This should be should be linked to the BISMAP. It must be a regular BSC event. This should be articulated in the exit strategy. |
| PA 7 | Designing and developing the web portal of BSIS (on the BSC web page) | Completed (Feb 2015) | This work is going further than what was intended as only a prototype was meant to be developed, and it is developed. The prototype should turn into a functional and sustained web portal, where BSIS becomes a real information system for the Black Sea region. | This is linked to TE recommendation to focus on building capacity for strengthening knowledge management at the BSC to undertake knowledge facilitation and coordination of future learning activities, including overseeing and sharing, packaging the results of environmental monitoring for policy change, in particular, in the future. |
| PA 7 | Concept on the proposed developments of the WQ, emissions and phytoplankton components of BSIS, functional and technical specifications | Basic concept for WQ is prepared (in 2014), but it needs further work in EMBLAS 2. | The WQ database concept needs further development and work under EMBLAS-II. Because EMBLAS II will produce data, it needs to be adjusted, reflecting the type of data, meta data to be collected, etc The concepts for the mnemiopsis database and the phytoplankton database need to be prepared. | |
| PA 7 | Web-based WQ system prototype, further developed mnemiopsis and phytoplankton data bases | The same as above | WQ database prototype is available. This is not the case for mnemiopsis and phytoplankton. For mnemiopsis, though, some very primitive databases were previously developed under other projects. EMBLAS 2 should make a significant effort in the database development follow-up. The WQ database prototype was not well advanced, as the GES methodology was not sufficiently prepared. Mnemiopsis and phytoplankton databases should be fully handled almost from the start. | Need completion and follow-up. |

| PA | Name of deliverables. | Status / Date of finalization | Explanatory comments / PMU suggested next steps /recommendations | Evaluator comments |
|------|---|---|--|--|
| PA 7 | Manual (Guidance document) on the WQ database use and data upload | Completed (Jan 2015) | The manual is for the existing WQ database prototype, further development is needed together with the WQ database itself. | |
| PA 7 | Concept for the long-term maintenance of BSIS and interaction between the central BS Water Quality Database and other BS regional data management infrastructures | Partly completed, follow-up work needed | Concept for the long-term maintenance of BSIS as such is not yet developed. Two documents were prepared: BSIS concept paper and Technical assessment of BSIS, as a basis for the preparation of the Concept. Overview of interaction between the central Black Sea WQ Database and other regional data management infrastructures was prepared, however further work is expected in EMBLAS 2 - with more clear indications of compatibility of databases and considering also national databases. This work will be also linked with the databases developed in EMBLAS 2. | This is also about regional BS knowledge management, need to consider the institutional role and linkages for managing this and why. |

ⁱ iGEF on TDA-SAP for BSIS (Black Sea Information System) and BSIMAP (Black Sea Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Program) to provide reliable and consolidated data for "state of the environment" reporting, "impact assessments" of major pollutant sources, "trans boundary diagnostic analysis" and SAP implementation reports (BSSAP process) in view of decision-making needs in the Black Sea region. The sites, parameters and monitoring frequencies also reflect data requirements for compliance with relevant national and international legislation and agreements.