

**United Nations Development Program - Global Environment Facility
United Nations Office for Project Services**

**Developing the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan
(RER/96/G32/C)**

Terminal Evaluation Report

Stanislaw Manikowski

February, 2001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge Ms. Ulrika Meissner, Mr. Ponnuswami Thayaparan and Andrew Menz from the UNOPS, Mr. Andrew Hudson from UNDP-GEF for their comments during the briefing sessions before and after my time in the field. The Program Co-ordinator Ms. Sema Acar, and hers team provided me with all the necessary documentation, information and technical support. They were always available to discuss the project achievements and the issues relative to their evaluation. Finally, I am greatly indebted to the national co-ordinators, and directors of the Activity Centers and their teams for the time they devoted to discussing the project's activities and their impact of the regional co-operation. Sema Acar, Andrew Hudson and Laurence Mee provided valuable comments on draft of the evaluation report.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

| | |
|--------|---|
| AC | Activity Center |
| APPER | Annual Project Performance Evaluation Report |
| BOD | Biological Oxygen Demand |
| BS SAP | Black Sea Strategic Action Plan |
| BSAP | Black Sea Action Plan |
| BSEC | Black Sea Economic Cooperation |
| BSEP | Black Sea Environmental Program |
| Danida | Danish cooperation agency |
| DEPA | Danish Environmental Protection Agency |
| EBRD | European Bank for Reconstruction and Development |
| EQO | Environmental Quality Objectives |
| EQS | Environmental Quality Objectives Standards |
| EU | European Union |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| GIS | Global Information System |
| IAEA | International Atomic Energy Agency |
| ICZM | Integrated Coastal Zone Management |
| IFI | International Financing Institution |
| IMO | International Maritime Organization |
| IOC | Intergovernmental Oceanic Commission |
| MARPOL | International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships |
| MoE | Ministry of Environment |
| NATO | North Atlantic Treaty Organization |
| NEAP | National Environment Action Plan |
| NGO | Non Governmental Organization |
| NSAP | National Strategic Action Plan |
| BSEF | Black Sea Environmental Fund |
| PCU | Program Co-ordination Unit |
| Phare | Poland, Hungary: Aid for Reconstruction and Economy; Program of assistance for economic reconstructing in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe |
| PIR | Project Implementation Review |
| PPER | Project Performance Evaluation Report |
| PSC | Port-State Control |
| QA | Quality Assurance |
| QC | Quality Control |
| RAC | Regional Activity Center |

| | |
|----------|---|
| SAP | Strategic Action Plan |
| Tacis | Technical assistance to the Commonwealth of Independent States |
| TDA | Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Program |
| UNDP/OPS | United Nations Development Program/Office for Project Services |
| UNEP | United Nations Environment Program |
| UNESCO | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Culture Organization |
| UNOPS | United Nations Office for Project Services |
| WHO | World Health Organization |
| WQO | Water Quality Objective |
| WQS | Water Quality Standard |

SUMMARY

The report contains terminal evaluation of an important UNDP GEF project-- RER/96/G32/C "Developing the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan" executed by UNOPS between 1997 and 2000. The project was a continuation of a RER/93/G31 "Environmental Management and Protection of the Black Sea" financed between 1994 and 1997. Both projects assisted Black Sea littoral countries (Bulgaria, Georgia, Romania, Russian Federation, Turkey and Ukraine) in taking steps toward restoration of the Black Sea environment. The evaluated project (RER/96/G32/C) corresponds to the GEF priorities and UNDP areas of concentration. It was implemented timely and responded to the regional demand.

The attained objectives and some of the produced outputs strongly contributed to protection of the Black Sea environment. The most important achievement was the project's support to the countries in preparation of national Strategic Action Plans and in identification of priority national investments needed to improve Black Sea environmental situation.

The evaluated RER/96/G32 and the preceding RER/93/G31 projects gave impetus for regional co-operation of Black Sea coastal countries in reduction of the sea pollution and in launching a sustainable exploitation of the sea's resources. Both projects were decentralized and participatory. Thus, they left behind them trained and experienced national personnel. The documents produced by the projects became a basis for many legal and administrative modifications introduced by the governments to protect the Black Sea environment. They are basis for further projects financed from both national and international resources. Many priority investments identified thanks to the projects initiatives were introduced into national investment plans. In summary, both projects very satisfactorily motivated the countries to introduce changes in their policy, legislature and investment plans in favor of the Black Sea.

The evaluated RER/96/G32/C project received great attention from relevant governments and administrations. Nevertheless, the governments are not implementing the recommended--and frequently agreed upon--actions and are not all willing to commit funds to regional activities. Despite the project's efforts the citizens were probably not sufficiently aware of the impact of the Black Sea degradation on their welfare and prosperity; and the NGOs not sufficiently influent.

The project's impact on national policy, Black Sea problems perception, and regional cooperation was important. Under this and the previous projects leadership, first time in their existence, the countries started to work together towards constructive solutions of Black Sea environmental problems. This co-operation was reinforced by the current global concern toward the environmental issue. Thus, the project's impact on the region is probably highly sustainable.

The project achieved some remarkable and outstanding results, but it was also marred by weaknesses and unsatisfactory achievements. The project document was unsatisfactory. Its development objective overstated the conceivable project's achievements; there was no work plan; institutional arrangements were flawed by conflict of interest; the list of beneficiaries was inadequately formulated; some risks were identified but there was no information about actions needed to mitigate them. The project only partially attained its four immediate objectives. The regional SAP's deadlines were not respected, by the beneficiary countries; the national SAPs were not yet approved.

The GEF, Istanbul Commission and project Steering Committee should assure further scrutiny of the project achievements and their impact on the beneficiaries. **It is recommended to the UNDP-GEF as an Implementing Agency to maintain its assistance to the Istanbul Commission in designing and executing the next steps toward Black Sea protection. These steps may include:**

- regional data gathering, analysis and distribution
- regional coordination of Black Sea state monitoring and research.
- co-ordination of national activities that have regional impact
- private sector involvement
- regional funding management and optimization
- efficient citizen awareness rising,
- governments' decisions and implementation watching

Summary of Recommendations

IA - Implementing Agency, EA - Executing Agency, IC - Istanbul Commission

| No | Address | Recommendation |
|------------------|---------|---|
| Project's design | | |
| 1 | IA | The project document was unsatisfactory. As such, it should have been improved at the early stages of the project implementation. To avoid similar situations, the Implementing Agency should tighten its control over submitted proposals for financing. |
| 2 | IA | The Implementing Agency should instruct the project co-ordinators to check the project documents and provide the Implementing Agency with comments and proposals for improvement or actualization. |
| 3 | IA, EA | The Implementing Agency, through the Executing Agency, should instruct the project co-ordinators to prepare and regularly update the projects' work plans. |
| 4 | IA, SC | The Steering Committees and other equivalent stockholder supervisory bodies should duly fulfill their obligations as project monitoring institutions, and check the coherence and pertinence of the project documents' arrangements. The Implementing Agency should instruct the Steering Committees about their obligations toward the projects. |
| 5 | IA | Implementing Agency should indicate who, in the project's channel of command, is responsible for the improvement and actualization of the project document. |

| | | |
|---|--------|---|
| Project's Actions and Outcomes in the Light of the GEF Guidelines | | |
| 6 | IA | The Implementing Agency should duly instruct project managers about their responsibilities towards instructions contained in the project documents and the additional UNDP and GEF regulations. |
| 7 | IA, SC | The Implementing Agency should instruct the Steering Committee or other body directly supervising the projects about their obligations and responsibilities towards the project and the beneficiaries. |
| 8 | SC | It is recommended to the Steering Committee of the RER/96/G32/C (or the desirable next phase) to instruct the PCU to restore as much information as is possible about activities' execution and the progress in output delivery achieved by the two projects. |
| 9 | IA | The Implementing Agency may expect that in the future, managerial and supervisory staff will be unacquainted with operational regulations. Consequently, it may be useful to periodically organize briefing sessions that will familiarize the new staff with the projects' administrating and reporting. |
| Sustainability of the Programme. | | |
| 10 | IC | The Istanbul Commission that took over the both projects' achievements should evaluate the importance and actuality of the projects' outputs (such as for example, the network of the Activity Centers) to implementation of the Black Sea protection program. The Commission should create conditions within the countries that will promote sustainability of the outputs important for the Black Sea protection. |
| General Implementation and Management | | |
| 11 | EA | The Executing Agency should instruct the project management about the communication procedures with the Executing Agency accounting system, and about the ways of updating project's spending. Since the project personnel are frequently on short-term contracts, the Executing Agency should reinforce procedures for briefing managerial staff. |
| 12 | IA | The Implementing Agency should require that project managers report annually about the cost-effectiveness of their managerial decisions. They should demonstrate that other decisions would have been more costly or less efficient in term of outputs quality or delivery timeliness. |

| | | |
|--|----|---|
| Adequacy of Management Arrangements, Monitoring and Backstopping | | |
| 13 | IA | Implementing Agency should identify the reasons for the unsatisfactory monitoring and backstopping and issue instructions that would prevent this inadequacy in the future. |
| Awareness of the Participating Countries | | |
| 14 | IC | It is recommended that before the next steps towards investment in the Black Sea protection project, the Istanbul Commission take steps toward establishing a national and regional consensus about the importance of the Black Sea pollution, needed commitments and agreements to be reached. |
| 14 | IC | It is recommended that the Istanbul Commission organize a study that will help it to understand the place of Black Sea environmental problems in the central and local governments' and citizens' priorities. The study should be done by an impartial institution, with no interest in the promotion of Black Sea protection. |
| Level of Ownership and Commitment | | |
| 16 | IC | The Istanbul Commission should re-assess the national commitments to implementation of the regional SAP and TDA recommendations, and agree with the countries on new realistic deadlines. |
| 17 | IA | The Implementing Agency and the Istanbul Commission may invest in identification of appropriate measures that will accelerate national actions aiming at Black Sea environmental improvement such as: further monitoring and research to provide more arguments in favor of Black Sea protection, NGO support, creating citizens' awareness, mobilizing investment, or promoting new, appropriate legislation. |
| Co-operation | | |
| 18 | IC | The Istanbul Commission should maintain the existing co-operation networks, animate them and promote the creation of new ones. Especially, the Commission may motivate private sector investors, civil society organizations, education systems and the NGOs to create associations voicing the environmental concerns. |
| 19 | IC | The Istanbul Commission should evaluate the networks with respect to their utility to Black Sea protection. It should support all initiatives, but it may reward the most dynamic ones by promoting their quests for additional funding. |
| Sustainability of Further Actions | | |
| 20 | IC | The Istanbul Commission should critically analyze the sustainability of the project's launched initiatives and identify their present and future viability for Black Sea protection. It should also identify the priority actions needed to be re-inforced. |
| 21 | IC | The international assistance may be helpful in re-inforcing the sustainability of the project's results. The Istanbul Commission should decide if the aid will be more instrumental in creating new regional initiatives, or in reinforcing the on-going actions and accelerating their implementation. It should decide the type of the most appropriate assistance and demonstrate its pertinence and efficiency. |

| Actions Upon Completion of the Projects | | |
|---|----|---|
| 22 | IA | <p>It is recommended to the Implementing Agency to consider a few years' assistance the Secretariat to achieve objectives as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – regional data gathering, analysis and distribution – regional coordination of Black Sea state monitoring and research. – co-ordination of national activities that have regional impact – private sector involvement – regional funding management and optimization – efficient citizen awareness rising, – governments' decisions and implementation watching |
| 23 | IC | <p>Establish a common data gathering and exchange system that would help:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – environmental assessment – monitor changes in environmental quality – monitor progress in implementing national obligations towards a regional program |
| 24 | IC | <p>To make the governments accountable, it is recommended that the Istanbul Commission support national institutions in supervising the governmental agencies, and help citizens to organize themselves to keep governments liable for their obligations.</p> |
| 25 | IC | <p>Maintain and develop the regional co-operation among the existing Activity Centers Focal Points and other affiliated institutions. More attention than has been shown in the past should be paid to co-operation among Activity Centers, technical institutions, administration, the private sector and social organizations. Future regional co-operation should be better-rooted in national investment and policy planning, so as to avoid actions that cannot be financed and deadlines that cannot be respected.</p> |
| 26 | IC | <p>It is recommended to the Istanbul Commission to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – involve the private sector to invest in technologies that will benefit the Black Sea, as for example, creation of fish nursery grounds, development of fish reproduction plants, development of tourism and eco-tourism – encourage governments to give the investors concessions and guarantees; the donors' specialized agencies may help countries create conditions that would attract private industry to invest in Black Sea protection; the applied research projects could help investors in the adjustment of existing technologies; other financing may come from the municipalities and agriculture – innovate the Sea protection methods, for example allowing the private sector to enter into research, monitoring, training and control programs now reserved for the governmental institutions – work out new partnerships with NGOs and other non-profit organizations based on both ethical commitments and economical profitability |

| | | |
|------------------------|--------|---|
| 27 | IC | To help both countries and donors optimize and co-ordinate the funds-allocation, it is recommended to the Istanbul Commission to assist the countries to develop project proposals of regional importance, and inform governments and donors about identified appropriate projects. |
| Closing recommendation | | |
| 28 | IA, IC | It is recommended to the Implementing Agency and to the Istanbul Commission to elucidate the motivation of the governments that accompanied their hesitation. |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| 1 GEF Assistance Concept..... | 2 |
| 2 Project's Design..... | 4 |
| 2.1 Objectives | 4 |
| 2.2 Outputs and Activities..... | 5 |
| 2.3 Beneficiaries | 6 |
| 2.4 Institutional arrangements..... | 7 |
| 2.5 Budget and Work Program | 7 |
| 2.6 Review Reports and Evaluation..... | 8 |
| 2.7 Risks..... | 8 |
| 2.8 Project Design Assessment..... | 8 |
| 2.9 Pertinence of project design..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 3 Project's Implementation..... | 11 |
| 3.1 RER/96/G32 Developing the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan 11 | |
| 3.1.1 Objective 1: Consolidation of the Policy Strategy to Implement the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan..... | 13 |
| 3.1.2 Objective 2: Preparing for the Technical Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan | 18 |
| 3.1.3 Objective 3: Public Involvement in the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan | 31 |
| 3.1.4 Objective 4: Developing the Financing of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan 34 | |
| 3.1.5 RER/96/G32 Implementation | 37 |
| 3.2 Activity Centers and Advisory groups..... | 46 |
| 3.2.1 Activity Center on Environmental and Safety Aspects of Shipping..... | 48 |
| 3.2.2 Activity Center on Control of Pollution from Land Based Stations and Activity Center on Pollution Monitoring and Assessment | 52 |
| 3.2.3 Integral Coastal Zone Management | 55 |
| 3.2.4 Activity Center on the Conservation of Biological Diversity..... | 56 |
| 3.2.5 Activity Center on Fisheries and other Marine Living Resources..... | 57 |
| 4 Project Management and Support..... | 60 |
| 4.1 Management Arrangements | 60 |
| 4.2 Financial Management..... | 61 |
| 4.3 Reporting..... | 62 |
| 4.4 BSEP Umbrella..... | 63 |
| 5 Project's Impact..... | 65 |

| | | |
|------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| 5.1 | Regional Co-operation | 65 |
| 5.1.1 | Activity Centers network | 66 |
| 5.1.2 | SAP and TDA Preparing | 66 |
| 5.1.3 | Environmental Standards Improvement | 67 |
| 5.2 | Commitments | 68 |
| 5.2.1 | Governments | 68 |
| 5.2.2 | NGOs | 69 |
| 5.2.3 | Citizens | 69 |
| 5.3 | Investments | 69 |
| 5.4 | Black Sea and Danube basins co-operation | 70 |
| 6 | Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons | 73 |
| 6.1 | Project's Design | 73 |
| 6.1.1 | Appropriateness of the Project's Concept | 73 |
| 6.1.2 | Project's design | 74 |
| 6.1.3 | Project's Current Effectiveness in Realizing the Objectives, | 76 |
| 6.1.4 | Project's Contribution to the Overall Development Objective | 76 |
| 6.1.5 | Project's Actions and Outcomes in the Light of the GEF Guidelines | 77 |
| 6.1.6 | Sustainability of the Programme | 78 |
| 6.2 | Project Implementation | 79 |
| 6.2.1 | General Implementation and Management | 79 |
| 6.2.2 | Adequacy of Management Arrangements, Monitoring and Backstopping .. | 80 |
| 6.2.3 | Changes in the Environment in which the Project Operates | 81 |
| 6.3 | Project Results | 82 |
| 6.3.1 | Global results | 84 |
| 6.4 | Project Impact | 84 |
| 6.4.1 | Changes in the Beneficiary Countries | 84 |
| 6.4.2 | Awareness of the Participating Countries | 85 |
| 6.4.3 | Level of Ownership and Commitment | 87 |
| 6.4.4 | Impacts on Policies and Strategies | 88 |
| 6.4.5 | Co-operation | 89 |
| 6.4.6 | Sustainability of Projects Impact | 90 |
| 6.5 | Main Achievements | 91 |
| 6.5.1 | Relevance of the Project Design | 91 |
| 6.5.2 | Project Implementation | 92 |
| 6.5.3 | Project Results Against Announced Project Objectives and Actions; | 92 |
| 6.5.4 | Sustainability of Further Actions | 93 |
| 6.6 | Lessons and Future Actions | 95 |
| 6.6.1 | Lessons From the Experience of the Project | 95 |
| 6.6.2 | Actions Upon Completion of the Projects | 96 |
| 6.7 | Closing conclusions and Recommendations | 99 |
| Annex I. | Terms of Reference | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Annex II. | Mission Calendar | 108 |
| Annex III. | List of Persons Met | 110 |
| Annex IV. | List of Documents Reviewed | 112 |

TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1. RER/96/G32 Developing the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan. Summary of results | 40 |
| Table 2. Actions that should be terminated or outputs delivered included in 2000 or before. According to the Strategic Action Plan. | 71 |

Introduction

Project evaluation aims to assess its relevance, performance and success (Annex I), and according to the UNDP regulation, every important UNDP project is subject to final, and sometimes mid-term, evaluations. The final evaluation of the important UNDP-GEF sponsored project RER/96/G32/C "Developing the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan"--was thus mandatory.

The evaluation took place between September 27 and December 20, 2000 (Annex II). It consisted of visits to the projects' activities executing-agencies and beneficiaries in the countries of the region, the project management, and the donor's headquarters. During the field visits, the evaluator met with several stakeholders (Annex III). He visited the Istanbul PCU offices; the national co-ordination representations in Bucharest, Kiev, and Sofia; the UNDP offices in Kiev and Ankara; and the major project contributors in Constanta, Odessa and Varna. Finally, during the briefing and debriefing of the mission held in UNDP-GEF and UNOPS headquarters in New York, the evaluator encountered the UNOPS and UNDP-GEF officers who provided technical backstopping and administrative support for the projects.

The evaluation referred to the procedures described in the Terms of Reference provided by the UNOPS (Annex I), and the guidelines for the project evaluation by the UNDP Central Evaluation Office. The present report describes findings, conclusions and recommendations of the mission. It is organized so as to reflect UNOPS' concerns in regard to the Terms of Reference.

1 GEF ASSISTANCE CONCEPT

In the 1960s, the world entered into a "Green Revolution" characterized by massive use of fertilizers. As a result, food production increased, but aquatic life around the world started to suffer from the consequences of washing fertilizer surplus away from the soil and into the coastal waters. The diluted fertilizers were at the origin of abundant phyto-plankton development, which in turn created an unusually high demand for oxygen dissolved in water.¹ In many basins where water mixing and air dissolving could not replace the consumed oxygen, the aquatic life started to die. The Black Sea basin suffered from unsustainable land fertilization as well. Being isolated from the ocean, overexploited, and polluted by rapidly growing coastal human settlements, the Black Sea suffered even more than the other seas.

Ten years ago, the degradation of the Black Sea's ecological potential became so great that the neighboring countries (Bulgaria, Georgia, Romania, Russian Federation, Turkey and Ukraine) have seen their expected yearly revenue from the sea reduced by about \$1 billion.² In the fishery sector alone the annual loss amounted to \$240 million, while the loss from tourism was evaluated between \$300 to \$400 million a year.³ Since many human activities contributed to this degradation, future deterioration of the sea could not have been stopped without a joint and multi-sector action of all neighboring countries. It became clear that to avoid further degradation and restore the damaged ecosystem, the countries had to harmonize their policies, laws, sea exploitation methods and pollution control, and to invest in new, environmentally sound technologies.

To this end, the Black Sea riparian countries signed a Convention for the Protection of the Black Sea-- the "Bucharest Convention" in 1992, which came into force in 1994. In order to support the countries in implementing the Convention, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) launched, in 1993, a preparatory assistance project RER/92/G31 (of \$0.486 million) followed by a three-year project--RER/93/G31 "Environmental Management and Protection of the Black Sea"⁴ (for an amount of \$8.8 million, plus the governments' inputs in kind of \$4.2 million⁵). This project was succeeded in 1995 by additional GEF financing of \$0.049 million ("Development of Self-Sustaining Mechanism to Ensure the Environmental Management of the Black Sea"--RER/95/G41) and in 1996 by an UNDP project--RER/96/G32/A "Formulation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan" of \$0.347 million. Furthermore, still in 1996, the GEF decided to

¹ Zaitsev, Yu., P., 1998. Eutrophication of the Black Sea and Its Major Consequences. In Black Sea Pollution Assessment. Black Sea Environmental Series. Volume 10. pp.57 and 67

² RER/93/G31 Project Document, p. 8.

³ Ibid.

⁴ RER/92/G31, RER/93/G31, RER/95/G41, RER/96/006 Final Report.

⁵ The total GEF contribution to the RER/93/G31 that is indicated in the project document includes the RER/92/G31 project (0.486 + 8.814 = 9.300).

support the countries by financing a project--RER/96/G32/C "Developing the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan" of \$1.79 million, plus \$0.13 million of cost-sharing.⁶

The common goal of all five projects was to assist the Black Sea littoral countries in taking steps toward restoration of the Black Sea environment. All projects were designed to motivate governments and citizens to take actions that should stop environmental degradation of the Sea and support their efforts in restoration of the Black Sea ecosystems. As a result, the countries' economies could benefit from the Sea's sustainable exploitation and citizens of the Sea's neighboring communities could improve their welfare taking advantage from clean beaches and non-polluted water.

The projects fitted well into the GEF priorities, namely: the eighth International Water Operational Program and important transboundary concerns; UNDP areas of concentration such as: environmental problems and natural resources management. In particular, it corresponded to the GEF objective in the international water area, which promotes an ecosystems management approach to achieve environmental benefits. This promotion should help countries to:⁷

- better understand the functioning of their international waters
- appreciate the influence of their sector's activities on the water environment
- collaborate in promoting effective environmental solution

The evaluated project was in line with this promotion and priorities as well.

The project also fitted well into the national and regional plans concerning the Black Sea expressed in the Bucharest Convention and Odessa Declaration, both signed by the Black Sea riparian countries.

As required by the UNDP-GEF and UNOPS, this document will review and evaluate the second major project, the RER/96/G32/C--Developing the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan.

⁶ RER/96/G31/C Project Document.

⁷ GEF Operational Strategy of the Global Environmental Facility. Chapter 4. International Waters.

2 PROJECT'S DESIGN

The present section reviews the RER/96/G32/C project document. The review will provide information helpful in assessing the appropriateness of its design, appraising coherence of its objectives, outputs and activities, and evaluating other arrangements in light of the UNDP and GEF guidelines for project design.⁸

The project document of the RER/96/G32/C was signed in April 1997, with a one-year duration. Further however, the project was extended until the end of 2000. The governments of Bulgaria, Georgia, Romania, Russian Federation, Turkey and Ukraine participated in the project. UNOPS was designated as Executing Agency. The project was conceived as a succession of the RER/93/G31.

2.1 OBJECTIVES

The project's long-term or development objective was stated as follows:

The long-term objective of the Project is the rehabilitation and the protection of the Black Sea as well as sustainable development of the region. This project will enable the Black Sea countries to develop NBS-SAPs and through such plans to set the ground for the full implementation of the Bucharest Convention, Odessa Declaration and BS-SAP. This objective will be achieved through the consolidation of the policy strategy, preparation of the technical implementation of the SAPs and development of the financial instruments for financing of the SAPs. This project should also provide the basis for joint work between the Black Sea Programme and the Danube Programme.⁹

⁸ UNDP GEF Information Kit on Monitoring and Evaluation.

⁹ RER/96/G32/C Project Document, p. 13.

The long-term objective should have been achieved through the execution of four immediate objectives:¹⁰

1. Consolidation of the policy strategy to implement the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan.
2. Preparing the technical implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan.
3. Public involvement in the implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan.
4. Developing the financing of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan.

Realization of the immediate objectives should produce the following results:¹¹

- adopted National Black Sea Strategic Actions Plans (NBS-SAPs) and conditions at the national level for their implementation
- initial proposal for a Black Sea Basin approach to support the implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan (BS-SAP)
- hand-over of the management of the BSEP network to the Istanbul Commission in accordance with the BS-SAP
- significant improvements in public participation prior to the implementation of BS-SAP and NBS-SAPs
- developed scooping studies for investment portfolios (for elimination of hot spots and for other actions for supporting the implementation of the BS-SAP) and a Black Sea Environmental Fund which may be components of follow-up actions by the GEF or other donors

The project was designed to create conditions that would facilitate future implementation of SAPs at regional and national levels.

2.2 OUTPUTS AND ACTIVITIES

The project document identified specific outputs and described corresponding activities. Although the document has no work plan, for many activities it indicated specific deadlines, and estimated the costs of the activities.

The project document clearly stated the outputs and activities.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 7 and 8.

2.3 BENEFICIARIES

Describing the beneficiaries, the project document made distinction between the direct recipients of the project's outputs and the target beneficiaries.¹²

The direct recipients were:

- national Black Sea Program co-ordinators
- regional scientific and technical organizations concerned with Black Sea water quality issues and management or rehabilitation of natural resources
- national, local and municipal governments in co-operating countries
- technical organizations, universities, research institutes and private sector organizations (tourism, agriculture, fisheries, industry, environmental consultancy firms, etc. in coastal states)
- non-governmental organizations concerned with environmental management and conservation of natural resources
- governments of the region
- Istanbul Commission (once operational)

The target beneficiary of the project was the population of 162 million living in the coastal zone and the drainage basin of the inflowing rivers. In particular:

- the resident population of the Black Sea Region, which would benefit from improved water quality, enhanced fishery resources, recreational opportunities and strengthened protection and management of natural habitats
- fishermen and the recreation business would also benefit from improved environmental quality as the result of the reduced transport of pollutants to the sea following implementation of new policies and investments
- regional and international tourists who visit the Black Sea Region and adjacent areas of the Black Sea coast for a wide range of purposes
- future generations of the human population within and beyond the region would benefit from the opportunities created by the conservation of biodiversity in the region - the present project enables present generations to respect the rights of future generations instead of transferring the consequences of irrational development to them
- the world population at large will benefit through the direct contribution made to the improvement of an important international water body and the demonstration effect which this project will have for other regional seas

Both lists are too general and improperly constructed. The project document gives the impression that everybody would benefit from the project: the direct recipients benefiting from the project were governments, institutions and environmentally-oriented NGOs; the

¹² RER/93/G31 Project Document, p. 9.

target beneficiary was the world human population. The distinction among the beneficiaries is odd as well. For example, direct recipients beneficiaries of the project are technical organization such as tourists and fishermen; the target beneficiaries are fishermen and recreational businesses! Or among the target beneficiaries, the project document distinguishes between the resident population and the world population although both categories are not mutually exclusive.

2.4 INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

The project should have been monitored and overseen by a Steering Committee that had been formed during the previous RER/93/G31 project. The Steering Committee should have been composed of:

- the executive director of the Istanbul Commission Secretariat
- national co-ordinators and their advisors
- project co-ordinator and senior project staff
- representatives of GEF, donors and co-operating UN agencies
- observers

The project management should be assured by the PCU composed of program co-ordinator, pollution control and abatement advisor, information management and scientific liaison officer, public participation adviser, project research assistant and six local staff.¹³

2.5 BUDGET AND WORK PROGRAM

The project described in details the expected expenditures according to budget line, objective and activities.

There was no work program.

¹³ RER/96/G32/C Project Document, p. 13. Annex II.

2.6 REVIEW REPORTS AND EVALUATION

The project should prepare the following reports:

- Project Performance Evaluation Reports (PPER) that provide an overview of the activities and expenditures
- periodic Status Reports at the request of the Steering Committee
- technical reports (four technical reports corresponding to the four objectives)
- publications
- Terminal Report
- and at the request of the supervisory bodies, the GEF Annual PIR

2.7 RISKS

In a long and confusing Section F entitled "Risks" the project seemed to identify three risk factors:¹⁴

1. Lack of resources to invest in Black Sea environmental improvement or such investment being not a priority for the governments (this factor: "not appears to introduce a high risk").
2. Some "economic constraints and risks...."
3. "Slow pace of incorporating international agreements and conventions on the statute books of Black Sea countries." This was a major risk, but strong public participation should help keep the Black Sea issues high on the political agendas of the countries.

The project enumerated risks that might hamper its execution, but it did not indicate actions to overcome the possible hazards. Although the project was conceived as part of a much larger program involving national institutions and foreign donors, modification of the national institutions' or the donors' agenda was not considered as a risk.

2.8 PROJECT DESIGN ASSESSMENT

The development objective was wordy, confusing and overstated the project' long-term achievements. The project should probably contribute to rehabilitation and protection of the Black Sea instead to protect and rehabilitate it. It is clear that the development objective of a project cannot always be precisely stated. It makes reference to the ultimate target of the

¹⁴ RER/96/G32/C Project Document, p. 30.

recipient government (or governments) which is usually general and larger than what the project could achieve. Nonetheless, the project objective--although it should make reference to the national goal-- should accurately describe the project's contribution to achieve this ultimate goal. Lack of precision or overstatement of the development objective inevitably diminishes the project's credibility.

In some places there was no link between outputs and immediate objective. A close look at the outputs reveals that:

- some of them could never be executed by the project (and in fact they were not executed, as for example the outputs belonging to Objective 2 that might have been produced providing that two to four other donors co-finance them)
- some others were incoherent with the objectives (for example Objective 2, Sub-Objective 2, Tasks 1, 2 and 3; and attached outputs)¹⁵

The outputs and activities were clearly stated and the cost was attached to the activities.

The document did not specify any work program, however, the PCU prepared annual work plans .

Institutional arrangement is flawed by conflict of interest; some members of the project management staff were part of the project controlling institution. It should be noted, however, that according to the PCU co-ordinators this arrangement did not harm god collaboration between the project and the Steering Committee.

The most prominent and positive element of the project's design was its participatory approach toward implementation of its activities. The project was oriented toward creating regional Black Sea environment management programs, reinforcing national programs, creating institutional networks and collecting data. To re-inforce the national capacities, the project document programmed training sessions and workshops; to execute the activities the project should largely mobilize national institutions and individual contributors from the beneficiary countries. The role of the project management (PCU), was merely to co-ordinate and manage the activities.¹⁶

But here we have to note erosion of the sound participatory principle in comparison to the first UNDP-GEF project, the RER/93/G31, and a shift towards PCU domination. In fact, the PCU of the RER/93/G31 project was responsible for direct execution of only two of thirty

¹⁵The sub-objective requires "Co-ordination of the Institutional Network and its transfer to the Istanbul Commission", whereas the outputs should:

Task 1. Identify the most important endangered species, develop a strategy for their protection and important habitat conservation.

Task 2. Fisheries and marine resources management (sic).

Task 3. Develop a regional integrated coastal zone management strategy for the Black Sea.

¹⁶ RER/96/G32/C Project Document, pp.10 and 39.

outputs. The PCU was composed of three technicians and some local staff. Although the second--RER/96/G32/C project maintained the same participatory approach, its PCU was directly responsible for executing as many as thirty among thirty-one outputs; its personnel consequently increased from three technicians and some local staff to five technicians and six local staff.

The project's document identified the beneficiaries. In fact, it divided them into the direct recipients and the target beneficiaries. Unfortunately, the project document gave a platitudinous impression that everybody would benefit from the project.

The project enumerated risks that might hamper its execution but it did not indicate actions to overcome the possible hazards. In fact, as we will show later, it underestimated or overlooked the risks that in fact hampered project execution.

In summary, compared to the UNDP and GEF guidelines for project design,¹⁷ the project document is unsatisfactory, but it has some positive elements, namely a list of outputs and activities.

It should be noted that in spite of these weaknesses, the project achieved some remarkable results.

¹⁷ UNDP GEF Information Kit on Monitoring and Evaluation. UNDP Programming Manual Chapter 5. GEF Council 1997; Framework and Work Program for GEF's Monitoring, Evaluation and Dissemination Activities. Instructions for Program Implementation Review.

3 PROJECT'S IMPLEMENTATION

The present chapter evaluates the achievements of the project RER/96/G32 "Developing the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan." The first section describes outputs and actions that the project should produce, and compare them with the expected achievements. The second section summarizes the results obtained by the Activity Centers, which are the most important regional execution agencies of both projects. The chapter ends with an evaluation of the implementation of the project.

All information provided in the first three sections is based on documents available in UNOPS, UNDP-GEF, PCU and Activity Centers and through personal communication with national co-ordinators, PCU staff or AC members. The documents' sources are indicated by footnotes, the whole list of documents consulted in Annex IV, the list of persons met is in Annex III.

3.1 RER/96/G32 DEVELOPING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BLACK SEA STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN

At the end of the project, as the result of its activities, the beneficiaries should:¹⁸

- have adopted NBS-SAPs and developed conditions at the national level for their implementation
- have prepared initial proposal for the Black Sea Basin approach to support the implementation of the BS-SAP
- the management of the BSEP network handed over to the Istanbul Commission in accordance with the BS-SAP
- significantly improved public participation prior to the implementation of BS-SAP and NBS-SAPs
- have developed scoping studies for investment portfolios (for elimination of hot spots and for other actions for supporting the implementation of the BS-SAP) and a Black

¹⁸Ibid., p. 7.

Sea Environmental Fund which may be components of follow up actions by the GEF or other donors

The expected end of project situation and the development objective should have been achieved through execution of four immediate objectives:

Objective 1: Consolidation of the Policy Strategy to Implement the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan.

Objective 2: Preparing the Technical Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan.

Objective 3: Public Involvement in the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan.

Objective 4: Developing the financing of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan.

In the remaining sections of the chapter we describe the outputs and examine their contribution to achievement of the immediate and the development objectives. The project's outputs will be described in the same order as they were listed in the project document. The chapter ends by a summary of project's results in Table 1.

3.1.1 Objective 1: Consolidation of the Policy Strategy to Implement the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan

The project should consolidate the policy on national and regional levels through both development and implementation of national SAPs, and facilitation of Black Sea basin approach.¹⁹ To this effect, the project should achieve two sub-objectives:

1. Develop and Implement of National Action Plans for the Black Sea.
2. Facilitating a Black Sea Basin Approach.

Each sub-objective has one output.

3.1.1.1 Sub-objective 1: Development and Implementation of National Action Plans for the Black Sea

Output:

Adopted National Black Sea Strategic Action Plans

All project's member countries prepared detailed national Strategic Action Plans. The plans made reference to the regional SAP prepared during the previous RER/93/G31 project, included priority investments identified in the TDA elaborated also by the previous GEF project, described the current environmental situation of the Black Sea, considered risks of unsound management of biological resources, and described sources of the sea water and beaches pollution (including water pollution, air based pollution, pollution caused by solid wastes management, sea transportation, and industrial or transport accidents). Furthermore, they described the current status of environmental management, namely the legislation, organization, financing, pollution control and public participation. The National SAPs proposed strategies that should help countries improve ecological state of the Sea. Finally, they included lists of projects that should be executed in priority.

The national SAPs were discussed during national consultations and meetings. The civil society and NGOs were associated with the strategy formulation.

¹⁹ RER/96/G32/C Project Document, p. 14.

Formulation of national plans reinforced political will and commitment among technical ministries, institutions, NGOs, and individuals to improve ecological situation of Black Sea. None of the Black Sea countries, did yet approve the national SAP. Nonetheless, some priority investments are already realized. The progress in formulation and approval of the national SAPs may be summarized as follows:²⁰

Bulgaria

Bulgaria has prepared a national SAP covering all priorities defined by the regional SAP: pollution assessment in territorial waters and Bulgarian seaside, shipping related activities (including contingency plans and emergency response), reception facilities, port state control, coastal zone management, biological diversity and fisheries. Most of the proposed activities are not yet included in the governmental financing program. In particular, there is not enough funds for building and reconstruction of existing port reception facilities or establishing better pollution monitoring network.

Georgia

Georgia started to design the national SAP as early as in July 1997. The drafting took into consideration concerns of all interested technical ministries, NGOs and public. The SAP examined the state of Black Sea protection, coastal zone management policies and strategies, and legal actions. The national investment portfolio included six projects concerning water resources protection, four biodiversity protection projects, two public participation projects and one project of: air pollution, sustainable tourism, waste management and pollution monitoring.

Romania

National plan proposed execution of 76 projects during three years at cost of \$1 000 million a year.

Russian Republic

The national Black Sea SAP was part of more general National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP). The NEAP defined environmental policy concept in Russia, specified priority directions from 1999 to 2001, and indicated the plan implementation instruments.

²⁰ According the PCU files.

Financing of environmental programs comes mostly from national budget. For example, the 1966 programs were financed from:²¹ federal budget (6%), regional and local budgets (22.7%), internal funds of enterprises (67.4%), and environmental funds (3.6%). The external resources (borrowing from international or private banks) are very important in environmental financing. During the preceding ten years, the Russia spent more than \$1 billion from external financing. However, the external sources are known to finance only part of a project and require guarantee of the national or regional government.

The GEF was considered as a valuable financing source for additional costs in multinational water protection and biodiversity conservation.

The authorities appreciated stakeholders' involvement in the NEAP elaboration and implementation processes since they represented independent opinion and suggested options.

NGO was considered a considerable force. In the future, it should support the NEAP, promote solution of the environmental problems, upgrade institutional relations, and elaborate and implement effective environmental policy.

The public participation in the NEAP development was conceived as a support in:

- disseminating information in the regions and mass media
- elaborating concrete projects and control of implementation
- promoting the NEAP implementation

The NEAP included activities that should be carried out by the state authorities. But, some of NGOs having high qualifications may participate in such activities as: biodiversity conservation programs, environmental education, information dissemination or environmental expertise.

The NEAP proposes thirty-eight projects concerning the Black and Azov Seas totaling Rubles 3,254 million.

Turkey

The national SAP was prepared by a group of national consultants under leadership of a national environmental consulting group. The group met with the representatives of agencies involved in environmental management, gathered data; reviewed environmental and seashore reports and management plans. The draft plan was submitted to the government, coastal municipalities and major NGOs. After national discussion, the SAP was revised and disseminated for implementation.

²¹ The National Environment Action Plan of the Russian Federation for 1999-2001, p. 53.

The plan covered management strategies, laws, government organizations, municipalities, private sector, and civil society.

Although not yet included in the national budget, the national SAP priorities constitute a guiding framework for further governmental and NGO actions in the region. The municipalities and regional or local NGOs attribute great importance to the plan. Parts of it have been incorporated into local Agenda 21 initiatives carried out in the Black Sea region. The NGOs give the national SAP priority in their agenda and follow its implementation.

The government of Turkey is developing mechanism that will permit the country to support the projects, such as Environmental Pollution Prevention Fund. However, the country has not yet appropriate financing mechanisms that would allow him to collect funds by municipalities or villages for waste management or water cleaning.

The plan includes a list of 40 priority projects totaling \$419 million.

Although the Turkish law enables the public to participate in project environmental evaluation and decision making, the public has no experience in participation.

Ukraine

Ukraine began to develop the national SAP in 1997. The draft of the plan encompassing both the Black and the Azov Seas was discussed by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine in 1998. The PCU supported its publication and presentation in a project's meeting in September 1998. The structural changes within the Environment Protection Ministry delayed approval of the SAP to the 2000. Once approved, it will become a law and the SAP activities will be financed from the regular State budget.

The plan includes execution of 191 national projects concerning the Black and Azov Seas for \$200 million.

3.1.1.2 Sub-objective 2 : Facilitating a Black Sea Basin Approach

Adopted basin wide approach for the co-ordination of national and international activities for the protection of the Black Sea

The project contributed to development of a basin wide approach for Black Sea protection. In 1997, the Black Sea and Danube Commissions established a joint technical working group. Since then, technicians and representatives of the concerned countries participated in ad-hoc experts meetings organized by both Commissions. They prepared national reports about pollutants in territorial waters, and discharges from land based sources. The reports were synthesized into a regional (Danube and Black Sea) report. On that basis, the Commissions prepared a Draft Memorandum of Understanding and later agreed on a final draft.

The drafting process was at the origin of more comprehensive and focussed cooperation between the Black Sea and Danube Commissions that resulted this year in preparation of a common Black Sea Basin Programme that will facilitate implementation of nutrient reduction programme by seventeen countries in the region. It is expected that the GEF will support the incremental costs of the project.

Another achievements of the Black Sea and Danube Basin countries' collaboration were:

- development of a common methodologies for pollution and environment assessment
- agreements on harmonized procedures for port state control in the Black Sea ports
- preparation of a list of components and parameters to be monitored
- common approach to environmental quality objectives and standards in the Black Sea basin
- agreement on Regional Black Sea Oil Spill Contingency Plan

One of the promising results of the Committees' initiative was the World Bank recent proposal of establishing Strategic Partnership for Nutrient Reduction project concerning the Danube River basin and the Black Sea littoral countries (\$70 million project, financed from the GEF).²²

²² The World Bank 2000. World Bank Strategic Partnership for Nutrient Reduction in the Danube River Basin and Black Sea. The World Bank, pp. 11.

3.1.1.3 Objective Achievement

The objective one was partially achieved. The project successfully helped countries to develop the national SAPs and adopted a basin wide approach for co-ordination of activities for the Black Sea protection. However, none of the Black Sea riparian countries has yet approved the national SAP.

3.1.2 **Objective 2: Preparing for the Technical Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan**

Execution of this objective should have assured a smooth transfer of excellence centers network created by the project RER/93/G31 (Objective 1, Output 2) to the Istanbul Commission, and assisted countries in implementation of the key actions of the Strategic Action Plan.²³ The activities and outputs leading to achievement of this objective were clustered under three sub-objectives:

1. Pollution control and assessment in the Black Sea
2. Co-ordination of the institutional network and its transfer to the Istanbul Commission
3. Information and data exchange mechanism

3.1.2.1 Sub-objective1: Pollution Control and Assessment in the Black Sea

The project's resources had to be utilized for two advisory group meetings, capacity building and supply of minimal material for QA and QC programme. Realization of other outputs depended on mobilization of supplementary resources.²⁴ To attain the first sub-objective, the project should produce the following outputs:²⁵

²³ RER/96/G32, Project Document, p. 16.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 17.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 18.

Task 1. Technical Assistance for Integrating and Implementing a Regional Status and Trends Monitoring Network Based upon Existing Enhanced National Programs

1. A report assessing participation by key laboratories in all Black Sea countries in a regional data Quality Assurance/Quality Control programme for chemical analyses and for measurements of the biological effects of pollution.
2. A regional pollution monitoring programme, established in accordance with the provisions of the BS-SAP and based upon the integration of national monitoring programmes. The full regional programme will begin in early 1998.
3. Report of the Advisory Group on Pollution Monitoring and Assessment, proposing a detailed strategy for the development of Water Quality Objectives to be harmonised on the basis of the uses of water (drinking water, bathing water, aquaculture, ports, etc.). The SAP requires these standards to be adopted by mid-1998.
4. Report of the Advisory Group on Control of Pollution from Land-Based Sources, which shall examine common standards for the compliance monitoring of sources of pollution to the Black Sea and propose common standards for monitoring the quality of bathing waters.
5. Report of the Black Sea Steering Committee Meeting.

Task 2. Assistance to Countries for Controlling Sea-Based Pollution in the Black Sea

6. Review of regional port-state control procedures and formulation of recommendations to the Istanbul Commission.
7. Review of ballast and bilge water, oil handling and garbage reception facilities in the region and specific proposals for action (jointly with the EU and IMO).
8. Black Sea Strategy for contingency planning and emergency response to be submitted to the Istanbul Commission for approval.

Task 1 Technical Assistance for Integrating and Implementing a Regional Status and Trends Monitoring Network Based upon Existing Enhanced Programs

A report assessing participation by key laboratories in all Black Sea countries in a regional data Quality Assurance/Quality Control programme for chemical analyses and for measurements of the biological effects of pollution

The Odessa Activity Center identified the key laboratories in the Black Sea countries. The laboratories' staff (except Turkey) attended the training workshops on QA and QC. All laboratories participated in equipment calibration and laboratory procedures standardization.

The activities were funded under the Phare programme and executed by Odessa Activity Center.

A regional pollution monitoring programme, established in accordance with the provisions of the BS-SAP and based upon the integration of national monitoring programmes. The full regional programme will begin in early 1998

The regional monitoring programme was discussed and approved in a meeting held in Odessa November 1998. The participants submitted for approval to the Ministries of Environment the following elements of the program:

- list of parameters to be monitored
- frequency measure matrices
- proposal of analytical methods

It is not known if the elements were officially approved. Nevertheless, since then the national monitoring programmes are implemented in the Black Sea countries (except Georgia and Turkey) according to the meeting's recommendations. Unfortunately, the monitoring networks are settled according to the national priorities only.

The activities were funded by Tacis and executed by Odessa Activity Center

Report of the Advisory Group on Pollution Monitoring and Assessment, proposing a detailed strategy for the development of Water Quality Objectives to be harmonised on the basis of the uses of water (drinking water, bathing water, aquaculture, ports, etc.). The SAP requires these standards to be adopted by mid-1998

The regional Strategic Action Plan has mandated the Activity Center in Odessa to establish a Black Sea monitoring, data interpretation and dissemination system. To this effect, the Center elaborated WQOs and WQSs and presented them to the MoEs. The Odessa Center organized a workshop in October 2000 to discuss the proposal and the specific implementation structures in the countries. The representatives of the MoEs informed the Center that, in principle, the proposed WQOs and WQSs were approved. Romania already approved the WQSs for recreational waters. Adoption of the whole EQO and EQS, including the water standard, approach is discussed in Georgia and Russian Federation. Rumania, Bulgaria and Ukraine are harmonizing the national law with the EC regulations, and adjusting to the EQO and EQS requirements. The Turkey was invited to join the activity, but since no financial support was available for Turkish participants, it did not participate.

The Activity Center in Odessa elaborated a document: "A Status and Trends Monitoring for the Black Sea: A Proposal for a Regional Strategy" that designed framework of a regional integrated chemical and biological monitoring programme. This framework represents the minimum level of required monitoring that will allow to:

- identify the present pollution level
- identify the pollutant loads in water bodies and effluents
- test compliance with standards
- provide an early warning about pollution

Moreover, the document proposes to:

1. Conduct chemical monitoring in 51 hot spots and 3 polygons, land bases sources, drainage waters, storm waters and beaches. The monitoring should cover presence of nutrients, metals, chlorinated hydrocarbons, general standard variables and others pollutants such as phenols, detergents, and petroleum hydrocarbons. In addition, the beeches should be sampled every two weeks from May to October for *Escherichia coli* and fecal *Streptococci*.
2. Evaluate the effect of toxicants on the indigenous biological species.
3. Organize biological surveys to measure the effects on algal growth, bioaccumulation in mussels, valve movement of mussels, and test impact on oyster or mussel larvae.

This information should be exchanged with the BSEP (according to AC) for compilation and storage, and with the national focal points for study and dissemination.

Thus, according to the elaborated document, in the framework of pollution monitoring, the Activity Center will assist the PCU and BSEP with compilation, processing and

quality control, the national Focal Points with data standardization and conservation and the Center itself will co-ordinate training and data management.

The activities were financed by Phare and executed by Odessa Activity Center

Report of the Advisory Group on Control of Pollution from Land-Based Sources, which shall examine common standards for the compliance monitoring of sources of pollution to the Black Sea and propose common standards for monitoring the quality of bathing waters

The Black Sea countries produced national assessments of land-based water and land pollution sources according to the WHO guidelines concerning the Rapid Source Inventory Techniques and their use in formulating environmental control strategies.²⁶ The information obtained was included in the final edition of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis. Turkey was not informed and did not participated in this activity.

To support the effort of the countries in implementation of the Bucharest Convention and the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan, especially its pollution control programs; Tacis is financing a project²⁷ that covers Russian Federation, Ukraine and Georgia. The long-term objectives of the Tacis project are:

- strengthening regional capacities for managing the Black Sea ecosystem
- developing an appropriate policy and legislative framework for the assessment, control and prevention of pollution, and maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity
- facilitating the preparation of sound environmental instruments

According the Tacis project's 1999 report, the Black Sea Environmental Program (BSEP) and the PCU play very important part in this support.

Three countries: Bulgaria, Romania and Ukraine are now adopting the EQO and EQS standards²⁸

Bulgaria is in process of adjusting its national legislation to those in force in the EU. A new Water Act was adopted in July 1999 and it entered into force in January 2000. The Bulgaria is in process of adoption of regulation about:

²⁶ WHO. 1998. Guidelines for Safe Recreational-water Environments: Coastal and Fresh-waters. Draft. 205 pages.

²⁷ Tacis 1996/1997 Funds for the Black Sea Environmental Programme - Phase 2. Implementation Report June 1999

²⁸ According to the reports presented on the second workshop on Environmental Quality Objectives and Standards for the Black Sea held in PIU, Istanbul 2 to 6 October 2000.

- quality of bathing water
- quality of coastal marine waters
- quality of waters to support fish and shellfish life
- emission standards for harmful and dangerous substances into water discharges
- issuing permits for pollutant discharges
- establish a national monitoring network

Adoption of the EQOs and EQSs will require changes in national regulation, upgrading the monitoring program and improvement of co-ordination between the institutional bodies.

In Romania, the following regulations are in force (since 1996):

- a water management permit is needed to develop social and economic activities in connection with water
- a water management license regulates activities that may be developed in connection with water
- an environment permit for activities having impact on environment is required
- an environment license for development and operation of economic activities is required

Ukraine integrates the EC as well. Consequently, the Ministry of Ecology and Nature Resources examines the EC and Ukrainian legislation and is harmonizing both legislative bases.

The activities were financed by Tacis and executed by various national institutions under leadership of the Odessa Activity Center.

Report of the Black Sea Steering Committee Meeting

The project produced two reports presented to the Steering Committee. One in 1997, another dated December 1998.

The 1997 report was not available in the PCU.

According to the 1998 report, between February 1 and December 31, 1998, the project spent \$180,000 instead of committed \$296,400. The funds was spent for staff (\$86,500), operations (travel and activity according to the work plan--\$71, 500), Miscellaneous (communication, operation and maintenance--\$22,000).

The activities financed were:

| Activity | Cost in US\$ |
|---|--------------|
| Meeting to develop and implement the national Strategic Actions Plans | 12,000 |
| Meeting joint Danube/Black Sea working party | 11,500 |
| Red Data Book Publication and Newsletters publication | 12,000 |
| Grants for NGO | 7,500 |
| Steering Committee Meeting | 15,000 |
| Internet services, homepage update | 3,500 |

The report contained a work-plan for January-April 1999, without specific budgeting. The plans covered:

- development and implementation of National Action Plans
- facilitating Black Sea Basin Approach
- pollution control and assessment in the Black Sea
- implementation of the regional SAP monitoring
- development of regional oil and chemical pollution Emergency Action Plans
- finalising the SAP recommended feasibility studies

There was no Steering Committee meeting in 1999 and (not yet) in 2000.

Task 2 Assistance to Countries for Controlling Sea-Based Pollution in the Black Sea

Review of regional port-state control procedures and formulation of recommendations to the Istanbul Commission

Concerning the port-state control procedures, the Activity Center on Environmental and Safety Aspects of Shipping organized two regional workshops:

- Preparatory Meeting in Varna, Bulgaria (14-17 September 1999)
- Preparatory and Signatory Meeting in Istanbul (4-7 April 2000)

As a follow-up of these meetings in April 7, 2000, the Black Sea countries signed a memorandum of understanding, agreed to locate a port-state control information center in Novorosijsk. According to the agreement, the countries would share budget and running cost; the administrators and inspectors would be trained in Constanta, Romania and Istanbul.

Danish Environmental Protection Agency (DEPA) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO) financed these activities. Activity Center in Constanta co-ordinated the execution.

Review of ballast and bilge water, oil handling and garbage reception facilities in the region and specific proposals for action (jointly with the EU and IMO)

The IMO organized in September 1999 a workshop "Ballast Water Management and Control" attended by participants from the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea riparian countries. The participants demonstrated sampling and analysis methods of ballast water and discussed cost effective treatment methods. At this occasion, the Activity Center in Varna reviewed port reception facilities in the major ports in the Black Sea countries and proposed some improvements. Turkey was invited to this activity and two investment projects from Turkey were included to the pre-feasibility study.

Phare and Tacis financed these activities.

Concerning the harmful aquatic organisms and pathogens into the Black Sea, IMO and UNDP are funding now (in 2000 and 2001) a special project aiming to assess and reduce the harm linked with their introduction. Ukraine was selected as a focal point for this pilot project.

Black Sea Strategy for contingency planning and emergency response to be submitted to the Istanbul Commission for approval

Activities were initiated according to recommendations of the BS-SAP (paragraphs 48, 49 and 50, and then conducted and completed by the Activity Center on the Environmental and Safety Aspects of Shipping.

The general approach to the emergency response in the Black Sea region was discussed in a regional workshop held in Varna in 1994. Then the Activity Center developed a detailed regional approach and conducted a study in 1995 (financed by IMO) that recommended in a document "Regional Oil and Chemical Pollution Emergency Action Plan for the Black Sea" a national oil spill contingency plans for the Black Sea countries conform to the IMO guidelines. The plan was not accepted by the Black Sea countries. In 1998, a new project funded by IMO aimed to prepare a new Regional Oil Spill Contingency Plan. The prepared plan was discussed during two regional workshops: in Varna, 1 to 5 November 1999 and in Constanta, 29 May to 2 June 2000. The delegations agreed on preparing a new regional Contingency Plan for Combating Pollution of the Black Sea by Oil. The plan is expected to be completed by 2001.

IMO finance the activities; the Activity Center in Varna execute.

3.1.2.2 Sub-objective 2: Co-ordination of the Institutional Network and its Transfer to the Istanbul Commission

Under the cover of this sub-objective the project should:²⁹

- identify the most important endangered species, develop a strategy of their protection and of important habitat conservation
- improve fisheries and marine resources management
- develop a regional integrated coastal zone management strategy for the Black Sea

The sub-objective should be attained through execution of seven outputs regrouped in three tasks:

Task 1: Living Resources Management

- 1 Draft Regional Black Sea Red Data Book, identifying and describing endangered species.
- 2 Regional Strategy for Conservation Areas, including identification of priority locations for the creation of new protected areas.
- 3 Specific measures to protect and restore the populations of marine mammals in the Black Sea adopted by Governments.
- 4 Draft Protocol to the Bucharest Convention on Biological Diversity and Landscape Protection.

Task 2. Commercially Exploited species and Sustainable Aquaculture Development

- 5 A regional strategy of cooperative stock assessment. The Strategy should be detailed enough to include the number of boats involved, timetable, equipment, target species, budgets. This proposal is envisaged to be a foundation on which regional support from NATO, IOC and ComSBlack, etc., will be developed.
- 6 Draft Annex to the Bucharest Convention on releasing commercial strains and introduction of exotic species.

Task 3. Improving Planning in Coastal Areas, Including Urban and Industrial Zones

- 7 Effective Regional Bucharest Convention on releasing commercial strains and introduction of exotic species.

Task 1. Living Resources Management

Draft Regional Black Sea Red Data Book, identifying and describing endangered species

A preliminary list of endangered species was published in 1997³⁰ and posted in a Web site. The final version of the book was completed in 1999.³¹ It included endangered Black Sea species and threatened and rare coastal species depending on marine environment.

²⁹ RER/96/G32/C Project Document, p. 19 and 20.

³⁰ PCU GEF BSEP 1997, Black Sea Red Data Book. 41 pages.

³¹ Black Sea Red Data Book. Henri J. Dumont Editor. pp. 414.

Regional Strategy for Conservation Areas, including identification of priority locations for the creation of new protected areas

Final draft of the Regional Strategy for Conservation Areas was prepared by Batumi Activity Center. It will be discussed in November or December 2000 and officially submitted to the Commission.

The Tacis financed the activities.

Specific measures to protect and restore the populations of marine mammals in the Black Sea, adopted by Governments

An agreement on protection of small cetaceans in the Mediterranean and Black Sea was formulated within the context of the Bonn Convention with participation of some Black Sea countries. The role of the project in this agreement is unknown.

Draft Protocol to the Bucharest Convention on Biological Diversity and Landscape Protection

Tacis support for drafting protocol to the Bucharest Convention on Biological Diversity and Landscape Protection became available in 2000. Turkey was not invited to participate in preliminary preparations; however, it was invited to comment of the draft and it attended the workshop in 2000. The activities were not been completed yet. Final draft should be discussed in November or December 2000 and officially submitted to the Commission.

Tacis financed the activity.

Task 2. Commercially Exploited species and Sustainable Acquaculture Development

A regional strategy of cooperative stock assessment. The Strategy should be detailed enough to include the number of boats involved, timetable, equipment, target species, budgets. This proposal is envisaged to be a foundation on which regional support from NATO, IOC and CoMSBlack, etc., will be developed

No information in PCU about this output although Dr. Kamen Prodanov (Bulgaria) and his team prepared a plan for future stock assessment. According to the PIR, 2000³² the Krasnodar Activity Center was responsible for its execution.

³² RER/96/G32/C. Project Implementation Review (PIR) 2000

The PIR, 2000 rates the output as unsatisfactory.

Draft Annex to the Bucharest Convention on releasing commercial strains and introduction of exotic species

Nothing was done on commercial strains.

Task 3. Improving Planning in Coastal Areas, Including Urban and Industrial Zones

Effective Regional Black Sea Strategy for integrated coastal zone management

National ICZM Strategies and Policies were developed and submitted to the relevant national authorities. The Bulgarian law on ICZM was approved, the Romanian law is under discussion in the Parliament.

Financed probably by Tacis.

3.1.2.3 Sub-objective 3: Information and Data Exchange Mechanism

To attain this sub-objective, the project document assigned to the project team four outputs:

Task 1: Improvement of Communication, Environmental Data and Information Exchange

- 1 Fully operable regional e-mail network and improved Internet connections and Web server services.
- 2 Established regional environmental Internet node, including information on data, data sets and copies of historical data.
- 3 Fully operable and monthly updated BSEP Home Page on Internet.

Task 2: Updating and Making Available the Black Sea Databases and GIS

- 4 CD-ROM Encyclopaedia "All about the Black Sea Environment."

Task 1. Improvement of Communication, Environmental Data and Information Exchange

Fully operable regional e-mail network and improved Internet connections and Web Server services

All activity centers, national focal points and ministries of environment were provided with e-mail and Internet facilities (acquired under the RER/93/G31 or other donor's financing). The e-mail network is operational but in some countries their use was impeded by high cost or limited network availability.

Established regional environmental Internet node, including information on data, data sets and copies of historical data

The regional environmental Internet node was established in 1997. Black Sea maps, physico-chemical and historical data, and assessment of land based sources of pollution are available. Black Sea GIS is also available.

Fully operable and monthly updated BSEP Home Page on Internet

BSEP Home Page was updated in 2000.

Task 2. Updating and Making Available the Black Sea Databases and GIS

CD-ROM Encyclopaedia "All about the Black Sea Environment"

A CD-ROM GIS was published in 1997 and largely distributed around the Black Sea. The Black Sea GIS won the gold medal awarded by UNDP.

3.1.2.4 Objective Achievement

To attain the objective two "Preparing for Technical Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan," the project should have produced nineteen outputs. The review of the outputs has shown that with its own financing and the PCU participation, the project executed only six.

The project produced two reports for the Steering Committee, completed the Black Sea Red Data Book, established regional Internet node and published CD-ROM encyclopedia. It helped to make regional e-mail network fully operational. The BSEP Home Page was updated in 2000.

Eleven remaining outputs were financed by other donors and executed by the Activity Centers. Two outputs were not executed.

Objective 2 was partially attained by the project.

3.1.3 Objective 3: Public Involvement in the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan

The project should provide arguments and create incentives that might convince the public to support actions leading to the Black Sea protection. To this purpose, the project should have supported the NGOs networks through training in such skills as grassroots organizing, project management and public participation; and trained the local authorities in environmental management (through Phare or Tacis, and other financing). Finally the project should assess qualitative changes in communities economics, social organization and culture. Additionally it should assess effectiveness of the BS-SAP policies.³³

The objective should have been achieved through execution of four sub-objectives:

1. Raising Public Awareness of the Black Sea Environmental Issues.
2. Strengthening of the Black Sea NGOs.
3. Involving Local Authorities and other Stakeholders in Designing and Implementing National Black Sea Strategic Action Plans.
4. Social Assessment of the Human Communities Particularly Affected by the Degradation of the Black Sea Ecosystem

³³ RER/96/G32/C Project Document, p. 24.

3.1.3.1 Sub-objective 1. Raising Public Awareness of the Black Sea Environmental Issues

One output was required to achieve this sub-objective.

Public better informed and involved in environmental management process

The project edited one issue of the Black Sea Newsletter (16 pages). The edition was published in English, Bulgarian, Georgian, Romanian, Russian, Turkish and Ukrainian. The Black Sea Newsletter presents information concerning the BSEP activities, the most important environmental events, meetings, and NGOs' initiatives.

The coastal NGOs were involved and consulted in national SAPs drafting. In many countries the final draft was discussed in especially organized workshops where the NGOs and other stakeholders presented their comments. Radio programmes and newspaper articles covered the consultations about national SAPs.

There is no information in the PCU indicating that after the project's activities the public was better informed and more involved.

3.1.3.2 Sub-objective 2. Strengthening of the Black Sea NGOs

To achieve this sub-objective, the project should have produced one output.

Improved organizational and networking capacity of the Black Sea NGOs

In 1998, the NGOs developed a regional structure called “Black Sea NGO Network” composed of the most active NGOs in the countries. The network developed its own Web site. Most of their activities were financed by funds raised by the NGOs themselves; some funds were provided also by donors as Tacis and Dutch assistance. The project supported the NGOs as well.

The Turkish NGOs were not eligible to Tacis aid and not able to obtain Dutch assistance. This created some unease among the Black Sea NGOs community. As a consequence, the Turkish NGOs adopted former network different to those of other NGOs.

Currently, a new GEF-Tacis project is raising public awareness of Black Sea environmental issues and encouraging public participation in environmental decision

making.³⁴ The project trains NGOs, environmental managers and key local leaders. It finances environmental projects in each country, and provides educational material to support the Black Sea Day, Black Sea Action Plan, and Save the Wetlands campaigns.

In PCU there is no information if the project activities improved organizational and networking capacity of the Black Sea NGOs; it is unknown if these actions have any impact on networking capacity of the NGOs.

3.1.3.3 Sub-objective 3. Involving Local Authorities and other Stakeholders in Designing and Implementing National Black Sea Strategic Action Plans

Attainment of this sub-objective required realization of one output.

Enhanced role of local authorities and other stakeholders in the process of the Black Sea rehabilitation and protection

The local authorities' role was enhanced to a great extent through the process of drafting and negotiating the national Strategic Action Plans. During the development of NSAPs the coastal authorities exposed their problems related to the marine environment, their planned activities and investments; they attended the workshops and contributed to drafting the NSAPs.

Most of the investments identified and included in the NSAPs were connected with the coastal localities. The local authorities started to implement the investment projects based on their own financial sources or taking loans from IFIs. A good example of local involvement stimulated by NSAP is the main wastewater treatment plant in Constanta that was upgraded with the financial support from EBRD.

A recently implemented Tacis project³⁵ will strengthen municipal and regional licensing and enforcement systems (it will train local inspectors, organize audits, review effluent standards, improve data management capacities, strengthen inspectorates network, equip local inspectorates).

In summary, the project indirectly enhanced the role of local authorities in the Black Sea rehabilitation process.

³⁴ GEF BSEP/ Tacis 1999. Environmental Quality Objectives for the Protection of the Black Sea Ecosystem. Draft Final Report. Odessa. 133 pages.

³⁵ GEF BSEP/ Tacis 1999. Environmental Quality Objectives for the Protection of the Black Sea Ecosystem. Draft Final Report. Odessa. 133 pages.

3.1.3.4 Sub-objective 4. Social Assessment of the Human Communities Particularly Affected by the Degradation of the Black Sea Ecosystem

The only output:

Reports on the findings of social assessment studies of selected human communities particularly affected by the degradation of the Black Sea ecosystem

Although the PIR 200 report no activity and rate the performance as unsatisfactory, however, according the former PCU co-ordinator there exists an extensive social assessment of Turkish and Ukrainian fishing communities.

3.1.3.5 Objective achievement

To increase the public awareness, the project published a Newsletter and supported the NGOs. Public involvement in formulation of the national SAP contributed as well to awareness raising. The project did not assess the changes in perception of the Black Sea problems by the public.

The objective was partially achieved.

3.1.4 **Objective 4: Developing the Financing of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan**

Realizing this objective, the project should develop a mechanism for financing the actions agreed upon the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan.³⁶ To this effect, the project should prepare a portfolio of national investments and create a Black Sea Environmental Fund.

According to the project document, the Objective 4 should have been achieved through realization of two sub-objectives:

1. Portfolio of Black Sea Environmental Investments.

³⁶ RER/96/G31 Project Document, pp. 24 to 28.

2. Creation of a Black Sea Environmental Fund.

3.1.4.1 Sub-objective 1. Portfolio of Black Sea Environmental Investments

Outputs

- 1 Report by national consultants on the initial technical analysis, based on an in-depth review of relevant material.
- 2 A portfolio of Black Sea environmental priority investments to include proposed single projects and/or packaged investments. These should be fully endorsed by respective governments as an integral part of NBS-SAP. They should be in appropriate format for presentation to IFI's and further developed through such mechanisms as PPC.
- 3 Report demonstrating the list of projects accepted by donors for which feasibility studies shall be conducted.

Report by national consultants on the initial technical analysis, based on an in-depth review of relevant material

According to the PCU, a national portfolio of Black Sea environmental investments was prepared by national consultants; however, this report was not available at the PCU.

A portfolio of Black Sea environmental priority investments to include proposed single projects and/or packaged investments. These should be fully endorsed by respective governments as an integral part of NBS-SAP. They should be in appropriate format for presentation to IFI's and further developed through such mechanisms as PPC

Each NSAP included an investment portfolio that should be implemented by the local or central authorities. To ensure better distribution of investments, each national portfolio was split into three groups as: pollution control, biodiversity protection and human development.

The portfolio was not yet formally adopted.

The PIR, 2000 writes under this objective: "nothing done" and rates implementation of this output as unsatisfactory.

Report demonstrating the list of projects accepted by donors for which feasibility studies shall be conducted

Not done

3.1.4.2 Sub-objective 4.2: Creation of a Black Sea Environmental Fund

Outputs

- 1 A report based on extensive research demonstrating background information and results of consultations and study tours conducted by consultants.
- 2 National strategies integrating appropriate sources of revenue, disbursement priorities, structures and Governance procedures, based on discussions of national and regional inter-sectoral workshops.
- 3 An in-depth feasibility study assessing the viability of the Black Sea Environmental Fund as a sustainable source of finance.

A report based on extensive research demonstrating background information and results of consultations and study tours conducted by consultants

and

National strategies integrating appropriate sources of revenue, disbursement priorities, structures and Governance procedures, based on discussions of national and regional inter-sectoral workshops

The countries appointed national consultants and organized national workshops with participation of ministries of finance, treasury, maritime and others. The funding was widely discussed; however, it was not possible to identify a way to create a specific Black Sea financing source.

The PIR for 2000 rated the implementation as unsatisfactory

An in-depth feasibility study assessing the viability of the Black Sea Environmental Fund as a sustainable source of finance

The Environmental Fund feasibility study mission financed by the project in 1998 visited Bulgaria, Georgia, Romania, Russian Federation, Turkey and Ukraine, and met with

representative of several key ministries including those of finance. The mission found that:³⁷

1. The countries prefer to restrict the use of national financial resources to co-finance investments on their own territories.
2. The countries agree to link the Environmental Fund with the Istanbul Commission.
3. The countries lack resources that may be committed to the Environmental Fund.

Thus, the existing national funds are limited and committed, and the private banks are not involved in environment financing. Although there was "a political support for the establishment of a BSEF among the national institutions visited...", there was no financial commitment to the Fund.³⁸ According to the mission, "developing and implementation of new economic instruments in order to finance the fund ...will be a very lengthy process and face some major political, legal and institutional obstacles."³⁹

Seeing lack of commitment by the Black Sea countries to tackle the Black Sea deterioration, the mission stated that a Black Sea Environmental Fund is neither needed nor feasible.⁴⁰

3.1.4.3 Objective implementation

The project did not develop a specific portfolio of investments in format ready for presentation to IFI, neither did it create a Black Sea Environmental Fund.

The objective was partially achieved. It should be noted however, that achievement of some of these outputs was largely independent on the PCU initiative. The countries themselves were supposed to take an active part in execution of such outputs as preparation of portfolio of environmental investments or contribution to the environmental fund.

3.1.5 RER/96/G32 Implementation

³⁷ GEF/BSEP 1998. Feasibility Study for the Establishment of a Black Sea Environmental Fund. 87 pages.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 11.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 85.

Review of outputs produced (see also Table 1. for summary of the review) has shown that the project did not fully achieve any of its objectives. The situation expected at the end of the project⁴¹ was not attained except drafting the initial proposals for the Black Sea Basin approach to support the implementation of the BS-SAP. The countries themselves are largely responsible for this situation.

The project initiated and financed preparation of national SAPs however, the countries didn't adopt them yet. It financed national workshops and international consultation to assess viability of the Black Sea Fund, but since the countries were not willing to contribute to such a Fund, the Fund itself was not established. The project edited one issue of the Black Sea newsletter, established an Internet node, updated recently its WWW homepage, issued a CD-ROM encyclopedia and supported some NGO actions, unfortunately, the impact of these activities on the public opinion is still unknown.

These unsatisfactory performance of the project was balanced in some extent by a role it played in maintaining an "environmentally friendly" approach of the Black Sea riparian countries governments. The most important manifestations of this approach were: institutions network consolidation, actualization of Black Sea protection legislation, investment in Black Sea protection, country involvement, and information exchange.

Institutions network consolidation

Helping the countries to develop national SAP, the project has given a supplementary motivation to the national administrative and technical institutions to extent and consolidate the network of institutions interested in Black Sea conservation.

Actualization of the Black Sea protection legislation

The national SAPs themselves were important elements in full implementation of the Bucharest Convention and Odessa Declaration. The national actions plans were developed, they are considered by governments as important and necessary steps into Black Sea situation improvement (according to national co-ordinators and responsible of the Activity Centers), but their incorporation into national planning and investment programme will require more time than scheduled by the project. The countries have no resources they can commit in short term for investment, survey and pollution control. Introduction of new legislation and administrative reforms requires more time. But, the countries are actively working on introduction of new legislation.

Investment in the Black Sea protection

⁴¹ RER/96/G32/C Project Document, p. 13, or section 3.1 of the present chapter.

Although none of the countries officially adopted the national SAP, thanks to the project initiative of drafting the national SAP, they are in fact implementing some national SAP proposals. According to opinions of the national co-ordinators interviewed, the countries implemented ten to fifteen percent of the planned investment; another ten to fifteen years will be necessary to full implementation of the national SAPs.

Moreover, the countries finance national laboratories, and monitor the Black Sea pollution; recently they started to finance the Black Sea Commission Secretariat in Istanbul.

Country involvement

The project's initiatives, jointly with other donors' efforts consolidated the countries' involvement in the Black Sea protection. This involvement was demonstrated by:

- implementation of environmental quality objectives and standards
- improvement on existing national monitoring systems including analysis of water column, sediments and biota
- upgrading the national Oil Spill Contingency Plans
- implementation of harmonized procedures for port state control
- adoption of procedures for assistance in case of major oil spill
- biodiversity protection

The project motivated the countries to:

- assess regularly the land based pollution sources
- build hydrocarbons monitoring system
- prepare a list of parameters and substances to be monitored

Information exchange

The project reinforced information exchange among the countries. Although there is no legal or institutional procedures adopted by the countries in this matter, the information exchange continues thanks to the existence of the Web network and the informal ties built during the meetings, workshops and training sessions organized by the project.

Table 1. RER/96/G32 Developing the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan. Summary of results

| Objectives and Outputs According to Project Document | Financing Source | Execution | Project Achievements |
|--|--|-----------|---------------------------------------|
| Objective 1 Consolidation of the Policy Strategy to Implement the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan | | | |
| Sub-objective 1 Development and Implementation of National Action Plans for the Black Sea | | | |
| Output Adopted National Black Sea Strategic Action Plans | Project | Project | National SAP are prepared and adopted |
| Sub-objective2 Facilitating a Black Sea Basin Approach | | | |
| Output Adopted basin wide approach for the co-ordination of national and international activities for the protection of the Black Sea | Project | Project | Final Draft Memorandum yet adopted |
| Objective 1 overall achievement | Objective was partially attained; achieved parts of outputs are hi | | |

Table 1. Continuation

| Objectives and Outputs According to Project Document | Financing Source | Execution | Project Achievements |
|---|------------------|--|---------------------------|
| Objective 2 Preparing for the Technical Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan | | | |
| Sub-objective1 Pollution Control and Assessment in the Black Sea | | | |
| Task 1. Technical Assistance for Integrating and Implementing a Regional Status and Trends Monitoring Network Based upon Existing Enhanced National Program | | | |
| Output 1. A report assessing participation by key laboratories in all Black Sea countries in a regional data Quality Assurance/Quality Control programme for chemical analyses and for measurements of the biological effects of pollution. | Phare | Odessa AC | Output was not produced |
| Output 2. A regional pollution monitoring programme, established in accordance with the provisions of the BS-SAP and based upon the integration of national monitoring programmes. The full regional programme will begin in early 1998. | Phare | Odessa AC | Output was not produced |
| Output 3. Report of the Advisory Group on Pollution Monitoring and Assessment, proposing a detailed strategy for the development of Water Quality Objectives to be harmonised on the basis of the uses of water (drinking water, bathing water, aquaculture, ports, etc.). The SAP requires these standards to be adopted by mid-1998. | Phare | Odessa AC | Output was not produced |
| Output 4. Report of the Advisory Group on Control of Pollution from Land-Based Sources, which shall examine common standards for the compliance monitoring of sources of pollution to the Black Sea and propose common standards for monitoring the quality of bathing waters. | Phare | National institutions; leadership of Odessa AC | Output was not produced |
| Output 5. Report of the Black Sea Steering Committee Meeting | Project | Project | Two reports were produced |
| Task 2. Assistance to Countries for Controlling Sea-Based Pollution in the Black Sea | | | |
| Output 1. Review of regional port-state control procedures and formulation of recommendations to the Istanbul Commission. | DEPA and IMO | Constanta AC | Output was not produced |
| Output 2. Review of ballast and bilge water, oil handling and garbage reception facilities in the region and specific proposals for action (jointly with the EU and IMO). | IMO and UNDP | Varna AC | Output was not produced |
| Output 3. Black Sea Strategy for contingency planning and emergency response to be submitted to the Istanbul Commission for approval. | IMO | Varna AC | Output was not produced |

Table 1. Continuation

| Objectives and Outputs According to Project Document | Financing Source | Execution | Project Achievements |
|---|------------------|--------------|---|
| Sub-objective 2: Co-ordination of the Institutional Network and its Transfer to the Istanbul Commission | | | |
| Task 1: Living Resources Management | | | |
| Output 1 Draft Regional Black Sea Red Data Book, identifying and describing endangered species. | Project | Project | Final version completed in |
| Output 2. Regional Strategy for Conservation Areas, including identification of priority locations for the creation of new protected areas. | Tacis | Batumi AC | Output was not produced b |
| Output 3. Specific measures to protect and restore the populations of marine mammals in the Black Sea adopted by Governments. | Unknown | Unknown | Agreement was reached |
| Output 4. Draft Protocol to the Bucharest Convention on Biological Diversity and Landscape Protection. | Tacis | Unknown | Draft prepared |
| Task 2. Commercially Exploited species and Sustainable Aquaculture Development | | | |
| Output 1. A regional strategy of cooperative stock assessment. The Strategy should be detailed enough to include the number of boats involved, timetable, equipment, target species, budgets. This proposal is envisaged to be a foundation on which regional support from NATO, IOC and ComSBlack, etc., will be developed. | Unidentified | Krasnodar AC | Produced output is unsatis |
| Output 2. Draft Annex to the Bucharest Convention on releasing commercial strains and introduction of exotic species. | | | Output was not delivered |
| Task 3. Improving Planning in Coastal Areas, Including Urban and Industrial Zones | | | |
| Output Effective Regional Bucharest Convention on releasing commercial strains and introduction of exotic species | Project | Project | National ICZM strategies approved in Bulgaria and Romania |

Table 1. Continuation

| Objectives and Outputs According to Project Document | Financing Source | Execution | Project Achievements |
|--|------------------------------|-----------|---|
| Sub-objective 3: Information and Data Exchange Mechanism | | | |
| Task 1: Improvement of Communication, Environmental Data and Information Exchange | | | |
| Output 1. Fully operable regional e-mail network and improved Internet connections and Web server services. | Project | Project | Network is operational , but limited national network c |
| Output 2. Established regional environmental Internet node, including information on data, data sets and copies of historical data. | Project | Project | Internet node established; |
| Output 3. Fully operable and monthly updated BSEP Home Page on Internet. | Project | Project | Home page was updated in |
| Task 2: Updating and Making Available the Black Sea Databases and GIS | | | |
| Output 1. CD-ROM Encyclopaedia "All about the Black Sea Environment." | Project | Project | Encyclopedia available an |
| Objective 2 overall achievement | Objective partially attained | | |

Table 1. Continuation

| Objectives and Outputs According to Project Document | Financing Source | Execution | Project Achievements |
|--|---|-----------|--|
| Objective 3 Public Involvement in the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan | | | |
| Sub-objective 1 Raising Public Awareness of the Black Sea Environmental Issues | | | |
| Output 1 Public better informed and involved in environmental management process | Project | Project | Project was active in raising information about impact |
| Sub-objective 2 Strengthening of the Black Sea NGOs | | | |
| Output 1 Improved organizational and networking capacity of the Black Sea NGOs | Project | Project | Support to the NGOs; impact unknown |
| Sub-objective 3 Involving Local Authorities and other Stakeholders in Designing and Implementing National Black Sea Strategic Action Plans | | | |
| Output Enhanced role of local authorities and other stakeholders in the process of the Black Sea rehabilitation and protection | Project | Project | Indirect enhancement through formulation |
| Sub-objective 4 Social Assessment of the Human Communities Particularly Affected by the Degradation of the Black Sea Ecosystem | | | |
| Output Reports on the findings of social assessment studies of selected human communities particularly affected by the degradation of the Black Sea ecosystem | Unknown | Unknown | Output was probably partial |
| Objective 3 overall achievement | Objective was partially achieved; impact of the produced output | | |

Table 1. Continuation

| Objectives and Outputs According to Project Document | Financing Source | Execution | Project Achievements |
|--|--|-----------|-----------------------------|
| Objective 4 Developing the Financing of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan | | | |
| Sub-objective 1 Portfolio of Black Sea Environmental Investments | | | |
| Output 1 Report by national consultants on the initial technical analysis, based on an in-depth review of relevant material. | Project | Project | National portfolios were p |
| Output 2 A portfolio of Black Sea environmental priority investments to include proposed single projects and/or packaged investments. These should be fully endorsed by respective governments as an integral part of NBS-SAP. They should be in appropriate format for presentation to IFI's and further developed through such mechanisms as PPC. | Project | Project | The portfolio is not adopte |
| Output 3 Report demonstrating the list of projects accepted by donors for which feasibility studies shall be conducted. | Unknown | Project | Output was not delivered |
| Sub-objective 2 Creation of a Black Sea Environmental Fund | | | |
| Output 1 A report based on extensive research demonstrating background information and results of consultations and study tours conducted by consultants | Project | Project | Workshops and national d |
| Output 2 National strategies integrating appropriate sources of revenue, disbursement priorities, structures and Governance procedures, based on discussions of national and regional inter-sectoral workshops. | Project | Project | National strategies were n |
| Output 3 An in-depth feasibility study assessing the viability of the Black Sea Environmental Fund as a sustainable source of finance | Project | Project | Feasibility study was cond |
| Objective 4 overall achievement | The project took steps toward objective 4 achievement; but neither Environmental Fund were not established | | |

3.2 ACTIVITY CENTERS AND ADVISORY GROUPS

Most of the remarkable technical achievements of both GEF projects should be attributed to the Activity Centers.

The annex III of the RER/93/G31 project document refers to a meeting held in Istanbul in June 1993 which established six Activity Centers based upon existing institutions with the best available regional expertise. The Centers should "work closely with the Project Co-ordination Unit of the GEF Programme;⁴²"⁴³ They should co-ordinate some activities, provide technical support to the RER/93/G31 project and execute some studies or projects. The meeting recommended establishment of the following centers:

1. Emergency Response Activity Center (hosted by Bulgaria).
2. Activity Center for Routine Pollution Monitoring (hosted by Turkey).
3. Activity Center for Special Monitoring Programme, Biological and Human Health Effects, and Environmental Quality Standards (hosted by Ukraine).
4. Activity Center for the Protection of Biodiversity (hosted by Georgia).
5. Activity Center for the Development of Common Methodologies for Integrated Coastal Zone Management (hosted by Russian Federation).
6. Activity Center on Fisheries (hosted by Romania).

In 1996, the Istanbul Commission decided that, by January 1997, it should establish:⁴⁴

on the basis of current BSEP Working Parties, subsidiary bodies which can assist it in the implementation of the BS-SAP.

The Istanbul Commission should initially establish Advisory Groups as its subsidiary bodies...

The BSEP means the RER/93/G31 project⁴⁵ and the term "Working Parties" probably names collectively the institutions contributing to execution of RER/93/G31 and later RER/96/G32/C projects.

⁴² The "GEF Programme" means probably the GEF RER/93/G31 project. In fact in the page 1 the RER/93/G31 project document says "The present Programme for the Environment Management and Protection of the Black Sea, to be funded by the GEF...".

⁴³ RER/93/G31 project document, p. 28.

⁴⁴ RER/96/G32 project document, p. 61.

⁴⁵ The BSEP (the Black Sea Environmental Programme) is probably a synonym of the RER/93/G31 project, since in the only place where this abbreviation is defined it as follows (RER/96/G32, page 1 footnote 1): "... (BSEP) is a condensed form of the title of the GEF Pilot Phase Programme 'Programme for the Environmental Management and Protection of the Black Sea (RER/93/G31)'. " Lets note that in the project document the RER/93/G31 project tile is labeled differently!

The purpose of the Advisory Groups was "to provide the Commission with the best possible advice and information on topics which are key to implementation of the BS-SAP and the Bucharest Convention. The Advisory Groups should have been supported by Activity Centers."⁴⁶

According to the SAP and the Annex III of the RER/93/G31 project document, the Istanbul Commission should establish the following Advisory Groups:

1. Advisory Group on Environmental and Safety Aspects of Shipping co-ordinated by the Activity Center in Varna, Bulgaria.
2. Advisory Group on Pollution Monitoring and Assessment co-ordinated by the Activity Center in Odessa, Ukraine.
3. Advisory Group on Control of Pollution from Land Based Sources co-ordinated by the Activity Center in Istanbul, Turkey.
4. Advisory Group on the Development of Common Methodologies for Integrated Coastal Zone Management co-ordinated by Activity Center in Krasnodar, Russia
5. Advisory Group on the Conservation of Biological Diversity, co-ordinated by the Activity Center in Batumi, Georgia.
6. Advisory Group on Fisheries and other Marine Living Resources co-ordinated by the Activity Center in Constanta, Romania.
7. Advisory Group on Information and Data Exchange co-ordinated by Commission Secretariat.

Since the Activity Centers and Advisory Groups were located within the same institutions it may be unclear which activity was done by the center, which by the group and which by the institution. To avoid confusion, we will follow the terminology of the Terms of Reference and the project document (which considered the Activity Centers as co-implementing agencies for 15 outputs -- Table 1, column 4) and consider these "units" as Activity Centers.

In this chapter we describe the main achievements of the Activity Centers and evaluate their role in the Black Sea protection.

⁴⁶ RER/96/G32 project document, p 18.

3.2.1 Activity Center on Environmental and Safety Aspects of Shipping

The Activity Center on Environmental and Safety Aspects of Shipping is located in Varna, Bulgaria. It co-ordinated the national efforts in contingency planning, emergency response and the shipping related activities and acted as a consultant of the Istanbul Commission and its Permanent Secretariat. As such, it collaborated with governments, international organizations, and the private sector in:

- co-ordination of regional approach to emergency response, in case of oil and hazardous chemicals accidents
- co-ordination, on behalf of the Commission, of the MARPOL Convention implementation on the regional level
- elaboration of port-state-control procedures
- maintaining the appropriate port reception facilities

The work program of the Center was agreed during a conference held in Varna in May 1994; it covered three issues:

- developing a regional plan for emergency response in case of oil spill
- contribution to the Strategic Action Plan and Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis
- capacity building

Developing a Regional Plan for Emergency Response

Regional planning for emergency response started by identifying common needs and capacities of the littoral countries to deal with marine pollution accidents. In 1995, using the information provided by an IMO mission to the region and its own data, the Center warned the countries about risks of a large oil spills,⁴⁷ and urged them to update their national contingency plans, establish a common approach to risk minimizing actions, harmonize legislation, and refine the emergency procedures.⁴⁸ In 1997, the countries started to revise the national contingency plans in accordance with the IMO guidelines.⁴⁹ The same year, the Center assessed the needs of port reception facilities in the Black Sea Region.

⁴⁷ Emergency Response and Contingency Planning in the Black Sea Region: Current Status and Strategies for improvement

⁴⁸ 1995 Annual report, p. 1.

⁴⁹ Manual on Oil Pollution, Section II, Contingency Planning.

Contribution to the Strategic Actions Plan and Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis

Contribution of the Center to the Strategic Action Plan and Transboundary Analysis was discussed and defined during a meeting in June 1996.

Capacity building

The capacity building was materialized by two meetings:

- Regional Training Course on Preparedness for and Response to Maritime Pollution Incidents involving Oil and other Hazardous Substances in the Mediterranean and Black Seas (October 1995)
- Oil Spill Management Workshop (December 1996)

In 1997, by the end of the RER/93/G31 project, the countries still needed to:⁵⁰

- approve the strategy of the Activity Center, review and assess the prepared National Contingency Plans
- develop a harmonized system of port state control for the Black Sea Region
- develop and harmonize a system of enforcement including fines for the Black Sea Region

Since 1997, the GEF project support for the Center have ended; and the Center became financed by the Bulgarian Government and donors.

Main regional activities executed in 1998

1. Development and adoption of a work programme for the implementation of shipping related activities in the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan. The program was adopted during a Regional Workshop held in Varna in 24-26 November 1998.
2. Initiation of a project on Port State Control in the Black Sea region. The project was initially financed by the Danish Environmental Protection Agency (DEPA). Since 1999, this study has been supported by IMO.
3. Co-ordination of a Phare project "Feasibility Study regarding the establishment of reception facilities in the main Black Sea ports of Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey." The project was implemented by a Danish company Carl Bro Center.

⁵⁰ 1997 Annual Report, p. 3.

Main regional activities executed in 1999

1. Organization of the First Preparatory Meeting on Port State Control for the Black Sea Region, held in Varna in September 1999. Financed by IMO and the DEPA.
2. Co-ordination of a Phare Project "Feasibility Study regarding the establishment of reception facilities in the main Black Sea ports of Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey." Financed by Phare.
3. Co-organization of the Workshop on a Regional Oil Spill Emergency Response System for the Black Sea, organized by the US Department of Energy, held in Odessa, Ukraine the 14 and 15 September 1999. Financed by US Department of Energy.
4. Organization of the Regional Workshop on Contingency Planning and Emergency Response in the Black Sea, Varna, Bulgaria, 1-5 November 1999. Draft of a document "Regional Contingency Plan for Combating Pollution of the Black Sea by Oil and Other Harmful Substances." Financed by IMO.
5. Organization of a regional workshop on an agreed regional strategy and Action Plan for implementation of an adequate reception facilities in the Black Sea region, held in Istanbul, Turkey, 4-15 December 1999. Financed by Phare.
6. A partnership in the regional project: "TACIS Inter-state Programme for the Environment (Inland Seas Programme): BSEP." Support for the Regional Activity Centre for Pollution Monitoring and Assessment (Odessa, Ukraine): Phase I. Financed by Tacis.
7. A partnership in the regional project: "BSEP: Multi-country Project on the Black Sea Chemical Monitoring." Financed by Phare.

Regional Activities in 2000

The activities for the year 2000 were planned taking into account the programme approved by the regional workshop held in Varna in November 1998, DEPA and the BS SAP general strategy agreed in 1994.

1. Organization (in close cooperation with IMO and the DEPA) of the Second Preparatory Meeting for the establishment of a PSC Agreement for the Black Sea, in Istanbul in April 2000. A draft memorandum of understanding and training programme for the Black Sea states will be presented as well. Financed by IMO and DEPA.
2. Further development of the draft Regional Contingency Plan for Combating Pollution of the Black Sea by Oil and Other Harmful Substances. Organization of a regional Workshop on this matter in Constanta, Romania, probably in May 2001. Financing IMO.

3. Providing communication facilities and establishment of communications links between ERAC and the national responsible authorities in the Black Sea states. Better communication link and pollution reporting system will help countries to establish an Initial Warning System for the region.
4. Preparation of appropriate information on contingency planning in the Black Sea region for the Web page currently under preparation according to the NATO Special Working Center 12 and the Partnership for Peace initiative.
5. Further development and approval of the draft Action Plan for implementation of adequate reception facilities in the Black Sea region
6. Initiation of new projects (in close co-ordination with IMO) covering:
 - study on measures to minimize the risk of any further introductions of exotic species into the Black Sea through the de-ballast of vessels
 - development of a regional Black Sea system for monitoring of oil pollution and ship traffic by remote sensing, recommended by the UN Regional Preparatory Conference UNISPACE III for Eastern Europe, held in Bucharest between 25 and 29 January 1999
 - implementation of the activities related to the London Convention (1972), including a regional workshop under the auspices of article XIV of the Convention to adapt the Protocol on Dumping to the Bucharest Convention to the 1996 Protocol to London Convention

Conclusions

The work plan of the Center was inspired by achievements of the years 1994 to 1996 under the leadership of the first GEF project. The Activity Center still plays an important role in the region. It continues to implement the outstanding points of the regional program initiated under the RER/93/G31 project:

- preparation of national contingency plans
- harmonization of port state control

The Center actions are supported by the Bulgarian Government and by donors.

The dynamic Center team actually approves difficulties in financing communication and regional information collection and dissemination.

3.2.2 Activity Center on Control of Pollution from Land Based Stations and Activity Center on Pollution Monitoring and Assessment

The work plan of both Centers was prepared during a meeting on regional monitoring of the Black Sea pollution held in Odessa in May 1994. The delegates to the meeting developed an integrated regional strategy concerning pollution monitoring, pollution effects studies, information gathering and exchange. Realization of this strategy required improvement in information gathering methodology, and in analytical capacity of national laboratories. In consequence, still during the 1994, the project, jointly with Phare and Tacis, organized assessment of laboratory capacities in pollution monitoring; the projects ordered supplementary material to equip at least one laboratory in each country. At the same time, the RER/93/G31 project started to organize training sessions (twenty-one training session between 1994 and 1996) and specialized workshops. In 1995, invited experts assisted three national focal points in pollution monitoring.

In 1996, the countries decided to establish a regionally co-ordinated network of national pollution monitoring stations and ensure technical support for monitoring and assessment of pollution discharges from land based sources. The first activities should have been co-ordinated by the Activity Center in Odessa, the second by the Center in Istanbul.

When the national laboratories were equipped and the personnel trained, the Centers started pollution monitoring that covered:

- the Black Sea near the Dniepr river mouth
- the Danube outflows
- Black Sea shelf near Bosphorus

The monitoring programs were completed in 1997. Their results were a major contribution to the TDA and SAP; they were published in 1997 in a volume "The State of Pollution of the Black Sea."

The monitoring has shown, among others, that more than eighty percent of the Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) and total of suspended solid load come from the rivers. Danube itself is responsible for eighty-eight percent of BOD load coming from rivers.

The Center based in Odessa, which was visited during the evaluation mission, recently proposed a regional framework for integrated chemical and biological monitoring that should allow:

- identify the pollution level
- identify the pollutant loads in water bodies and effluents
- test compliance with EQSs and EQSs standards
- provide recommendations to decision-makers
- organize monitoring database

To achieve these results, the Center suggested to monitor fifty-one hot spots, three polygons, land bases sources, drainage waters, storm waters and beaches. The results should be stored, compiled and processed by the Center, and distributed within the region.

The Center continued the pollution studies as well. They were carried out in close collaboration with Marine Studies Laboratory in Monaco, WHO Environmental Health Division and the IOC of UNESCO. The IAEA checked the accuracy of determination of organochlorine compounds and petroleum hydrocarbons in marine samples, which is fundamental to pollution assessment in coastal and ocean environments. The Odessa Center successfully passed the test, which means that the analyses done in Odessa Center comply with the world standards⁵¹.

Currently, the Center (supported by Tacis⁵²) refines the co-ordination of pollution monitoring and assessment, and assists the staff from other focal points in the Black Sea region in improving their own monitoring procedures.

In 1999, the Odessa Center:

- organized marine environment monitoring
- introduced data management and exchange of information with other Activity Centers
- designed Web site containing pollution monitoring and assessment data
- organized evaluation of investigation on marine water quality including hydrophysics, hydrochemistry, chemical pollution, hydrobiology and radioecology
- improved ecological monitoring system, data management and information exchange
- elaborated marine aquatories classification by level of pollution and water quality
- elaborated marine geo-information concept using GIS technology

⁵¹ IAEA-408, 1999. World-Wide and regional Intercomparison for the Determination of Organochlorine compounds, Petroleum Hydrocarbons and Sterols in Sediment Sample.

⁵² Tacis Inter-State Programme for the Environment (Inland Seas Programme) 1996 and 1997: Black Sea Environment Programme. Report on the second weekshop on Environmental Quality Objectives (EQOs) and Standards (EQSs).

- prepared electronic atlas of the Black Sea ecology

The 1999 and the previous surveys have shown that:⁵³

1. Waste water discharge represents a major risk for human health, human welfare, recreation conditions, and economic development.
2. Quality of surface water represents an average risks for human health and human welfare, however a major one for recreation, tourist's satisfaction and economic development.
3. The quality of drinking water is a major risk for human health and human welfare, but an average one for recreation condition, tourist satisfaction and economic development.
4. The quality of sea water represents an average risk for human health and welfare, but a major one for recreation conditions, tourist's satisfaction and economic development
5. Total annual economic value of damage by hot spots amounts to about \$10 billion (calculated from the Table 4, of the survey report).⁵⁴

In 2000, the Odessa Center is realizing:

- environmental quality objectives definition for the Black Sea
- evaluation of hydrochemical, hydrobiology and radioactivity parameters of the water
- preparation of draft "Guidelines on Environmental Quality Objectives for the Protection of the Black Sea Ecosystem in Ukraine"
- proposal of regulations concerning Black Sea ecological information exchange on the national and regional levels
- information collation and exchange in Web site support for the Atlas of the Black Sea

The program for 2001 covers:

- preparation of national guidelines on environmental quality objectives for protection of the Black Sea
- evaluation of hydrochemical, hydrobiology and radioactivity parameters of water
- creation of a multipurpose marine information in support for Azov and Black Seas coastal management
- drafting of regulation concerning Black Sea ecological information exchange on the national and regional levels
- support for Web site, information system and atlas of the Black Sea environmental quality

⁵³ Activity Center, Odessa 1999. Support for the Activity Center for Monitoring and Assessment Within the Frame of the Strategic Action Plan. Final Report. 128 pages

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 10.

The Center plans its activities according to the program traced by regional Strategic Action Plan for the Black Sea, the national SAP proposal prepared in 1999, a Regional Monitoring Strategy proposed by the Center in 1998, and the environmental quality objectives for the Black Sea Protection.

The Center's team and its management were unaware of the RER/96/G31 project existence.

Conclusions

The Odessa Center effectively contributes to implementation of the regional Black Sea SAP. The Center suffers from insufficient funding. Actually it is seeking for supplementary assistance for:⁵⁵

- definition and recommendation on the optimum communication solution for electronic exchange of data
- tools for statistical analysis of environmental data
- procurement of software for exchange procedures to support data exchange and statistical analysis
- organization of a workshop on tools for statistical analysis and of data exchange

3.2.3 Integral Coastal Zone Management

The working plan of the Integral Coastal Zone Management Center, located in Krasnodar was defined in a meeting convened by the RER/93/G31 project in June 1994. The plan covers three major points:

- facilitate collation and dissemination of experience and research results
- prepare guidelines specific to the Black Sea's environment
- launch pilot activities and liaise with governments, international donors, NGOs and private sector

⁵⁵ Terms of Reference for TACIS support to BSEP (96/97 funds): Project - Data Processing, Data Interpretation and Information Dissemination.

To implement this plan, the Center established in 1994 an integral coastal zone management network that started to define the coastal management boundaries, prepare drafts of national assessment reports, and projects of pilot studies. In 1996, the coastal zone boundaries were determined, and the national assessment reports drafted. On that basis, the Center prepared a regional synthesis later published as "Summary Report on Black Sea Integrated Coastal Zone Management."⁵⁶ The information collected by the Center was exploited in the Black Sea Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan.

The national assessment reports prepared ground for a Black Sea Sustainable Tourism conference held in May 1996. Moreover, the Center proposed six national management pilot projects and submitted them to the World Bank for financing.

In 1997, the Center drafted an outline for National and Regional Black Sea Integrated Coastal Zone Management Policies and Strategies, and prepared final versions of national and regional plans. It is due to the Center that a decree on the protection of the Black Sea Coastal Zone was adopted in Russia and coastal zone management legislation was introduced in Bulgaria.⁵⁷

The PCU has no record of activities of the Center after 1997.

3.2.4 Activity Center on the Conservation of Biological Diversity

The Biodiversity Activity Center is based in Black Sea Ecology and Fishery Institute in Batumi. It plays a leading role in providing the riparian countries with guidelines in biodiversity monitoring, protection, and wetland conservation.

In 1994, the RER/93/G31 project provided the Center and the focal points with computers and communication equipment, and helped them in creation of biodiversity networks, and preparation of working plan. According to the plan, the Center should concentrate on:

- preparing national and regional biodiversity reports
- preparing regional investment strategy
- developing marine mammals protection strategy

⁵⁶ Annual Report 1996, p. 12.

⁵⁷ Final Report, p. 63.

Biodiversity reports were completed in 1996 and they contributed to drafting the Strategic Action Plan. They were published in 1997⁵⁸ and presented in international forums in Canada, Switzerland, France Finland and Malta.⁵⁹ A Black Sea Red Data Book including description of 120 endangered species and its CD-ROM version were edited in 1998.

The Center prepared an investment strategy that was included in the TDA.

Concerning the marine mammals protection strategy, the Center (in a symposium co-sponsored by UNEP held in 1994) identified the key issues (as identification of marine mammals ecosystems, factors affecting the populations, status of the endangered species, steps to monitoring the populations), and proposed a strategy that should help recovery of marine mammals populations. The reports about the key issues as well as the proposal for the national strategies were ready in 1995. The elaborated strategies were at the origin of a regional biodiversity program developed in cooperation with the World Bank.

Moreover, in 1995, the Center, jointly with the Istanbul University, recommended creation of a special marine mammals protection sub-group that should standardize population assessment methods, assess the marine mammals populations, propose their conservation plan and identify relevant projects. The UNEP and the World Bank assisted and co-financed the mammals' protection programs.

As a result of the Center's efforts, in 1996, fifteen countries signed an agreement on conservation of cetaceans of the Black Sea, the Mediterranean. The same year, the Center initiated development of a protocol on Protection of Biological and Landscape Diversity in the Black Sea.

In 1997, the Center prepared a first draft of a Regional Strategy for Conservation Areas. It launched as well a Development of Black Sea Landscape Strategy, and participated in implementation of the Pan-European Strategy in the Black Sea region.

The PCU has no record of the recent Center's activities.

3.2.5 Activity Center on Fisheries and other Marine Living Resources

The Activity Center on Fisheries and other Marine Living Resources is based in Romanian Marine Research Institute in Constanta. During a RER/93/G31 project meeting held in April 1994, the participants agreed upon the main activities of the Center:⁶⁰

⁵⁸ "Biological Diversity in the Black Sea: a Study of Change and Decline

⁵⁹ 1997 Annual Report, pp. 11 and 12.

⁶⁰ Annual Report 1994. Page 21.

- resource assessment, modeling and survey
- fisheries reconstruction and aquaculture

The teams from the Activity Center conducted the resource assessments, modeling and surveys and the National Fisheries Networks established in riparian countries. The FAO provided the project with a database; simulation models and expertise that helped establish the fishery statistics. Moreover, the FAO supported compilation of a regional report, and jointly with Danida it provided training for resources assessing teams. The fishery survey was compiled in 1996. It shown a dramatic collapse of catch around 1990 and shift of catch toward the anchovy.⁶¹ The survey results were included into the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis. The draft of joint assessment of the commercial fish stock was completed in 1997.

In parallel to the resource assessment, the Activity Center organized (in 1994) an aquaculture study mission (partially supported by the Norwegian government) to the Black Sea littoral countries.⁶² The mission's objective was to share experience, enhance regional contacts and assess feasibility of investment in one to two sites per country. The results were published in a second volume of the Black Sea Environmental Series.⁶³ Recommendations of the mission and collected information were used in 1996 to draft small scale projects that were submitted to Tacis and Phare for financing. The demonstration projects were initiated in 1997 in Bulgaria, Romania, Ukraine and Georgia. After one year of implementation, all projects were discontinued due to insufficient funding.

In parallel to these activities, the RER/93/G32 project and the Activity Center decided to:⁶⁴

- assess impact of fisheries degradation on human activities (the activity was not initiated)
- proceed to an economical analysis of commercial fisheries and environmental management (this activity was discontinued due to insufficient funding)
- assist in drafting Convention for Fisheries and Conservation of Living Resources of the Black Sea (the Convention is not signed yet; it was decided to incorporate it into the conventions that are worked out actually--the last meeting in September 2000--under umbrella of a Black Sea Economic Cooperation concerning eleven States including Black Sea riparian ones)
- prepare a multi-country project on sustainable fisheries management in the Black Sea
This multi-country project should:
 - standardize the Black Sea fish stock assessment methods and catch estimates, and establish a Black Sea Fisheries Data Base
 - prepare common fisheries management procedures in harmony with those developed by the European Union
 - strengthen the aquaculture expertise and activity, and develop common environmental norms for sustainable shellfish aquaculture

⁶¹ How to save the Black Sea. Page 13.

⁶² Annual report 1994. Page 22

⁶³ GEF BSEP, 1966. Marine Aquaculture in the Black Sea Region. Current Status and Development Options, pp. 239. UN Publications. Black Sea Environmental Series Vol. 2.

⁶⁴ Annual Report 1997 pp. 19 and 20.

These activities were not yet implemented.

The Activity Center in Constanta was a valuable contributor to the TDA and SAP. It played an important role in collecting information about the Black Sea fishery. This information became one of the most important economic arguments in favor of the Black Sea protection. The Center proposed projects that could demonstrate short-term economic benefits from the Sea protection measures. The Center is implicated now in execution of national programs, but it is still looking for financing aquaculture projects.

In practice, instead of executing demonstration projects, the Center served mostly as an information-gathering instrument. A strategy for rehabilitation and sustainable development of the fisheries (RER/93/G31, Objective 2, Achievement 4) was not prepared; preparing an investment plan for enhancement and conservation of fisheries was considered by the countries as "inadequate"; sustainable aquaculture development, one of the tasks of the RER/96/G31/C project (Objective 2, Sub-Objective 2 Task 2), was not implemented.

4 PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT

The section will cover four topics: management arrangements, financial management, project reporting and BSEP umbrella.

4.1 MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

As the previous RER/93/G31/C project, the present one was managed by a Program co-ordination Unit (PCU) hosted by the Turkish Government. The PCU's office was located in Istanbul on the premises that should be occupied by the permanent Secretariat of the Istanbul Commission. The PCUs were headed by project co-ordinators, staffed by international and national experts and by technical personnel. The PCUs were responsible for administration, support in preparation of technical studies, co-ordination of projects' activities, collection and dissemination of information relative to the projects, and preparation of reports.

On the country level, the project was represented by national co-ordinators responsible for national arrangements of the projects' activities, and co-ordination of national institutions implementing the projects' programs.

Most technical activities were implemented through the Activity Centers and their national focal points. Only some specific tasks were entrusted to hired experts from the region or from other countries.

The PCU was supervised by a Steering Committee composed of representatives of the recipient countries. UNOPS was the Executing Agency. GEF financed both projects.

In previous sections of the evaluation report we have noted that the representatives of the PCU were members of the Steering Committee or Donor Group.⁶⁵ and that the PCU staff increased from three in the first project to six in the second.⁶⁶ This arrangements seem to be inappropriate

The PCU has no information about activities executed and outputs produced by each of the PCU's personnel.

We have no specific comments to offer about general management, but the conclusions that the participatory execution of the project's activities and the national co-ordination were

⁶⁵ Section 2.1.4.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

considered by people met during the mission as constructive and well-functioning arrangements.

4.2 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

The general financial management of the project was assured by the UNOPS. The PCU arranged the local expenses and was responsible for their accounting. The UNOPS replenished the project's accounts and financed activities beyond the region as well as salaries of the centrally-hired personnel. Since the PCU was responsible for global project management it should have been timely informed about each project's budget balance. Planning of project activities requires information about the available budget; any optimization of future spending should be based, among others, on knowing the costs of similar actions in the past.

The financial records concerning the RER/96/G32/C available in the PCU shows that it was inadequately informed about project expenses. The PCU has records of its own expenses but it was not informed about expenses incurred on its behalf and about funds that were still available.

According to the records available in the PCU, the spending of the various projects were reported as follows:

| | RER/93/G31 | RER/96/006 | RER/96/G32/C | RER/99/G42 |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| 1996 | | | 24.5 | |
| 1997 | -2.0 | 1.1 | 430.0 | |
| 1998 | 0 | 56.5 | 152.2 | |
| 1999 | 4.4 | 59.7 | 5.7 | |
| October 2000 | 6.7 | 15.2 | 28.4 | 38.8 |
| Total spending recorded in PCU | 9.0 | 132.6 | 640.8 | 38.8 |
| Project Budget | 8 814.0 | | 1 920.0 | |

In thousands of dollars; source: PCU Istanbul

Among others, the table shows a gap between the project budget (the last line in the table) and the total recorded in the PCU.

In the 1998 report to the Steering Committee, the project manager did not communicate the budget for 1999.⁶⁷

The origin of the inadequacy lies probably in the fact that project spending was done by the PCU, the UNOPS and probably by national UNDP offices, whereas the PCU did not receive periodically updated financial statements. It is unsatisfactory that the project management and the UNOPS were unable to reach an agreement about information-sharing concerning financial management.

4.3 REPORTING

Reporting was another weakness of the project.

The project was obliged to produce, among others, annual Project Performance Evaluation Reports (PPER) and Terminal Reports.⁶⁸ But it did not produce the PPER and this shortcoming probably contributed to a large extent to its weak performance in outputs delivery.

The PPER should contain (among others) descriptions of the annual targets, progression in (all) outputs production, and proposed targets for the following year.⁶⁹ If the outputs and activities are unsatisfactorily described in the project document, by preparing the PPER, the project management might easily identify the document's insufficiency and propose corrections to the supervisory bodies.

Instead producing the PPER, the RER/96/G32/C co-ordinator prepared Project Implementation Reviews (PIR). However, the requirements of the PIR concerning the activities and output description are so general that PIR cannot be a basis for accounting of a project's activities, outputs and planning.⁷⁰ As a result, the PCU has no written account of the project's actions and no description of its outputs. The PCU did not produce a Terminal Report.

⁶⁷ GEF/BSEP. 1998. Meeting of the Black Sea Environmental Programme Steering Committee.

⁶⁸ Section 2.1.6.

⁶⁹ UNDP Programming Manual, Chapter 7: Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation, page 42 (in 1999 edition). The 1999 monitoring system is applied to the UNDP project since the early 1980s.

⁷⁰ For example, the PIR 1999 report about the "Specific measures to protect and restore the populations of marine mammals in the Black Sea, adopted by Governments" (Objective 2, Sub-Objective 2 Task 1, Output 3) as "under development" which is insufficient as the only information the PCU has about execution of this output in 1999.

The PCU and the Steering Committees are directly responsible for this highly unsatisfactory progress reporting by the project. The UNDP/GEF New York office assured an inadequate technical backstopping of the reporting.

4.4 BSEP UMBRELLA

The Terms of Reference (Annex I, par. 3) refers to BSEP, the Black Sea Environmental Programme as a:

Convenient umbrella ... for assisting the Black Sea coastal states in their endeavor to protect and rehabilitate the Black Sea and for co-ordinating this work with those of the other international organizations and multilateral and bilateral donors.

It should be noted that according to the RER/96/G32/C project document, the BSEP is a synonym of the RER/93/G31 project. The reason for the BSEP name introduction was its brevity: "(BSEP) is a condensed form of the GEF Pilot Phase Programme 'Programme for Environmental Management and Protection of the Black Sea (RER/93/G31).'"

Then, a Steering Committee meeting in Varna, June 1993, gave the BSEP some objectives. According to the TDA, the meeting:

Selected as three overall BSEB objectives: to improve the capacity of Black Sea countries to assess and manage the environment; to support the development and implementation of new environmental policies and laws; and to facilitate the preparation of sound environmental investments.⁷¹

Although the three new objectives resemble the three immediate objectives of the RER/93/G31 project, this statement suggests that the BSEP is not the RER/93/G31 project program but some program "selected" by the Steering Committee.

We can learn as well that the BSEP terms covers programs of other donors. For example in the TDA it is stated that "the BSEP's environmental investment programme, led by the World Bank has supported the development of an Urgent Investment Portfolio,"⁷²

⁷¹ BSEP, 1997. Black Sea Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis, p. iii.

⁷² Ibid., p. iv.

From introduction to the Black Sea Environmental Study⁷³ we learn that the BSEP has its own policy and is supported by GEF, the World Bank, Phare, Tacis, governments of five donor countries and the Black Sea riparian countries.

The term BSEP was identified with the RER/96/G32/C GEF project as well. The documents produced by the project were signed by BSEP and not by the project symbol and title. It is impossible, without the personal help from someone "from the project" to identify which project produced what. The reference to the project disappeared even from the GEF/96/G32/C project report to the Steering Committee in 1998. (Moreover, in this report and some other recent ones, the PCU became PIU which stands for Project Implementation Unit)

In summary tolerance of multiple meaning of the BSEP term and use of other undefined or inadequately defined terms that occurred in the reports produced by the project is an unsatisfactory practice.

⁷³ GEF BSEP, 1998. Ukraine, Black Sea Environmental Study, pp. xii and xv.

5 PROJECT'S IMPACT

The general commitment of the six Black Sea riparian countries to protect the Black Sea environment preceded the GEF financing. In April 1992, the countries adopted a convention about protection of the Black Sea against pollution, a "Bucharest Convention," and decided to elaborate a Black Sea Strategic Action Plan. As a first step towards preparation of this plan, they agreed on policy objectives and included them in a Ministerial Declaration on the Protection of the Black Sea called the "Odessa Declaration." At the same time, the countries requested that the GEF support them in SAP preparation and in actions leading to Black Sea protection. In 1993, the GEF responded by financing the RER/93/G31 project. In April of the same year, the countries adopted the Odessa Declaration. In October, the RER/93/G31 project became operational. This project was followed in 1997 by additional GEF financing, presently evaluated project RER/96/G32/C, that should assist countries in development and implementation of national SAPs.

There is no doubt that both (RER/93/G31/ and RER/96/G32/C) projects sustained the countries' commitment towards Black Sea protection and stimulated them towards new initiatives. Under the direct projects' impact, the countries organized regional co-operation, committed themselves to various initiatives in favor of the Black Sea environment, invested in pollution-reduction technologies, sustainable management practices, and extended the regional co-operation to the Danube basin countries. Both projects played an important role in implementation of these initiatives, and the presently observed impacts are the results of combination of their efforts. In consequence, the present chapter describes the role of both of them.

5.1 REGIONAL CO-OPERATION

The most salient acts testifying to the regional co-operation is creation of the Activity Centers network, SAP and TDA-preparing process, and co-operation in environmental standards improvement.

5.1.1 Activity Centers network

One of the first initiatives of the RER/93/G31 project was the creation of the Activity Centers and their Focal Points.⁷⁴ Each country hosted one Center and several Focal Points representing the Activity Centers created in the neighboring countries. Each Center covered different technical fields, all pertinent to Black Sea environment protection. The centers were located in the leading scientific or technical institutions, and to facilitate their work, the project provided equipment and training for the personnel. The governments furnished the personnel, working space, equipment and covered operational expenses. The personnel of the national institutions that became the Activity Centers or Focal Points accepted to execute the tasks assigned to them in addition to their own national program. The Activity Centers' contribution to the project outputs was remarkable and of the highest quality. The institutions that hosted the Centers co-operated fully with the national authorities and the PCU. The staff of the centers learned from the project as well. Participating in numerous regional and international working sessions, the national technicians have learned new methodologies, familiarized themselves with work of other similar institutions in the world and shared their experience.

5.1.2 SAP and TDA Preparing

The exhaustive and country-driven process of consultations and drafting the regional SAP, the TDA and then the national SAPs, launched by the GEF projects, helped the national technicians and administrators to test in practice the created networks of Activity Centers and Focal points. Intensive consultation and data collecting processes and successful preparation of the documents re-inforced confidence of the participants to the network and strengthened links among the contributors. The common effort created a sense of shared responsibility for the state of the Black Sea. Before the GEF projects, the countries rejected responsibility for the sea pollution attributing it to their neighbors or some anonymous agents. Now, thanks to the common effort and gained mutual confidence, the countries achieved a more balanced perception of the state of the Sea, the origins of its pollution, and their own responsibility in preserving the Black Sea's resources.

⁷⁴ Section 3.3.

The national and regional consultation process created a deep sense of ownership of the regional and national SAPs and TDA among the countries. There is unanimous sentiment among the representatives of the MoE, national co-ordinators and the AC staff met during the evaluation, that the direction of future actions traced by the documents is just; that the recommended changes and investments will be implemented; that among the governments, there is strong political will to implement the SAP and incorporate the TDA program into the national development plans. There is no doubt in the minds of national administrators that future Black Sea exploitation should only be based on sustainable technology with a guarantee of full preservation of the environment.

The effort of the environmental improvement initiated by the project continues thanks to the national contributions and donors' support.

5.1.3 Environmental Standards Improvement

The institutions created as a result of the projects' initiative are still active. They are elaborating now new environmental standards and new ways improving the Black Sea ecology. The institutions are supported by the beneficiary countries' governments and by donors, but their program is that traced by the project in the SAP.⁷⁵

Under the leadership of the Odessa Activity Center, the countries approved the new environment quality and water quality objectives and standards, and they are developing new quality assurance and control programs.

Under the leadership of the Varna Activity Center, the countries signed a memorandum of understanding on port-state control and are finalizing a regional contingency plan for oil spills.

Under the leadership of the Batumi Activity Center, a strategy for conservation areas and a protocol on biodiversity and landscape protection were prepared and submitted for approval.

A new strategy for coastal zones management prepared under the leadership of the Krasnodar Activity Center is now in implementation.

The Constanta Activity Center prepared a draft of convention for fisheries that will be incorporated this year into another convention adopted by Black Sea Economic Co-operation.

⁷⁵ Section 3.2.

5.2 COMMITMENTS

Both projects were mandated to push the governments toward decisions favorable to the Black Sea protection cause, to support the NGOs and to enhance public awareness.

5.2.1 Governments

In October 1996, the governments of the Black Sea riparian countries signed the regional Strategic Action Plans that have been worked out thanks to the project material and logistic support. Consequently, each country decided to invest in eliminating the pollution hot spots and to adjust national legislation and norms to the regional or international standards. Starting from 1997, the countries, assisted by the second project, began to work out national Strategic Actions Plans. Presently, they are in the process of adopting the national SAPs, and continue to include the regional and national priority investments indicated in the SAPs in national investment plans. In summary, both projects were catalysts in mobilization the riparian countries for reversing the environmental degradation of the Black Sea.

Although the adoption of the SAP is a great achievement of the project and a significant step taken by governments towards improvement of the Black Sea environment, the progress of implementation of specific governmental commitments was slower than anticipated in the regional SAP and TDA. The regional SAP contained fifty-one commitments, among them thirty-nine should have been implemented in 2000 or before. Table 2 describes the state of implementation of these commitments. Among the thirty-nine, only six were fully executed. Ten actions were initiated by the project, but to date the governments have not implemented them. Execution of six others did not even begin. Finally, there was no information about the present execution stage of the remaining eight commitments.

The PCU don't know why the SAP implementation is so slow. According to the opinion of persons interviewed, the process of actualization of national legislation is always slow and the national investment agenda was established taking into consideration numerous national priorities, many of them as pressing as Black Sea degradation. There is a "political will" to improve the Black Sea situation, but there is no funds available to implement this "will." However, even if one accepts this interpretation, it is still unknown why, knowing the countries' situation, the ministers have agreed on the SAP and signed it.

5.2.2 NGOs

Both projects took several initiatives that should implicate the NGOs in the protection of the Black Sea. The NGOs responded rapidly to the projects' initiatives. They organized themselves into "Forums," executed small projects and mobilized citizens for Black Sea protection. The NGOs experienced many difficulties organizing themselves and executing the projects: they were lacking funds and social support. The GEF projects considered them as dedicated but inexperienced and without much credit in the governments' and public eyes. The NGOs complained that they were inadequately supported by the GEF project, refused access to PCU activities and purposely deprived of the project' funds.⁷⁶

5.2.3 Citizens

The projects deployed many activities that should mobilize the populations for Black Sea protection. There is no independent evaluation of the citizens' reaction to efforts deployed from the project initiative.

5.3 INVESTMENTS

The projects initiated and sponsored SAPs and TDA, and mobilized the governments to invest in the environment. Ten to fifteen per cent of the investment program is now implemented. Additionally, the countries support national programs of monitoring and supervising the pollution in the Black Sea. Among the donors that finance actions initiated by the project are Phare, Tacis, DANIDA, EBIRD and the World Bank.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ GEF/BSEP 1998. Meeting of the Black Sea Environment Programme Steering Committee.

⁷⁷ Sections 3.1.1.1.

5.4 BLACK SEA AND DANUBE BASINS CO-OPERATION

The first objective of the first GEF project was to create and strengthen regional capacities for managing the Black Sea ecosystems.⁷⁸ The project achieved this objective thanks to the creation of Activity Centers, their national Focal Points and nomination of national co-ordinators. Recently and once again from the project's initiative, the Black Sea riparian countries extended the regional co-operation to the countries located in the Danube River basin. This co-operation is justified by the importance of the Danube River as a source of nutrients injected into the Black Sea.

⁷⁸ Section 3.1.1.2.

Table 2. Actions that should be terminated or outputs delivered included in 2000 or before. According to the Strategic Action Plan.
(Source: PCU)

| | Action | Target Date | Progress achieved |
|----|---|-------------|---|
| 1 | Hot-spots identified | 2000 | The hot-spots are identified by the project and national technical governmental approval |
| 2 | Prepare studies on insufficiently treated sewage discharges | 2000 | Studies conducted during the hot-spots identification (action plan) |
| 3 | Adopt harmonized water quality objectives and standards | 1998 | Water quality objectives and standards were elaborated but neither by the governments, nor on the regional scale |
| 4 | Adopt procedures for land based sources pollution control | 1998 | The procedures are not yet adopted |
| 5 | Implement efficient enforcement mechanisms for point source pollutants | 1999 | The mechanisms are not implemented |
| 6 | Harbor reception facilities for garbage installed | 1999 | The feasibility studies for harbor reception facilities were done but are not yet installed |
| 7 | Harbor reception facilities for oil installed | 2000 | The feasibility studies for oil reception facilities were done but are not yet installed |
| 8 | Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control adopted | 1998 | The Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control was adopted |
| 9 | Harmonized system of enforcement including fines developed | 1998 | The enforcement system was not developed |
| 10 | Measures to avoid any further exotic species introduction presented to the IMO | 1997 | The activities aiming at avoiding exotic species introduction are not yet implemented |
| 11 | Total ban on the disposal of municipal garbage in marine shoreline and estuaries area imposed | 1999 | The ban is imposed; there is no information about compliance |
| 12 | Define concentration levels for trace contaminants in dredged spoils | 1998 | Concentrations levels not defined yet |
| 13 | Develop Contingency plans and emergency response | 1997 | Contingency plans are elaborated but they are not yet implemented |
| 14 | National Contingency plans concerning both vessels and offshore installations adopted | 1998 | The contingency plans are not yet adopted |
| 15 | Adopt Black Sea Contingency Plan | 2000 | Black Sea Contingency plan not adopted yet |
| 16 | Prepare a "State of Pollution of the Black Sea" | 1996 | The document was prepared in 1999. The next edition is scheduled for 2000 |
| 17 | Establish a Black Sea Monitoring System for Pollutants | 1998 | The proposal for monitoring was prepared in 1999 |
| 18 | Uniform measurement technique for bathing water quality developed | 1997 | The measurement technique not yet developed. It will be developed in 2000 |
| 19 | Data regarding actual and assessed contaminant discharge measurements compiled and freely exchanged | 1996 | Rapid assessment was conducted in 1996 and information exchanged between countries of the region; full scaled regional measurement system not yet operational |
| 20 | Spawning areas of anadromous species restored and coastal lagoons rehabilitated | 2000 | No information about spawning area restoration. |

| | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|---|
| 21 | Adopt Fisheries Convention | As soon as possible | Not adopted |
| 22 | Develop and adopt a Protocol on Biological Diversity and Landscape Protection to the Bucharest Convention | 2000 | The Protocol is being elaborated |
| 23 | Publish a regional Black Sea Red Data Book | 1998 | Red Data Book was elaborated and published |
| 24 | Enforce a ban on the hunting of marine mammals | Immediately | The ban was enforced |
| 25 | Conduct regular assessment of marine mammals | First assessment in 1998 | No information |
| 26 | Equip and rehabilitate the Center for the Conservation of Biological Diversity in Batumi | | No information |
| 27 | Adopt a regional strategy for Conservation Areas | 1998 | Not done |
| 28 | Adopt national laws for protection of conservation areas | 2000 | No information |
| 29 | Adopt criteria for environmental impact assessment | 1998 | No information |
| 30 | Harmonize criteria for environmental impact assessment | 1999 | Not done |
| 31 | Develop a regional Black Sea strategy for integrated coastal zone management | 1998 | The strategy was partially elaborated |
| 32 | Each country adopt measures facilitating Integrated coastal zone management | 1999 | No information |
| 33 | Inter-sectoral committees for integrated coastal zone management established at national, regional and local levels | 1997 | No information |
| 34 | A survey of Coastal erosion problems conducted | 1998 | Not done |
| 35 | Aquaculture and tourism developed and managed according to common norms | 1999 | Not done |
| 36 | Adopt and implement rules which guarantee public access to environmental information | 2000 | No specific rules adopted |
| 37 | Make available to the public the information about the state of bathing water | 1998 | Done in Turkey only |
| 38 | Each country prepare National Strategic Action Plan | 1997 | All countries prepared the national plans |
| 39 | Establish Black Sea Environmental Fund | 2000 | Feasibility study has been done; the Fund not yet established |

6 CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS

The conclusions, recommendations and lessons are grouped under seven headings: conclusions and recommendations related to the project's design; project's implementation; project's results; project's impact; review of project's results measured against initial objectives and future actions. The chapter ends with closing comments and recommendations. The recommendations and the lessons learned are numbered in order of their appearance.

6.1 PROJECT'S DESIGN

In the Project's Design section we will review and assess the appropriateness of the project's concept and design to the overall situation in the Black Sea region; appraise the project's current effectiveness in realizing objectives, and the extent to which they contribute to the overall development objective as announced in the project document; appraise the projects' actions and outcomes in light of the pertaining GEF guidelines; assess sustainability of the program.

6.1.1 Appropriateness of the Project's Concept

During the last thirty years, the Black Sea has suffered from excessive oxygen depletion that impoverished the sea life, from unsustainable exploitation of commercial species, and from pollution by sewage and oil. In 1992, the Black Sea riparian countries that started to lose about \$1 billion of revenue from the sea annually, signed an agreement--the "Bucharest Convention"--aimed at protecting the Black Sea. According to the Convention, signatory countries should prepare a Black Sea protection plan, harmonize their legislation and policies, rationalize sea-exploitation methods, and invest in pollution reduction.

At the request of the Black Sea riparian countries, the UNDP-GEF decided to support the regional efforts towards Black Sea protection by financing two major projects. The first--RER/93/G31 "Environmental Management and Protection of the Black Sea," signed in

1993, should have created and strengthened the regional capacities for managing the Black Sea ecosystem, developed an appropriate harmonized policy and legislative framework, and facilitated preparation of sound investments. The second one--RER/96/G32/C "Development and Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan," signed in 1997, should have consolidated the implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan (SAP), helped countries in public involvement, developed national SAPs, and developed financing of investments identified in the regional SAP.

Assessment

Both projects corresponded to the objectives of the Black Sea riparian countries, and conformed very well to the steps envisaged by the countries to improve the Black Sea ecology. The GEF response to the countries' request of assistance was timely. The projects fitted into the GEF priorities, namely the eighth International Water Operational Program, the GEF transboundary concerns, and the UNDP area of concentration: environmental problems and natural resources management.

Lesson 1

Both projects were the results of pertinent and timely responses of the GEF and UNDP to the regional demand. The projects corresponded to the countries' priorities and were implemented at the onset of the regional co-operation towards the Black Sea protection. Thanks to these merits, the projects achieved remarkable results--some of them of historical importance--despite many weaknesses. The GEF and UNDP may regard both projects as an illustration of well-conceived development concepts, and as an example of importance that timely implementation of a project has on its impact on beneficiaries.

6.1.2 Project's design

Although the project's concept corresponded to the countries' priorities and the GEF and UNDP areas of action, designs of the project document was unsatisfactory.

The development objective "Restoration of the Black Sea ecosystem and protection of all its resources," was too broad. Taken literally, this objective was unattainable by the project since its immediate objectives did not aim at this goal. The projects rather contributed to restoration of the Black Sea ecosystems, or created conditions among the countries of the region that would help them to restore the Black Sea ecosystems and protect all its resources.

Moreover, in some places in the project documents there was no correspondence between immediate objectives and outputs that should have led to their achievement. It includes outputs that cannot be achieved by the project without some important supplementary

financing not available at the projects' signature, and in some places, there is incoherence between announced objectives and outputs.

Additionally, the document has no work plan; institutional arrangements were flawed by conflict of interest; lists of beneficiaries were inadequately formulated; some risks were identified but there was no information about actions needed to mitigate them.

Assessment

The design of the RER/96/G32 was unsatisfactory. The project document should have been improved at the very early stage of project implementation. The PCU should have initiated the process and asked the project supervision bodies to take steps to improve the documents

Recommendation 1

The project document was unsatisfactory. As such, it should have been improved at the early stages of the project implementation. To avoid similar situations, the Implementing Agency should tighten its control over submitted proposals for financing.

Recommendation 2

The Implementing Agency should instruct the project co-ordinators to check the project documents and provide the Implementing Agency with comments and proposals for improvement or actualization.

Recommendation 3

The Implementing Agency, through the Executing Agency, should instruct the project co-ordinators to prepare and regularly update the projects' work plans.

Recommendation 4

The Steering Committees and other equivalent stockholder supervisory bodies should duly fulfill their obligations as project monitoring institutions, and check the coherence and pertinence of the project documents' arrangements. The Implementing Agency should instruct the Steering Committees about their obligations toward the projects.

Recommendation 5

Implementing Agency should indicate who, in the project's channel of command, is responsible for the improvement and actualization of the project document.

6.1.3 Project's Current Effectiveness in Realizing the Objectives,

As we have mentioned in the previous section, the project document was inadequately formulated, and this insufficiency was not rectified during the project's execution. In this situation, the project's products did not correspond to the set of outputs announced in project documents; and the immediate objectives were partially achieved

It should be noted that some of the produced outputs were of a very high quality.

Assessment

Project's effectiveness in realizing the objectives designed by the project document was unsatisfactory. Nevertheless, despite the fact that the project delivered only some outputs and attained only a fraction of its objectives, the high quality of the attained outputs made the project strong contributor to the creation of conditions favorable for restoration of the Black Sea ecosystems.

Lesson 2

Despite inadequate project document, the quality of the results obtained highlights the important role played by dedicated and competent personnel in the project's execution. In the present case, the project management implemented outputs that were both attainable and represented key factors to achievement of progress toward protection of the Black Sea environment.

6.1.4 Project's Contribution to the Overall Development Objective

The produced outputs and attained objectives were a brilliant illustration of the depth of impact the GEF approach can have on achieving environmental goals. The first, RER/93/G31, project reviewed existing information that helped the countries to better understand current Black Sea pollution and overexploitation. When necessary, it collected supplementary data. Once this process ended, the project analyzed them and prepared detailed technical documentation (thirteen volumes, professionally edited and later published by United Nations Publications, New York). Then, the project prepared a diagnosis of the environmental situation and drafted a regional plan for Black Sea protection. The diagnostic--the TDA, and the plan--the SAP, were highly appreciated by the beneficiaries and adopted by the governments of all Black Sea riparian countries. In the last step, the second project helped the countries to proceed to national, more detailed environmental diagnoses, to prepare national SAPs and to lists national priority investments. The governments are now in the process of approving the national SAPs.

Assessment

The attained sections of the objectives strongly contributed to protection of the Black Sea environment.

6.1.5 Project's Actions and Outcomes in the Light of the GEF Guidelines

The project was co-ordinated by so called Program Co-ordination Unit (PCU) situated in Istanbul and represented in each country by a national co-ordinator. The project's activities were executed by various national and international institutions and by consultants. Among them, Activity Centers and their Focal Points played the major role. Although participatory in their approach, the project operated without a regional counterpart. The Secretariat of the Istanbul Commission that should become the counterpart of the project was not operational until November 2000. Thus, to maintain continuity in regional co-ordination and assure a smooth take-over of the responsibilities from both projects, the PCU should have carefully documented its activities, described progress in the outputs' delivery and reported about costs. The project document, the GEF guidelines for project implementation and the UNDP instructions all indicated precisely to the PCU the type and content of this documentation. The PCU did not produce satisfactory reports describing the project activities and outputs. The documents produced such as the "BSEP annual reports" and the annual PIR were not sufficient to satisfy the project document's reporting requirements.

Assessment

Reporting of the project's activities and outputs execution was highly unsatisfactory.

Recommendation 6

The Implementing Agency should duly instruct project managers about their responsibilities towards instructions contained in the project documents and the additional UNDP and GEF regulations.

Recommendation 7

The Implementing Agency should instruct the Steering Committee or other body directly supervising the projects about their obligations and responsibilities towards the project and the beneficiaries.

Lesson 3

In the future, the Implementing Agency and its implementing agencies may expect that newly contracted managers may not be fully aware of all obligations imposed on them by the project document and by the Organization. In fact, the always-challenging task to

implement the project may consume all the energy of the managerial staff, leaving little time and little regard for the half administrative, half technical, frequently redundant reporting. Moreover, in many situations it may not be so important to dwell on past events. Unfortunately in the case of the Black Sea project, the reporting was crucial: the project document was unsatisfactory, the counterpart institution was not operational and the experience was new in the history of the Black Sea coastal countries.

Recommendation 8

It is recommended to the Steering Committee of the RER/96/G32/C (or the desirable next phase) to instruct the PCU to restore as much information as is possible about activities' execution and the progress in output delivery achieved by the two projects.

Recommendation 9

The Implementing Agency may expect that in the future, managerial and supervisory staff will be unacquainted with operational regulations. Consequently, it may be useful to periodically organize briefing sessions that will familiarize the new staff with the projects' administrating and reporting.

6.1.6 Sustainability of the Programme.

The two main projects belonging to the program (the RER/93/G31 and RER/96/G32/C) were decentralized; their activities were principally executed by national institutions, while the PCU was responsible for co-ordination.⁷⁹ Being decentralized and participatory, the projects have left behind them trained and experienced national personnel that continue to implement Black Sea protection activities. Both projects financed training, meetings and information exchange, all for the benefit of national institutions. The projects were executed in a political atmosphere and social tendency promoting positive attitude of governments, industries and citizens toward protection of the Black Sea. All these factors advocate in favor of high sustainability of both projects and their strong impact on the countries.

Assessment

The projects' outputs sustainability is probably very high.

Recommendation 10

The Istanbul Commission that took over the both projects' achievements should evaluate the importance and actuality of the projects' outputs (such as for example, the network of

⁷⁹ In the RER/96/G32/C project, the role of the PCU was increased since it became a co-executing agency of almost all project outputs. However, since many outputs were not attained, and the most significant one--production of the national SAPs--was executed by the countries, the project was in fact a participatory one as well.

the Activity Centers) to implementation of the Black Sea protection program. The Commission should create conditions within the countries that will promote sustainability of the outputs important for the Black Sea protection.

6.2 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Project implementation will cover general implementation and management of the project in terms of quality and timelines of inputs and activities, with particular reference to financial and human resources; adequacy of management arrangements as well as monitoring and backstopping support given to the project by all parties concerned; changes in the environment in which the projects operate and which constituted the rationale for GEF support.

6.2.1 General Implementation and Management

In this section we will consider management of financial and human resources.

The financial management of the project suffered from inadequate communication between the UNOPS headquarters and the PCU. The projects did not receive updated information about its spending. From the other side, the PCU did not produce annual reports required by the project documents about executed actions and their costs. In conclusion, it seems that the PCU could not proceed with optimal allocation of its resources.

Recommendation 11

The UNOPS as Executing Agency should instruct the project management about the communication procedures with the UNOPS accounting system, and about the ways of updating project's spending. Since the project personnel are frequently on short-term contracts, the UNOPS should reinforce procedures for briefing managerial staff.

Recommendation 12

The Implementing Agency should require that project managers report annually about the cost-effectiveness of their managerial decisions. They should demonstrate that other decisions would have been more costly or less efficient in term of outputs quality or delivery timeliness.

The PCU has no documents commenting on human resources management. In consequence, we presume that the project personnel were recruited timely and satisfactorily fulfilled their duties. The opinions about the PCU staff and the hired expatriate consultants expressed by the national co-ordinators and the Activity Centers personnel were full of praise: they were considered as highly competent and reliable, and their approach to problem solving was regarded as sound and constructive.

A comparison of human resource programming between the two projects may raise some objections. The RER/93/G31 project document provided that the PCU should be staffed with three technicians and be directly responsible for two of thirty outputs. The evaluated RER/96/G32/C project document increased the PCU staff provision to five technicians, co-responsible for delivering of thirty of thirty-one outputs. This decision is surprising since the contrary might have been expected: further transfer of tasks to the personnel and institutions in the countries, instead of concentration of personnel and resources within the Istanbul-located PCU.

Assessment

The project was probably adequately staffed, but the increase of PCU personnel in the second project may be regarded as unsatisfactory.

6.2.2 Adequacy of Management Arrangements, Monitoring and Backstopping

The PCU successfully provided the national institutions with equipment, training, organized more than one hundred meetings, and produced numerous valuable documents and books. This seems to indicate that the project was managed energetically and efficiently, and that the institutional and personnel arrangements were adequate.

The produced outputs covered, however, only part of the project documents' requirements. The PCU was not requested by the supervisory institutions to produce more balanced results or, if full achievement of the objectives was unrealistic, to modify the project documents. These facts point to the weakness in project monitoring and backstopping. The inadequacy of monitoring started with the project document preparation and ended with tolerating unsatisfactory project progress reporting.

Recommendation 13

Implementing Agency should identify the reasons for the unsatisfactory monitoring and backstopping and issue instructions that would prevent this inadequacy in the future.

6.2.3 Changes in the Environment in which the Project Operates

The environment in which the project operated shifted in its favor and this and the previous UNDP-GEF projects themselves largely contributed to this shift.

The Black Sea countries took several steps towards Black Sea protection. In 1992, the Black Sea riparian countries signed a convention for that purpose, followed, in 1994 by the Odessa Declaration. A regional plan of action towards Black Sea protection was agreed upon and signed in 1996. National protection action plans are now ready, and some governments are in the process of their adaptation. Starting from 1996, the countries of the region have elaborated several regional agreements all in favor of Black Sea protection or sustainable management of its resources. All these steps brought the countries toward restoration of the Black Sea ecosystem and protection of its natural resources.

The projects diligently and efficiently assisted the countries in these changes. They specified the origins of environmental degradation of the Black Sea, assembled a list of important investments necessary to improve the Black Sea environment, and drafted a regional Strategic Action Plan. Once the countries' representatives signed the regional SAP, the second project started to support the countries in designing national SAPs. The legislation modifications and new international agreements concerning Black Sea protection that were introduced by the countries starting from 1996 have been, in most of the cases, stimulated by the regional SAP designed by the project. When the GEF funding became limited after 1997, other donors and international organizations took over the assistance, thus reinforcing the changes within the countries and increasing the prestige of the GEF projects.

Assessment

Both projects worked in political and institutional environments that evolved in the direction of the projects' objectives. The projects themselves contributed to the creation of this environment.

Lesson 4

The process of changes in the countries' perception of the Black Sea and the role of foreign assistance in shaping it may be an interesting subject for academic studies about the role of development projects in public opinion shaping and policy decision making. The results of such studies may be useful for the GEF in designing future regional assistance.

6.3 PROJECT RESULTS

The project results will be summarized and reviewed against their objectives, outputs and actions detailed in the project document.

The project was responsible for achieving four immediate objectives.

Objective 1

Consolidation of the Policy Strategy to Implement the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan.

As requested by the outputs, the project successfully helped countries to develop the national SAP and adopted a basin-wide approach for co-ordination of activities for Black Sea protection. However, none of the Black Sea riparian countries has yet approved or implemented the national SAP.

Objective one was partially achieved.

Objective 2

Preparing the Technical Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan.

To attain this objective, the project should have produced nineteen outputs. The review of the outputs has shown that the project executed only six minor ones; two outputs were not executed and ten others were financed by other donors and executed by the Activity Centers. (Two of the three visited Activity Centers were not even aware of the project's existence.)

The objective was partially attained.

Objective 3

Public Involvement in the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan.

The project published one issue of a 16-pages Black Sea Newsletter in seven languages. Other activities were initiated and executed by the NGOs or were the consequence of public involvement in formulation of the national SAPs. The project did not assess the changes in perception of the Black Sea problems by the public. Social assessment was not done.

The objective was partially achieved.

Objective 4

Developing the financing of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan.

The project did not develop a specific portfolio of investments in format ready for presentation to international financing institutions, nor did it create a Black Sea Environmental Fund, however, it took steps toward development of such portfolio and fund.

The objective was partially achieved.

The long-term objective

The long-term objective of the Project is the rehabilitation and the protection of the Black Sea as well as sustainable development of the region. This project will enable the Black Sea countries to develop NBS-SAPs and through such plans to set the ground for the full implementation of the Bucharest Convention, Odessa Declaration and BS-SAP. This objective will be achieved through the consolidation of the policy strategy, preparation of the technical implementation of the SAPs and development of the financial instruments for financing of the SAPs. This project should also provide the basis for joint work between the Black Sea Programme and the Danube Programme.

The project assisted the countries in drafting the national SAP, but the plans were not yet accepted and implemented. It financed several steps that should have led to preparation of the Black Sea Fund, but the fund itself was not established. The effect of the project effort in raising public awareness was unknown. The project provided the basis for collaboration between the Black Sea and Danube programs.

The modest performances of the project are balanced in some way by the positive role the project played in consolidation of the network of national Black Sea conservation institutions, actualization of the protection legislation; national investment in Black Sea protection, countries involvement in progressing toward Black Sea protection; and information exchange among the countries.

Assessment

The project did not achieve any of the four objectives; the situation expected at the end of the project was not yet fully attained, except for drafting the initial proposals for the Black Sea Basin approach to support the implementation of the Black Sea regional SAP.

6.3.1 Global results

The projects maintained impetus for regional co-operation of the Black Sea coastal countries in the reduction of Black Sea pollution, and launching a sustainable exploitation of Black Sea resources.

6.4 PROJECT IMPACT

The present section will review the changes in the beneficiary countries' policies, economies and plans that were induced by the project. It will review awareness of the participating countries about the project's outputs; level of ownership and commitment of the participating countries towards the project; impacts on the policies and strategies of the countries; technical and managerial co-operation among the participating countries; interagency or inter-ministerial co-operation in each country; co-operation among sectors, including the non-government and private sectors; and sustainability of project impact.

6.4.1 Changes in the Beneficiary Countries

This and the previous GEF projects initiated many changes in the beneficiary countries in favor of Black Sea environment protection. These changes were initiated by the previous the RER/93/G31 project which created the Activity Centers and their national Focal Points that became the major executor of the project's activities. The created network of Activity Centers, Focal Points and other institutions financed from national funds and by the project, prepared the regional and national Strategic Action Plans and finalized the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis.

The regional SAP, adopted by the government in 1996, initiated series of national legislative initiatives and administrative decisions leading to improvement of the Black Sea ecology: the priority investments entered into the national investment plans; the countries elaborated national Strategic Action Plans; they drew up lists of national priority investments; finally, they launched a collaboration with similar program aiming at Danube basin protection.

Thus, the changes in the beneficiary countries introduced by the previous and the presently evaluated projects were numerous, profound and probably sustainable. It should be noted, however, that it was expected that the national commitments would go further. For example, from 39 SAP deadlines identified in these evaluation only few were fully respected by the countries; they countries started to contribute to the Istanbul Secretariat only in 2000 instead of 1997.

The Black Sea's pollution and unsustainable exploitation has attained very dramatic levels and is at the origin of serious economic losses for the countries. The concern of the international community is great and justified by the threat of Black Sea mismanagement to human welfare, the countries' economies and global biodiversity. Surprisingly, the interested countries' involvement is insufficient and slow.

Assessment

The projects motivated the countries to introduce changes in their policy, legislature and investment plans in favor of the Black Sea. The project's activities in this field were highly satisfactory.

6.4.2 Awareness of the Participating Countries

The project was decentralized and many of its activities were executed using national resources such as governmental administration, research institutions and NGOs. Numerous activities received media attention; the day of the regional SAP signature is commemorated by the NGOs as a "Black Sea Day." Impacts of the projects on government decisions concerning the Black Sea is perceptible and was discussed previously. Its impact on civil society was not measured and remains unknown.

Since the implementation of the regional SAP was slow and the investments were insufficient, one may infer that neither the governments nor the citizens of the countries were motivated to follow the program prepared by this and the previous projects. In consequence, we presume that the countries' judgement of the Black Sea environmental situation and its impact on the economy and human welfare were different than the perception hold by both projects. Obviously, there is no reason to *à priori* consider the project as having a monopoly on the truth in Black Sea ecological deterioration matters, and the governments and citizens as not sufficiently aware. Before the next steps towards investment in the Black Sea protection project, it will be necessary to establish national and regional consensus about the importance of Black Sea pollution, needed commitments and agreements to be reached.

Recommendation 14

It is recommended that the Istanbul Commission take steps toward establishing such a consensus.

Additionally, two unfortunate events marred the projects' and the Black Sea problems' visibility.

Firstly, in 1993 the Steering Committee authorized the PCU to introduce the name "Black Sea Environmental Programme" or "BSEP" as a synonym of the RER/93/G31 project. The BSEP name was extended then (probably by PCU) to designate other projects, activities. As a result, the project's name disappeared from the documents produced by the RER/93/G31 and RER/96/G32/C projects. In consequence now it is time-consuming and sometimes virtually impossible to identify the genuine GEF projects contribution.

During the last three years, the RER/96/G32/C PCU staff became much less active than before. In particular, promotion of Black Sea protection has lost its visibility: the project's utility may be questioned. This pre-occupation was reflected in the comments of the visited UNDP offices, who complained of lack of information about the project activities, achievements and the advancement in promoting Black Sea protection. The offices were frustrated, since being themselves concerned with Black Sea pollution, they were willing to advise the host government about specific, favorable actions for the Black Sea, and eventually re-allocate the UNDP funds or re-orient the UNDP projects' activities. The frustration of the UNDP offices was compounded by the fact that the only signs of the project's existence were the periodic project request for arrangements in administrative matters.

Assessment

The project received great attention from governments, involved administrations and institutions. They are aware of the project's results and consider them to be important steps toward improvement of the Black Sea ecology. From another point of view the governments are not implementing the recommended--and even agreed upon--actions and are not providing funds to regional activities. As a result, it seems that governments and probably the citizens are aware of the situation, but are not willing to give the Black Sea problem the same degree of priority as advocated by the project and included in all SAPs and TDA.

Recommendation 15

It is recommended that the Istanbul Commission organize a study that will help it to understand the place of Black Sea environmental problems in the central and local governments' and citizens' priorities. The study should be done by an impartial institution, with no interest in the promotion of Black Sea protection.

6.4.3 Level of Ownership and Commitment

By signing the regional SAP, the countries approved two important outputs of project RER/93/G31: a list of recommendations to implement and deadlines to respect, and a list of priority investments. The national commitments to implementing the SAP and investing according to the TDA were, unfortunately, not respected. The governments are not implementing the SAP, and the status of the investments is unknown. TDA is not actualized as it was required, and environmental impact assessment and public participation is not a rule in all countries of the region. The public sector is not yet involved.

The project prepared the basis for sound investment policies. However there is no evidence that this basis will in the short-term "...foster the revitalization and protection of the Black Sea ecosystem and the sustainable development of its natural resources"⁸⁰ as was required by the project document.

As a follow-up of the SAP, the project encouraged the countries to prepare national reviews, and develop strategies for rehabilitation and sustainable development and pollution assessment. The project itself reviewed the existing legislation and continually encouraged the countries to finance the Secretariat of the Istanbul Commission. Unfortunately, since the countries were not ready to commit themselves politically and financially to implement the Strategic Action Plan, no decisive steps have been taken in this matter.

Assessment

In practice, all the technical activities of the project were executed by national institutions under national direct supervision: the products belong to the countries and the national authorities have full access to the results. Still, although the project acted for the benefit of the countries (including the economical benefit) the material implication of the national authorities was insufficient. In general, the project successfully attained the targets that did not require commitment and financial implication from governments. It was less successful in actions requiring the national financial contribution: updating the national reviews or assessing pollution sources; developing a strategy for rehabilitation and sustainable development of fisheries; cleaning the environment to attract tourism; and implementing the priority investment.

Recommendation 16

The Istanbul Commission should re-assess the national commitments to implementation of the regional SAP and TDA recommendations, and agree with the countries on new realistic deadlines.

⁸⁰ Project Document. Page 32, second paragraph.

Recommendation 17

The Implementing Agency and the Istanbul Commission may invest in identification of appropriate measures that will accelerate national actions aiming at Black Sea environmental improvement such as: further monitoring and research to provide more arguments in favor of Black Sea protection, NGO support, creating citizens' awareness, mobilizing investment, or promoting new, appropriate legislation.

6.4.4 Impacts on Policies and Strategies

The project impacted the policy and strategies of the countries developing scientific, technical and economic arguments in favor of Black Sea protection. The government of the countries agreed to modify their policies and adopt the strategy proposed by the project. It seems however, that the countries' declarations and commitments guided by intellectual considerations may well be volatile: the implemented decisions are those dictated by economical concerns or survival necessity. Black Sea environmental improvement do not figure in these categories. Nevertheless, the countries changed their policies and adopted the new strategy toward the Sea resources exploitation, but they acted slowly, lagging far behind the established agenda.

In spite of this, the chances for implementing the project's proposals are high.

At first, all governments' decisions are subject to pressures from lobbying groups and citizens' organizations. The actions initiated by the NGOs thanks to the project, will play here their role.

Then, the Black Sea is a source of economical benefit for many public and private sector agents. Investment in Black Sea improvement should come directly from the public and private beneficiaries as well. This investment may be interesting for business that will bring short-term benefits such as human health improvement, welfare increase, tourism development, fishery and aquaculture activation. The ongoing privatization of the productive sector, and recent but rapid development of market-oriented economies in the Black Sea basin will re-inforce this trend.

Finally, some countries, namely Bulgaria, Romania, Turkey and Ukraine prepare themselves for entry into the European Community, and they are strongly motivated to comply with the strict European environmental standards.

Assessment

The project has impact on the countries' policies, namely through the regional and national SAPs. The project also impacted the way countries should implement that policy. The TDA and the national SAPs with the lists of specific investments are the most

prominent among the documents indicating the strategies needed to improve the Black Sea environmental situation.

6.4.5 Co-operation

The present section summarizes the project's achievements in re-inforcing the co-operation within the countries on technical and managerial levels, interagency and inter-ministerial ones and co-operation among sectors.

Technical and managerial

The RER/93/G31 created and the present project sustained a network of institutions and specialists in all the Black Sea riparian countries that executed the project activities and produced outputs. The most important elements of this network, the Activity Centers, were incorporated into a network of institutions called Advisory Groups that should act as subsidiary bodies to the Istanbul Commission. The network was active and productive, and its most important contribution was the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and the technical documentation published in the Black Sea Environmental Series.

Interagency or inter-ministerial

Interagency and inter-ministerial co-operation was stimulated by both projects. Project's presence was especially important during preparation of the national Strategic Action Plans.

Co-operation among sectors

The co-operation among sectors was needed to fulfill such objectives as raising public awareness, and involving lower level governments in investment and monitoring. According to the opinions of encountered national co-ordinators this co-operation was weak.

Assessment

The project fostered and maintained co-operation at many levels among national institutions and within the region. Such vast national and regional co-operation was new for the countries and its success is considered by the beneficiaries as an historical achievement of the project.

Recommendation 18

The Istanbul Commission should maintain the existing co-operation networks, animate them and promote the creation of new ones. Especially, the Commission may motivate private sector investors, civil society organizations, education systems and the NGOs to create associations voicing the environmental concerns.

Recommendation 19

The Istanbul Commission should evaluate the networks with respect to their utility to Black Sea protection. It should support all initiatives, but it may reward the most dynamic ones by promoting their quests for additional funding.

6.4.6 Sustainability of Projects Impact

The region now has all the elements needed to assure sustainability of the results achieved by the project's impact. The strategic documents prepared by the previous and the evaluated projects were signed by the governments or will be signed soon. The investments that the projects indicated as important are on the list of national priorities. The regional institutional network built by both projects has been taken over by the Istanbul Commission and its Secretariat that has become operational.

The whole region entered the phase in human history when environment matters. Signing the SAP and being in the process of adopting national SAPs, the countries are demonstrating their concern with the Black Sea environment and their will to reverse its degradation. While it seems that national funds are not sufficient for implementation of the necessary steps toward the rehabilitation and protection of the Black Sea within the schedule established by the project, it is reasonable to expect that the Black Sea environment will improve each year.

Assessment

The project results and its impact on the countries is probably sustainable.

6.5 MAIN ACHIEVEMENTS

The present section deals with relevance of the project design in view of the current situation of the countries and the priorities within the donor community; general project implementation in terms of use of human and financial resources; backstopping services provided; project results against announced project objectives and actions; sustainability of further actions in the region upon completion of the current project within the overall objectives of the GEF.

6.5.1 Relevance of the Project Design

The project was conceived as tool that should help the governments of the Black Sea coastal countries in reinforcing regional co-operation and launching Black Sea environment protection activities. The project assumed these roles brilliantly. It designed the regional and national Black Sea protection plans, identified priority investments, and sustained regional co-operation.

The project was conceived as participatory: small project management units co-ordinated activities of implicated national institutions, and national specialists assured the collection of needed complementary information, drafting of programs, and preparing lists of investment priorities.

This transparent and relevant concept was obscured by unsatisfactorily designed project document. Nevertheless, the obtained results still bode well with the countries' priorities. The program of Black Sea environment improvement designed by the project is now implemented by national governments and donors.

Assessment

The project concept and the delivered outputs corresponded to the countries' requirements. The programs designed by the project are now implemented by governments and donors.

6.5.2 Project Implementation

The project was managed by a PCU and executed by various (mostly national) agencies. The project's management, the PCU, was located in Istanbul on the premises that should harbor the Istanbul Commission, a regional body created by the Bucharest Convention, and responsible for implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan. The PCU was supervised by a Steering Committee. The program designed by the project document should be executed by national institutions, mostly so-called Activity Centers, and other contracted agencies or specialists.

Some activities depended not only on the PCU decisions and GEF funds, but on steps taken by governments, national administrations and other donors. Having no control over these institutions, the project's activities and output delivery suffered from delays and many of them were not executed. Consequently, the non-delivery of many outputs by the project cannot be attributed to the PCU or other specific executing body, but to the inadequate support from the institutions situated out of the project's control. Or, going one step back, to inadequately conceived project document.

The PCU was inadequately controlled by the Steering Committee: the PCU itself was a part of this controlling body, and the Steering Committee accepted, probably due to inexperience, inadequate reporting by the PCU about the activities executed by the project.

Assessment

The project implementation corresponded to the requirement of participatory countries. The results obtained by national executing agencies were easy to appropriate by the countries and the recommendations were incorporated into national development plans. Weakness of the project document hampered the project's efficiency.

6.5.3 Project Results Against Announced Project Objectives and Actions;

In past sections we have shown that the project did achieve partially its immediate objectives. Thus, measured against the project documents, it performed unsatisfactorily. From another point of view, we have seen that some project's actions were of historical importance. The progress made by them were appreciated by the governments of all beneficiary countries, and officials encountered during the mission stressed the positive role played by the projects in development of regional co-operation for Black Sea

protection. Thanks to the both projects' efforts, the countries created a network of activity centers and focal points that collected information needed to prepare the regional SAP, national SAPs, the TDA and national investment priorities. The TDA was considered as an excellent document and is used as a guide for planning the national investments.

The evaluated project continued to organize national and regional workshops and maintained regional co-operation among the national technical institutions and national administrations especially during formulation of national SAPs. This co-operation is ongoing, although performance of the Activity Centers is unequal, and co-operation among administration and technical sectors within countries was not as fruitful as it should be.

The project contributed greatly to consolidate the knowledge about the Black Sea ecosystems, sea exploitation and pollution. This information was widely published, among others, in 11 volumes of the *Black Sea Environmental Series*, by United Nations Publications, New York. Large sections of these information are available in the Internet.

Assessment

The project did not fully attain its immediate objectives. However, the output produced have important and lasting impact on the countries.

6.5.4 Sustainability of Further Actions

Both projects assisted the countries in preparing national and regional SAPs and initiating identification of national and regional priority actions and investments. Implementation of the Action Plans, specific Black Sea protection activities and the investments was the primarily responsibility of the beneficiary countries. The countries committed themselves to these actions and are implementing them, although not as rapidly as was initially scheduled in documents like the regional SAP or TDA. The sustainability of the project's launched Black Sea protection programs is probably assured. However, there are three facets of the Black Sea protection actions still requiring careful consideration. The Istanbul Commission will be the most appropriate institution to take care of them, and the international community may sustain it in this endeavor.

Firstly. The countries act slowly. It has not yet been studied if the countries' actions reduce the speed of Black Sea degradation. It is unknown if this action will suffice, when development of other sectors as agriculture or fishery, impose additional strain on the Black Sea.

Secondly, the countries plan and execute actions according to the national priorities, regional interest being neglected or subdued to the national one.⁸¹ Thus, for example, the countries financed only the Activity Centers' national programs whereas the regional programs were neglected or left to be financed by donors. The countries were also unwilling to contribute to the regional Fund.

Finally, the private sector, for the reasons that are unclear, is not interested in investing in the Black Sea regional projects.

The sustainability of future regional actions depends on the energy and initiative of the Istanbul Commission. The Commission and its Secretariat should nurture the growing ideas of regional co-operation. They may do so by arguing the rationale of such actions, involving foreign donors in supporting the regional actions, demonstrating to the private sector profitable investment opportunities, and mobilizing public opinion, NGOs and lobbies in favor of regional activities.

Assessment

The project outputs are probably sustainable. However, their sustainability on regional level is less assured than the sustainability of outputs that directly re-inforce the national benefits.

Recommendation 20

The Istanbul Commission should critically analyze the sustainability of the project's launched initiatives and identify their present and future viability for Black Sea protection. It should also identify the priority actions needed to be re-inforced.

Recommendation 21

The international assistance may be helpful in re-inforcing the sustainability of the project's results. The Istanbul Commission should decide if the aid will be more instrumental in creating new regional initiatives, or in reinforcing the on-going actions and accelerating their implementation. It should decide the type of the most appropriate assistance and demonstrate its pertinence and efficiency.

⁸¹ According to the evidence available for the evaluation mission.

6.6 LESSONS AND FUTURE ACTIONS

The section deals with lessons from the experience of the projects and its results, particularly those elements that have worked well and those that have not and actions in the region upon completion of the projects.

6.6.1 Lessons From the Experience of the Project

Looking back at the project's efforts, one of the questions one can ask, is what it was about the project that caused achievements to be so unsatisfactory and yet so important for the region. The project was well-conceived yet poorly designed; participatory in their nature yet prone to concentrate the means in the PCU. The answer to this question is beyond the scope of the present evaluation; we do not have at our disposal all the elements needed to formulate the whole answer. Yet, before the next step in assisting the region in Black Sea protection, the Implementing Agency, the Executing Agency and Istanbul Commission have a strong interest in achieving deeper understanding of the years of the project's execution. The analysis itself will increase coherence of the regional co-operation programs and will help to re-design the "umbrella" for the next generation of regional projects.

When the first RER/93/G31 project was initiated, all parties were eager for regional co-operation. The countries adopted the Odessa Declaration, designated the Activity Centers and national focal points, and detached national administrators to co-ordinate project activities within the countries. Both projects financed training programs, workshops and research. They drafted regional and national SAPs and TDA, organized NGOs and sensitized citizens. Seven years later, the urgency has gone or perhaps has not been perceived symmetrically. The regional SAP deadlines were not respected, and the national SAPs are not yet approved. Regional co-operation in Istanbul is not yet fully implemented, and Activity Centers are without funding for regional activities.

The massive absence of concern for the Black Sea environment reflects to some extent the fragility of the concept of Black Sea environment protection as it was formulated in the SAP and national environmental programs.

Clearly, no scientific arguments alone can overcome ambivalence of the governments: between the will to restore the profitability of the Black Sea and the reluctance to invest; between necessity to co-operate and temptation to return to past, traditional isolation; between the necessity to act for the benefit of other countries and a desire to free-ride on their efforts. Government actions must be motivated by national interests: whereas the

projects concentrated themselves on scientific or intellectual justification of Black Sea protection. The future efforts should probably be directed toward development of credible economic arguments and workable political pressures.

6.6.2 Actions Upon Completion of the Projects

It is clear that further support from international donors for organization of regional activities and regional co-ordination for the Black Sea benefit would be most welcome. The Istanbul Commission and its Secretariat will need help in attaining objectives such as regional data gathering, analysis and distribution; co-ordination of national activities that have regional impact; private sector involvement; and regional funding management and optimization.

Recommendation 22 It is recommended to the Implementing Agency to consider a few years' assistance the Secretariat to achieve the following objectives :

- regional data gathering, analysis and distribution
 - regional coordination of Black Sea state monitoring and research.
 - co-ordination of national activities that have regional impact
 - private sector involvement
 - regional funding management and optimization
 - efficient citizen awareness rising,
- governments' decisions and implementation watching

Enhancement of transparency in environmental evaluation, pollution reduction programs and industrial development planning within the region would be an important step in the regional approach to Black Sea environment protection. For this purpose it is recommended to the Istanbul Commission:

Recommendation 23

Establish a common data gathering and exchange system that would help:

- environmental assessment
- monitor changes in environmental quality
- monitor progress in implementing national obligations towards a regional program

Among the unfulfilled obligations that are nonetheless, the prerequisite to any coherent regional approach to Black Sea Protection, is respect of the regional SAP deadlines,

continuous financing of regional programs executed by the national Activity Centers, and contribution to regional programs and regional investments.

Recommendation 24

To make the governments accountable, it is recommended that the Istanbul Commission support national institutions in supervising the governmental agencies, and help citizens to organize themselves to keep governments liable for their obligations.

The Istanbul Commission should reinforce the weakening regional co-operation among the governmental administrative and technical institutions. It should implicate other actors in the co-operating network such as the private sector and social organizations.

Recommendation 25

Maintain and develop the regional co-operation among the existing Activity Centers Focal Points and other affiliated institutions. More attention than has been shown in the past should be paid to co-operation among Activity Centers, technical institutions, administration, the private sector and social organizations. Future regional co-operation should be better-rooted in national investment and policy planning, so as to avoid actions that cannot be financed and deadlines that cannot be respected.

The economic profitability of Black Sea environmental protection was the first argument in favor of the regional co-operation developed in both project documents. The Istanbul Commission should exploit this argument and rationale.

Recommendation 26

It is recommended to the Istanbul Commission to:

- involve the private sector to invest in technologies that will benefit the Black Sea, as for example, creation of fish nursery grounds, development of fish reproduction plants, development of tourism and eco-tourism
- encourage governments to give the investors concessions and guarantees; the donors' specialized agencies may help countries create conditions that would attract private industry to invest in Black Sea protection; the applied research projects could help investors in the adjustment of existing technologies; other financing may come from the municipalities and agriculture
- innovate the Sea protection methods, for example allowing the private sector to enter into research, monitoring, training and control programs now reserved for the governmental institutions
- work out new partnerships with NGOs and other non-profit organizations based on both ethical commitments and economical profitability

Different Black Sea riparian countries are eligible for different international financing. For example, Phare funds finance projects in Bulgaria and Romania but not in Turkey; the NATO funds are available for Turkey but not for the Russian republic. There are financing sources reluctant to support regional projects such as the World Bank loans.

Recommendation 27

To help both countries and donors optimize and co-ordinate the funds-allocation, it is recommended to the Istanbul Commission to assist the countries to develop project proposals of regional importance, and inform governments and donors about identified appropriate projects.

6.7 CLOSING CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

By signing two project documents that claimed as long-term objectives that they will restore the Black Sea environment, the Implementing Agency was perhaps taking a political risk; beneficiary governments might become reluctant to contribute to this endeavor, but rather wait until the projects will do their work; their ministers of finance might refuse to spend money on what should have been done in the first place by the projects.

Prompt acceptance but hesitant and slow implementation of SAP and TDA deadlines may to some extent be a consequence of this promise. It is possible that the reactions of the governments were reinforced by weak arguments behind the strongly recommended actions by the TDA⁸². Finally, slow national administration and lack of funding might have been behind the governments' decisions as well. Whatever the reason, it should be important to identify the reasoning behind the governments' indifference to the regional activities after the signature of the regional SAP.

Recommendation 28

It is recommended to the Implementing Agency and to the Istanbul Commission to elucidate the motivation of the governments that accompanied their hesitation.

⁸² TDA, Section 2.

Annex I. Terms of Reference

**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL FACILITY
United Nations Office for Project Services**

Black Sea Environmental Programme

Developing the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan (RER/96/G32)

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PROJECT EVALUATION

1. BACKGROUND

The Black Sea is recognised as one of the regional seas most damaged by human activity. Its drainage basin covers over one third of the European continent including major areas of seventeen countries, fourteen of which are undergoing a profound economic and political transition from centrally-planned to market economies. Until 1992, there was no common formal framework for cooperation between these coastal countries and no means of planning and implementing joint actions to halt and reverse the worsening environmental situation. The Governments of the region (*Bulgaria, Georgia, Romania, Russian Federation, Turkey and Ukraine*) have shown their willingness to collaborate by formulating and adopting the ***Convention on the Protection of the Black Sea Against Pollution*** (Bucharest Convention) and its three protocols -on land based sources, dumping and cooperation in oil pollution emergencies - in April 1992. The Convention included a call to competent international organisations asking their assistance in the process of implementation of the Convention and elaboration of detailed criteria and methodology for preventing, reducing and controlling pollution. The Contracting Parties also made a concomitant pledge to establish and support the permanent Secretariat of the ***Black Sea Commission*** [(Istanbul Commission), executive organ of the Bucharest Convention)]. Turkey agreed to host the Secretariat of the Black Sea Commission and to cover 40% of the costs for the first three years of its operation.

As a response to regional and global concerns about the critically degraded environmental conditions in the Black Sea, and to the call made by the Contracting

Parties, the countries were assisted by UNEP, and UNDP to elaborate the ***Ministerial Declaration on the Protection of the Black Sea*** (Odessa Declaration) which was adopted in April 1993. The Odessa Declaration constitutes a policy statement with common long-and short-term pragmatic environmental goals for the control of pollution and the rational management and rehabilitation of natural resources.

The six Black Sea coastal countries initiated joint action to protect the unique environment . With the support from a GEF Pilot Phase programme, concrete, country-driven actions have been launched under the **Environmental Management and Protection of the Black Sea (RER/93/G31)**. However, because of the short time frame of the GEF Pilot Phase programme (three years, terminated on 30 June, 1996), the economic realities of the coastal countries and the recently approved GEF Operational Strategy, a new step was to be taken in order to allow a strategic reorientation of the project. While building upon the three year pilot phase activities, the second project was designed to enable a smooth transition by funding key activities to achieve the results required under the new GEF Operational Strategy on International Waters. This project, **Developing the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan (RER/96/G32)** aimed at developing the national components of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan and facilitating follow-up actions, particularly those requiring investments and having significant incremental costs. Since 1993, the two consecutive GEF Programmes have provided a convenient umbrella, widely recognised as the ***Black Sea Environmental Programme (BSEP)***, for assisting the Black Sea coastal states in their endeavor to protect and rehabilitate the Black Sea and for coordinating this work with those of the other international organizations and multilateral and bilateral donors. The BSEP has been managed through the Programme Coordinating Unit (PCU) in Istanbul, hosted by the Government of Turkey, and has filled the gap created by the fact that the permanent Secretariat of the Istanbul Commission was not in function. In the medium/long term, all BSEP responsibilities will be transferred to the Commission Secretariat itself.

Through the Programme for Environmental Management and Protection of the Black Sea (RER/93/G31) significant progress has been made towards the establishment of a sustainable process for the rehabilitation and protection of the Black Sea. An effective regional network of governmental representatives, scientific and other experts, and representatives of non-governmental organizations has been established. This network, as is evidenced by the ***Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA)*** has laid the basis for attaining the sustainable development of the Black Sea. Also, through the establishment of Regional Activity Centres, National Focal Points, Regional Working Parties and the NGO-Forum, important elements of the regional institutional infrastructure required to attain the rehabilitation and protection of the Black Sea has been established. As a result of recent strong cooperation among the Black Sea countries, much of which was within the broad framework of BSEP, an extensive effort has been made to gather, analyse and disseminate reliable information on the state of the Black Sea environment. These activities have confirmed the serious state of the commons and coastal environment and its consequences for the coastal economies of the six Black Sea countries. Particularly acute problems have arisen as a result of pollution (notably from nutrients, faecal

material, solid waste and oil), a catastrophic decline in commercial fish stocks, a severe decrease in tourism and an uncoordinated approach towards coastal zone management.

The transboundary nature of most of these problems, coupled with earlier political realities, was the main reason for the insufficiency of previous control measures. ***The Strategic Action Plan for the Protection and Rehabilitation of the Black Sea*** (SAP) formulated in light of the TDA , and adopted at the Ministerial Conference held in Istanbul in 1996 was a holistic and regional approach to sustainable development in the project area. The SAP introduced a coherent set of policies and actions to reverse the ecological breakdown and improve the livelihood of the population around this fragile ecosystem. The TDA and the SAP also shed a light on the extra-regional and global dimensions of the environmental problems in the Black Sea, thus underlined the need for commitment and action at the wider Black Sea basin level.

The efforts of the coastal countries were further supported by the GEF through the programme **Developing the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan (RER/96/G32)**. The programme aimed at fostering sustainable institutional and financial arrangements for effective management and protection of the Black Sea in accordance with the SAP and supported the development and implementation of National Action Plans . Based on the findings of TDA and the orientation made by the SAP, the Programme also aimed at providing a suitable basis for cooperation between the Black Sea and Danube programmes.

2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION MISSION

The final evaluation of the project "Developing the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan (RER/96/G32) " will consider its effectiveness and efficiency. It will analyse the contribution of the project towards capacity development, long-term sustainability and direction for the future.

Project evaluation is an activity which attempts to determine as systematically and objectively as possible, its achievements as the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The evaluation will assess the achievements of the project against its objectives, including re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and the project design. It will also identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the objectives. While a thorough review of the past is in itself very important, the evaluation is expected to lead to detailed recommendations and lessons learned for the future.

In particular, the evaluation will address the following issues considering the participation of all countries covered by the project:

6.8 2.1 PROJECT DESIGN

- a. Review and assess the appropriateness of the project's concept and design to the overall situation in the Black Sea Region;
- b. Apprise the project's current effectiveness in realising the objectives, and the extend to which they contribute to the overall development objective as announced in the project document;
- c. Appraise the project's actions and outcomes in the light of the pertaining GEF guidelines;
- d. Assess sustainability of the programme.

2.2 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

The mission will evaluate:

- a. General implementation and management of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and activities, with particular reference to financial and human resources management;
- b. Adequacy of management arrangements as well as monitoring and backstopping support given to the project by all parties concerned;
- c. Changes in the environment in which the project operates and which constituted the rationale for GEF support, particularly in the areas of: regional cooperation, policy development, and public participation.

2.3 Project Impact

The mission shall review the achievements of the project against the announced objectives, outputs and activities as detailed in the project document and summarised below:

The overall long-term objective of this project is to foster sustainable institutional and financial arrangements for effective environmental management and protection of the Black Sea, in accordance with the BS-SAP. This project is designed for enabling the Black Sea countries to develop their National Black Sea Strategic Action Plans, and through such plans to set the ground for the full implementation of the Bucharest Convention, Odessa Declaration and regional Strategic Action Plan. This objective will be achieved through the consolidation of the policy strategy, preparation of the technical implementation of the SAPs and development of the financial instruments for financing of the SAPs. This project also intends to provide the basis for joint work between the Black Sea Programme and the Danube Programme.

The project has been designed to integrate fully its immediate objectives, outputs and activities, the results of the pilot project, the environmental aspects of pollution of the

Black Sea, and to ensure the active participation of non-governmental organization (NGOs) and grass root organizations, technical cooperation with other countries, financing institutions for examination of investment potential, and the private sector.

The objectives of the Programme are:

- *Consolidation of a Policy Strategy to implement the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan*, mainly through the development of national action plans and creating the conditions which will facilitate its future implementation at a regional and national level; facilitating a wider Black Sea Basin Approach;
- *Preparing the Technical Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan* through pollution assessment and control (regional monitoring network, maritime pollution network); coordination of the institutional network and its subsequent transfer to the Commission Secretariat; and strengthening information and data exchange mechanisms.
- *Public Involvement in the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan*; through raising public awareness; supporting the Black Sea NGO Forum which was established in 1993 by the Black Sea NGOs with a view to enhance the NGO cooperation in taking actions that for the benefit the Black Sea environment; involving local authorities and other stakeholders in designing and implementing the national SAPs; and carrying out social assessment studies on the human communities particularly affected by the degradation of the Black Sea ecosystems.
- *Developing the financing of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan* through developing a portfolio of national projects of regional significance within the context of reducing transboundary pollution and presenting the portfolio to the donor community; and to elaborate the feasibility of a Black Sea Environmental Fund which may be used to support financing environmental investments as well as the incremental costs of regional programmes/institutions.

In addition, the evaluation will consider the general impact of the project in terms of the following criteria:

- a. Awareness of the participating countries about the project's outputs
- b. Level of ownership and commitment of the participating countries towards the project
- c. Impacts on the policy and strategies of the countries
- d. Technical and managerial cooperation among the participating countries
- e. Interagency/interministerial cooperation in each country
- f. Cooperation among sectors, including the non-government and private sectors
- g. Sustainability of project impact.

The evaluation team will also review the mid-term Project Evaluation Report (November 1995) for the Environmental Management and Protection of the Black Sea (RER/93/G31) as well as the Final Report (RER/92/G31- RER/93/G31 RER/94/G41 RER/96/006) (7 March 1997) attached to this Terms of Reference.

2.4 Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the above the mission shall:

- a. Write up its conclusions of the visit
- b. Address the relevance of the project design in view of the current situation of the countries and the priorities within the donor community
- c. Assess the general project implementation in terms of use of human and financial resources, and backstopping services provided
- d. Review in detail the project results against announced project objectives and actions
- e. Advice on the suitability of further actions in the region upon completion of the current project within the overall objective of GEF.
- f. Drawn lessons from the experience of the project and its results, particularly those elements that have worked well and those that have not
- g. Recommend on further actions in the region upon completion of the current project

7 3. METHOD

The evaluation will be composed of three activities:

- ***studying documents***
- ***field visits and***
- ***interviews of individuals who were either involved in the project, or who have or might be expected to have impacted by the project.***

Although the mission should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorised to make any commitment on behalf of UNOPS, UNDP or GEF.

4. *Composition of the mission*

The evaluation will be performed by a consultant who shall be responsible for the overall review of the project. The consultant should have extensive technical and managerial background at both policy and institution level of environment and international waters in particular, and in-depth experience of project evaluation techniques, particularly of those projects which are funded by GEF. Experience in Europe is preferable. Fluency in English is required, knowledge of French and Russian is an asset.

The consultant should not have been directly involved in the design or implementation of the project.

8 5. REPORT

In drafting the report, the consultant will be guided by the standard UNDP Guidelines for Evaluators.

The final report should contain the following Annexes:

- a. Terms of Reference for final evaluation
- b. Itinerary (actual)
- c. List of meetings attended
- d. List of persons interviewed
- e. List of documents reviewed
- f. Any other relevant material

As the report is the product of an independent evaluation, it is up to the consultant to make use of the information provided during the mission. However, he is responsible for reflecting any factual corrections brought to his attention prior to the finalisation of the report. Therefore, in order to ensure that the report considers the view of all parties concerned, is properly understood, and is factually accurate, it is required that the consultant submit draft reports to UNOPS and UNDP/GEF. UNOPS will revert promptly with collective feedback from project partners in order that the evaluator may finalize his report.

The final version of the evaluation mission report should be submitted in electronic format (MS Word) to UNOPS and UNDP/GEF no later than Ulrike I think you should change the period and duration in accordance with the actual period.. The report shall also be submitted in five hard copies to UNOPS.

5. Mission Timetable and Itinerary

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| 25 September | Debriefing at UNOPS,UNDP New York |
| 27-29 September | Visiting the Programme Coordinating Unit, Istanbul |
| 28 September | Visit to Pollution Control and Assessment Activity Center, Istanbul |
| 29 September | Meetings in Ankara, field visits, laboratories |
| 2-5 October | Meetings in Sofia and Varna (Bulgaria), Activity Center for Environmental and Safety Aspects of Shipping |
| 6-9 October | Meetings in Bucharest and Constantza (Romania),Activity Center for Fisheries |
| 11-14 October | Meetings in Kiev and Odessa (Ukraine), Activity Center for Pollution Monitoring and Assessment |
| 16- 17 October | Meetings in Moscow and Krasnodar , Activity Center for ICZM and/or Tbilisi and Batumi (Georgia) Activity Centre for Biodiversity. |
| 19 October | Meeting with the Project Coordinator, Istanbul |
| 20-21 October | Meeting with the former CTA , Plymouth (UK) |
| 23 October | Submission of the evaluation report |

Annex II. Mission Calendar

September 2000

- 27 New York. Briefing in UNOPS and GEF
- 28 New York Study of documents in UNOPS
- 29 New York Study of documents in UNOP
- 30 Istanbul Meeting in PCU

October 2000

- 1 Istanbul Study of documents
- 2 Istanbul Study of Documents
- 3 Sofia Meeting in Ministry of Environment and Water
- 4 Varna Meeting in Activity Center for Environmental and Safety Aspects of Shipping
- 5 Varna Meeting in Activity Center for Environmental and Safety Aspects of Shipping
- 6 Bucharest Meeting in Ministry of Waters, Forests and Environmental Protection
- 7 Bucharest Study of documents
- 8 Constanta Meeting in Activity Center for Fisheries
- 9 Constanta Meeting in Activity Center for Fisheries
- 10 Travel to Kiev
- 11 Kiev Meeting with Oksana Tarasova and Natalia Movchan Ministry for Environmental Protection and Nuclear Safety of Ukraine
- 12 Meeting in UNDP Kiev
- 13 Travel to Odessa
- 14 Odessa Meeting and documentary study in Activity Center for Pollution Monitoring and Assessment
- 15 Odessa Meeting and documentary study in Activity Center for Pollution Monitoring and Assessment
- 16 Odessa Meeting and documentary study in Activity Center for Pollution Monitoring and Assessment
- 17 Odessa Meeting and documentary study in Activity Center for Pollution Monitoring and Assessment
- 18 Odessa Meeting and documentary study in Activity Center for Pollution Monitoring and Assessment
- 19 Odessa Meeting and documentary study in Activity Center for Pollution Monitoring and Assessment
- 20 Travel to Istanbul
- 21 Istanbul Meetings and documentary study in PCU
- 22 Istanbul Meetings and documentary study in PCU

- 23 Istanbul Meetings and documentary study in PCU
- 24 Istanbul Meetings and documentary study in PCU
- 25 Istanbul Meetings and documentary study in PCU
- 26 Istanbul Meetings and documentary study in PCU
- 27 Ankara Meeting in UNDP and Ministry of Environment
- 28 Departure for Montreal

March 2001

- 12 New York Debriefing in UNOPS and GEF

Annex III. List of Persons Met

- Acar, Sema (Ms.) Program Coordinator, RER/96/G32/C. Istanbul, Turkey
- Arat, Guzin Ms. Foreign Relations Department. Ministry of Environment. Ankara
- Balashov, George Deputy Head of Water Resources and Quality Division, Ministry of Environment and Water. Sofia, Bulgaria
- Bologa, Alexander NIMRD. National Institute for Marine Research and Development "Grigore Antipa," Constanta
- Bursa, Murat Sungur Ex Deputy Secretary. Ministry of Environment. Ankara
- Cavdir, Vaim Black Sea Environmental Programme. Istanbul, Turkey
- Cimen, Saban General Director, Pollution Control. Ministry of Environment, Ankara
- Denga, Juri Head Laboratory of Analytical and Methodical Development Ukrainian Scientific Center if the Ecology of Sea. Ministry for Environmental Protection and Nuclear Safety of Ukraine
- Djadjev, Plamen (National Coordinator) Head of Water Resources and Quality Division, Ministry of Environment and Water. Sofia, Bulgaria
- Dogan, Arzu Isul Ms. RER/96/G32/C Administrative Assistant. Istanbul
- Ionescu, Lucian Executive Director, Organizatia Ecologista Neguvernamentala, Constanta
- Karadag, Esra Ms. Environment Programme Officer. UNDP. Ankara
- Kostylev Eduard Heag Laboratory of Hydrobiology Ukrainian Scientific Center if the Ecology of Sea. Ministry for Environmental Protection and Nuclear Safety of Ukraine
- Leschenko, Oksana Ms. Environmental Issues Consultant. UNDP Kiev
- Lisovsky, Richard, J. Head of Laboratory of Integrated Coastal Zone Management. Ukrainian Scientific Center if the Ecology of Sea. Ministry for Environmental Protection and Nuclear Safety of Ukraine
- Mara, Liliana Ms. Department Director, Ministry of Waters, Forests and Environmental Protection. Bucharest
- Mara, Septimus. PIAC expert. Flood Protection, Synthesis and Cadastre Directorate. Ministry of Waters, Forests and Environmental Protection. Bucharest
- Mikhailv, Valery Director Ukrainian Scientific Center if the Ecology of Sea. Ministry for Environmental Protection and Nuclear Safety of Ukraine
- Movchan, Natalia Ms. Deputy head, Water Resources Department, Ministry for Environmental Protection and Nuclear Safety of Ukraine
- Nicolaev, Simion. General Director, Romanian Marine Research Institute. Constanta
- Papadopol, Nicolae, C. National Institute for Marine Research and Development "Grigore Antipa," Constanta
- Petkov, Nicolay Head of Shipping and Port Operations, Research Institute of Shipping. Varna Bulgaria
- Rosioara, Valerin Expert, Ministry of Waters, Forests and Environmental Protection. Bucharest

- Sinclar, David VSO-EEP volunteer Information, Education and Resources Center for the Black Sea. Constanta
- Stoyanov, Lyubomir Director Emergency Response Activity Center on Environmental and Safety Aspects of Shipping
- Tanev, Christo Chief of Research Institute of Shipping. Varna, Bulgaria
- Tarasowa Oksana. Ministry for Environmental Protection and Nuclear Safety of Ukraine
- Topping Graham, Marine Environmental Consultant.
- Ucer, Okan Deputy Undersecretary, Ministry of Environment. Ankara
- Volosko-Demkiv, Oksana Ms. Programme Officer on Environmental Issues. UNDP Kiev
- Witchi- Cestari, Alfredo, A. UN Resident Coordinator in Turkey and UNDP Resident Representative. Ankara

Annex IV. List of Documents Reviewed

1. Anon. 1998. Multi Country Project on Sustainable Fisheries Management in the Black Sea. Terms of Reference. Constanta, pp. 34.
2. Black Sea Red Data Book. Dumond, H., J., Mamaev, V. O. and Y. P. Zaitsev Editors. 414 pages.
3. Danube River Pollution Reduction Programme and the Black Sea Environmental Programme Report on the Ecological Indicators of Pollution in the Black Sea. Ukraine. Institute of Biology of the Southern Seas, Odessa Branch, and UNDP/GEF Assistance, pp. 49.
4. Danube River Pollution Reduction Programme and the Black Sea Environmental Programme Report on the Ecological Indicators of Pollution in the Black Sea. Russian federation. State Committee on Environmental Protection, and UNDP/GEF Assistance, pp. 30.
5. Danube River Pollution Reduction Programme and the Black Sea Environmental Programme Report on the Ecological Indicators of Pollution in the Black Sea. Turkey. METU - Institute of Marine Sciences, and UNDP/GEF Assistance, pp. 104.
6. Danube River Pollution Reduction Programme and the Black Sea Environmental Programme Report on the Ecological Indicators of Pollution in the Black Sea. Bulgaria. Sofia University, Faculty of Biology and UNDP/GEF Assistance, pp. 81.
7. Danube River Pollution Reduction Programme and the Black Sea Environmental Programme Report on the Ecological Indicators of Pollution in the Black Sea. Romania. Romanian Marine Research Institute, Constanta, and UNDP/GEF Assistance, pp. 49.
8. GEF Operational Strategy of the Global Environment Facility (www.gefweb.org/public/opstrat)
9. GEF BSEP Tacis Ministry of Environmental Protection and Nuclear Safety of Ukraine, the Activity Center on Pollution Monitoring and Assessment, Ukrainian Scientific Centre of Ecology of the Sea. 1999. Support for the Regional Activity Center for Pollution Monitoring and Assessment (Odessa, Ukraine) Phase 1. Odessa, 139 pp.
10. GEF BSEP, 1995. 19 Expedition of the Research Vessel V. Parshin. Assessment of Contamination of the Ukrainian Coastal Zone from Land-Based Sources. Odessa, pp. 81 .
11. GEF BSEP, 1995. Black Sea Bibliography. Black Sea Environmental Series Vol. 1. United Nations Publications. New York, pp. 364.

12. GEF BSEP, 1995. Environmental Expert Group. Technical Sub-Group on Environmental Financing: Meeting on Establishing a Black Sea Environmental Fund. Istanbul, pp.26.
13. GEF BSEP, 1996. Assessment of Land Based Sources of Water and Land Pollution Contamination on the Ukrainian Black Sea Coast. Odessa. 33 pages.
14. GEF BSEP, 1996. Biological Diversity in the Black Sea: A Study of Change and Decline. Black Sea Environmental Series Vol. 3. United Nations Publications. New York, pp. 208.
15. GEF BSEP, 1996. Marine Aquaculture in the Black Sea Region Current Status and Development Options. Black Sea Environmental Series Vol. 2. United Nations Publications. New York, pp. 239.
16. GEF BSEP, 1996. Recreational Water and Beach Quality in the Ukrainian Black Sea Coastal Zone. Odessa. 48 pages.
17. GEF BSEP, 1996. Strategic Action Plan for the Rehabilitation and Protection of the Black Sea. Istanbul, pp.29.
18. GEF BSEP, 1996. Technical Support for Estimating the Economic Value of Reduced Risks to Human Health in Black Sea Coastal Areas. Odessa. 34 pages.
19. GEF BSEP, 1997. Black Sea Biological Diversity: Bulgarian National Report. Black Sea Environmental Series Vol. 5. United Nations Publications. New York, pp. 131.
20. GEF BSEP, 1997. Black Sea Biological Diversity: Romanian National Report. Black Sea Environmental Series Vol. 4. United Nations Publications. New York.
21. GEF BSEP, 1998. Black Sea Biological Diversity: Georgian National Report. Black Sea Environmental Series Vol. 8. United Nations Publications. New York, pp. 167.
22. GEF BSEP, 1998. Black Sea Biological Diversity: Ukraine National Report. Black Sea Environmental Series Vol. 7. United Nations Publications. New York, pp. 351.
23. GEF BSEP, 1998. The Most Blue in the World. By Y. Zaitsev. Black Sea Environmental Series Vol. 6. United Nations Publications. New York, pp. 239.
24. GEF BSEP, 1999. Black Sea Biological Diversity: Turkish National Report. Black Sea Environmental Series Vol. 9. United Nations Publications. New York, pp. 144.
25. GEF BSEP, 1999. Black Sea Pollution Assessment. Black Sea Environmental Series Vol. 10. United Nations Publications. New York, pp. 380.
26. GEF BSEP, 2000. Black Sea NGO Directory. Istanbul, pp.101.
27. GEF BSEP/ Tacis, 1999. Environmental Quality Objectives for the Protection of the Black Sea Ecosystem. Draft Final Report. Odessa. 133 pages.
28. GEF UNDP RER/93/G31 Environment Management and Protection of the Black Sea. Revised Project Document, pp. 3.
29. GEF UNDP RER/93/G31 Environment Management and Protection of the Black Sea. Project Document, pp.46.
30. GEF UNDP RER/96/G32/C Developing the Implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan. Project Document, pp. 68.
31. GEF, 2000. World Bank Strategic Partnership for Nutrient Reduction in the Danube River and Black Sea. The World Bank, pp. 11.
32. GEF. Control of eutrophication, hazardous substances and related measures for rehabilitating the Black Sea ecosystem. Project proposal, pp. 51
33. GEF/BSEP, 1997. Black Sea Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis. 142 pages

34. GEF/BSEP, 1998. Black Sea Environmental Priorities Studies. National Report of Ukraine. United Nations Publications. New York. 105 pages.
35. GEF/BSEP, 1998. Black Sea Environmental Priorities Studies. National Report of Turkey. United Nations Publications. New York, pp. 177.
36. GEF/BSEP, 1998. Feasibility Study for the Establishment of a Black Sea Environmental Fund. 87 pages.
37. GEF/BSEP. Annual reports 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997
38. GEF/BSEP. Meetings of the Black Sea Environmental Programme Steering Committee. 1994, 1995, 1998
39. IAEA-408, 1999. World-Wide and regional Intercomparison for the Determination of Organochlorine compounds, Petroleum Hydrocarbons and Sterols in Sediment Sample
40. Lanier-Graham, S. 1991. The Nature Directory. A Guide to Environmental Organizations. Walker and Company, New York, pp. 190.
41. Mee, L. How to save the Black Sea.
42. Ministry of Environmental Protection and Nuclear Safety of Ukraine, 1998. Yje Concept of the Protection of the Environment of the Azov and Black Seas. Kyiv, pp. 14
43. Odessa Activity Center, 1996. Identification of "Hot Spots" in the Black Sea coastal waters in Ukraine. Odessa. 11 pages.
44. Odessa Activity Center, 1997. Progress report. 126 pp.
45. Odessa Activity Center, 1999. A Status and Trends Monitoring Programme for the Black Sea: A Proposal for Regional Strategy. 26 pages.
46. Odessa Activity Center, 1999. Complex monitoring of the marine economical zone of Ukraine and the state of the ecosystem of Azov-Black Sea Basin. 197 pages.
47. Odessa Activity Center, 1999. Support for the Activity Center for Monitoring and Assessment Within the Frame of the Strategic Action Plan. Final Report. 128 pages
48. Odessa Activity Center, 2000. Sovremiennoe sostojanie i perspektivy banka danyh geoinformacionnyh tekhnologii, upravleniu i obmenu danyimi. Odessa.
49. PCU GEF BSEP, 1997 Black Sea Red Data Book. 41 pages.
50. Phare and Tacis, 1997. Demonstration Projects in Aquaculture.
51. Project Implementation Reviews (PIR) RER/96/G32/C 1999, 2000
52. Romanian Marine research Institute. Improvement of Sestems and Practices for a Sustainable Development of Aquaculture in the Dobrudja Area. Project proposal.
53. Tacis, 1999. 1996/1997 Funds for the Black Sea Environmental Programme - Phase 2. Implementation Report June 1999
54. UNDP GEF Information Kit on Monitoring and Evaluation. 37 pages.
55. UNDP Programming Manual (www.undp.org/osg/pm)
56. UNDP RER/96/G32/A Preparatory Assistance. Formulation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan. Project Document, pp. 7.
57. WHO, 1998. Guidelines for Safe Recreational-water Environments: Coastal and Fresh-waters. Draft. 205 pages.