ROM BACKGROUND CONCLUSION SHEET (ONGOING)				
ROM ID	3-280 / MR-			
Project Title	RESEARCH AND RESTORATION OF THE ESSENTIAL FILTER OF THE SEA- REEFS			
Country	Romania RO, Bulgaria BG,Georgia GE,Turkey TR, Ukraine UA			
Project Task Manager	Bodil Persson			
Expert(s)	Tornike Gotsirize			
ROM field visit dates	start:	1 Jul 2013	end:	19 Jul 2013

1. RELEVANCE

The extent to which the objectives of the intervention are still consistent with beneficiaries' needs and partners' and donor's policies.

1.1 Does the intervention presently respond to the needs of the target groups?

A	B	C	D
○	○	●	○

a. Were there any changes in the situation of the target groups and the context which have, or will, influence the relevance of the operation for target groups?

b. Have the activities of other actors such as government and donors changed the needs and priorities of the target groups?

c. From the target groups' perspective, what is the level of priority of the needs the operation is addressing?

This project is a pilot international initiative for focused and specific scientific research on environmental impact of artificial reefs on particular Black Sea sites of Bulgaria, Georgia, Romania, Turkey and Ukraine.
An artificial reef is a human-made underwater structure, typically built to promote marine life in areas with a generally featureless bottom, control erosion, block ship passage, or improve surfing. Many reefs are built using objects that were built for other purposes, for example by sinking oil rigs (through the Rigs-to-Reefs program), scuttling ships, or by deploying rubble or construction debris. Other artificial reefs are purposely built (e.g. the reef balls) from PVC or concrete. Shipwrecks may become artificial reefs when preserved on the sea floor. Regardless of construction method, artificial reefs generally provide hard surfaces where algae and invertebrates such as barnacles, corals, and oysters attach; the accumulation of attached marine life in turn provides intricate structure and food for assemblages of fish.
The construction of artificial reefs is thousands of years old. However, in the Black Sea Basin there is almost no practical experience in using artificial reefs. Taking into account that, the awareness of target groups' in the participant countries is low, it can be concluded that the project objectives are still relevant to limited number of target groups: local authorities in Constantsa, Varna, Odessa, Batumi and Trabzon, marine biologists and scientists, environmental NGOs and Scientific-Research Institutions who are directly involved in the project implementation.

1.2 Does the operation presently support the policy (or its development) of the partner government and is it in line with existing policy?	A ○ B ○ C ◉ D ○
a. Have there been any changes in Partner government policy which have had, or will have, an impact on the relevance of the operation? *b. Is the operation supporting the development or improvement of a sector policy?*	In general, the project objectives are in line with the Governments' strategy and their international commitment related to the Black Sea biodiversity protection. Actually all beneficiary countries are signatory of the Bucharest Convention, which creates legal basis for Black Sea Protection on international level. However, the issue related to the artificial reefs is very new for all countries and there is no state policy or strategy on the development of artificial reefs. Even on international level the development of artificial reefs in the Black Sea Basin has not been considered and no relevant programme exists. Therefore, if the project is successful it has a potential to contribute to the development of artificial reef on the National and International levels in the Black Sea region.

1.3 Is the operation in line with EC development policy and strategies?	A ○ B ◉ C ○ D ○
a. Is the operation in line with the latest EU development cooperation policy? *b. Is it aligned with EU policy for the specific sector in the country/region?* *c. Does the operation respect the EU's international commitments such as the Paris Declaration and follow-up?* *d. Is the operation embedded in and supporting policy dialogue which the EUD/HQ is engaged in?*	The project objectives are in line with the Priority 2 -Sharing resources and competencies for environmental protection and conservation, of the CBC Black Sea Basin Programme, and in particular: Measure 2.1- Strengthening the joint knowledge and information base needed to address common challenges in the environmental protection of river and maritime systems.

Note: a = very good; b = good; c = problems; d = serious deficiencies.	Overall conclusion - Relevance	**C**

2. QUALITY OF DESIGN

The internal coherence and validity of the intervention logic, its formalization in a logframe (or other format) and the implementation arrangements.

2.1 Does the present intervention logic still hold true and is it clear and coherent?	○ A	○ B	◉ C	○ D

a. Does a logframe exist and what is its quality?

b. Is the operation's underlying intervention logic coherent, clear and realistic?

c. Is the approach adopted in the design taking sufficiently into account previous experience and state of the art knowledge in similar interventions?

d. Are the resources, capacity and timeframe adequate to achieve the project purpose?

e. Does the intervention logic explicitly mention risks and assumptions and are they specific, up to date and holding true? Are risk management arrangements in place?

f. To which degree does the design foresee sufficient flexibility for adaptation to a changing context?

g. Are the indicators SMART?

The project intervention logic is not clear and is confusing. The logframe matrix (LFM) was prepared as part of the Action/Proposal but the quality of the LFM is poor: the Project has three Overall Objectives and one Specific Objective; the Project Specific Objective (SO) is ambitious and no relevant results are specified in the action which could be logically linked with the SO or can lead to the achievement of the SO. The project results and outputs are mixed with OVIs. Some important results are not included in the LFM at all, i.e. an installation of five artificial reefs is not considered as a project result, and no relevant activities are proposed, which makes the project intervention logic confusing.

The project activities are grouped around five Components/Group of Activities (GAs). For each component the activities, outputs and Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) are described, but the logical linkage between the project activities and actual results is not always ensured. Moreover, Component 2/GA2 does not specify all activities related to the design, manufacturing and installation of artificial reefs.

From today's perspective it is obvious that the scope of work and many OVIs are ambitious. Moreover, the proposed timing and sequence of the implementation of activities in the action were not correct. Taking into account that the main task of the project is the installation and testing of five artificial reefs, it was logical to expect that the activities related to the procurement of scientific equipment as well as designing, manufacturing and installation of artificial reefs would be implemented in the first year of the project implementation as planned. However, this was not done and too much time was spent on theoretical and preparatory work. Moreover, it also became obvious that the lead partner had no clear vision on the design specification of the proposed artificial reefs and it took several months to discuss possible design with the partners. This process is still ongoing and no feasibility study has been prepared. Meanwhile, in 2012 the Ukrainian Partner designed and installed an artificial reef on its own cost. Although this experiment was partly successful, it proved that artificial reef can be populated during one year. This fact proves reefs could be installed during the first year of the project implementation period.

The main risks which may affect the achievement of the project purpose are: 1) Ambitious Specific Objective; 2) Delay in identification and a suitable reef structure; 2) Lack of consensus between project partner regarding the methodology and reef design; 3) Delay in installation of the artificial reefs, which creates problem for the implementation of other activities. 4) Delay in utilisation of the project funds. In this respect it should be mentioned that after one year of the project implementation inception payment is still not utilised and no request was prepared for the second installment. It means that in the best case installation of reefs will be done in November/December 2013. Upon analysis of all these risks it can be concluded that without time extension it will be very difficult for the project partners to achieve the Project Purpose.

2.2. Do the implementation arrangements take into account the capacity of the partners, and is the design fully supported by them?	○ A	○ B	◉ C	○ D
a. Are the timescale and activities realistic with regard to the stakeholders' capacities, organizational structure and implementation arrangements? *b. Have the relevant stakeholders been actively involved, as a driving force, in the design process?* *c. Do all relevant stakeholders, especially the target group, understand and agree on the intervention logic?* *d. Are the roles and responsibilities of all partners clearly defined and understood by all concerned?* *e. Does the operation foresee adequate capacity development support?*	The project was initiated and designed by the Bulgarian Biodiversity Foundation Kaliakra Branch (BBF), Dobrich, Bulgaria, in partnership with the Odessa Branch of the Institute for Biology of the Southern Seas (OBIBSS), Odessa, Ukraine, Southern Branch of Shirshov Institute of Oceanology, Russia, ONG Mare Nostrum, Constanta, South East, Romania, Energy Efficiency Centre and Black Sea Resources Hydrogen Development Fund, Georgia and Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon, Turkey (from IPA financing). The project proposal was submitted in April 2009 and it took almost three years to start the project implementation. During the evaluation of the proposal it turned out that the Project Partner from Russia could not participate in the project implementation due to the fact that Russia had not signed the CBC Black Sea Basin financial agreement with the EU. Moreover, after signing the Contract the Georgian Project Partner refused to participate in the project and new Partner Ilia State University was selected. Taking into account that the Project Partner from Russia was considered as a lead for the implementation of Component 3 activities it had negative consequences, since it is not quite clear how and by whom these activities will be implemented. Taking into account that the project has a strong scientific-research character it requires adequate experience and knowledge from all partners, which is not the case. Besides the leading Partner/beneficiary does not have enough experience in designing and application of artificial reefs, which affects the project implementation. Different approaches, which exist among the project partners on the implementation of the project tasks as well as on the scientific and technical issues related to the artificial reefs design and monitoring, causes the delay in the project implementation. The project tasks, responsibilities are not well defined or shared between two or more partners, which does not allow them to work autonomously and effectively, the coordination between the partners is week and not efficient.			

2.3 Is the current design sufficiently taking cross-cutting issues into account?	○ A	◉ B	○ C	○ D
a. Have the relevant cross-cutting issues (environment, gender, human rights and governance, donor coordination or others) been adequately mainstreamed in the design?	One cross-cutting issue: environmental protection is well incorporated in the project design. Two other cross cutting- issues: gender and good governance have not been adequately addressed during the implementation			

Note: a = very good; b = good; c = problems; d = serious deficiencies.	Overall conclusion - Quality of design	**C**
	Overall conclusion - Relevance and quality of design	***C***

3. EFFICIENCY

A measure of how economically (in terms of quality, quantity and time) resources/inputs are converted to outputs.

3.1 How well is the availability and use of inputs and resources managed?	A ○	B ○	C ○	D ●

a. To what degree are inputs and resources provided/available on time from all parties involved to implement activities? *b. To what degree are inputs available at planned costs (or lower)?* *c. Are staffing arrangements proving adequate?* *d. Are inputs monitored regularly, and by whom, to encourage cost-effective implementation of activities?* *e. Are operation resources managed well and in a transparent and accountable manner?* *f. Is the current budget break-down conducive to the implementation of the operation?* *g. Are all contractual procedures clearly understood and do they facilitate the implementation of the operation?*	By the end of June 2013, when approximately 54% of the project implementation time had elapsed the utilisation of the project resources is seriously behind the schedule. Some project partners did not utilise even 70% of the inception payment. The procurement of diving equipment is also behind the schedule. The third tender for the procurement of the diving equipment which was organised in June 2013 failed. Due to the fact that the project is not in position to apply for the second payment, many activities cannot be implemented, including production of the artificial reef structures. The project is suffering from week management and limited cooperation between the project partner. An internal monitoring system does not exist. According to the project partners some reallocation between the budget lines is necessary for successful implementation of activities, e.g. according to the Project Partner in Ukraine the budget for a ship rental is not sufficient and should be increased.

3.2 How well are the activities implemented?	A ○	B ○	C ●	D ○

a. To what extent are activities implemented as planned/scheduled? If there are delays, have the reasons been identified and remedial action been taken to get the operation back on track? *b. Are funds spent in line with the implementation of activities? If not, why?* *c. Is there a need to change any of the planned activities? If so, how well have these changes been managed?* *d. How well are activities monitored? Is monitoring used to take corrective action?* *e. How well does the operation co-ordinate with other, similar interventions (if any) for synergy and in order to avoid overlaps?* *f. Is a logframe (or an equivalent tool) actively used as management tool? If not, why?* *g. Is a work plan/implementation schedule available and actively used by project management?*	The grant contract was signed on 01/06/2012 and the implementation of the project started from 02/06/2012. The project team was quickly mobilized and the first installment was timely paid. During 27/06-30/06/2012 the opening conference was organised in Bulgaria. During June-December 2012 the project activities were implemented according to plan. However, from January 2013 onwards the implementation of the project activities has been seriously delayed. Hence the project work plan is obsolete. Moreover, the work plan is too brief and does not include all activities to be implemented by the project in the second year. Hence the work plan cannot be used for the project management purposes. GA1. Stratus: 50 % activities were completed with 5 months delay. Activities related to the research and analysis of legal and institutional framework in the participant countries were completed in all countries, and the final consolidated report was presented during the Second Round Table meeting in Romania, 20-22/05/2013. Reefs Restoration programme and scope and framework of the Action Plan were discussed during the first Round table meeting in Odessa, 29-30/11/2012. The Action Plan was also discussed during the second round table meeting in Romania during 20-22/05/2013 as well, however, the AP is still not approved. GA2-Feasibility Studies and Methodology. Status: the preparation of the feasibility studies is delayed. The installation of artificial reefs did not start in the second year as it was planned. The first technical seminar was organised in June 2012 where scientific methods, artificial reefs structures, criteria and possible localities were discussed. GA3- Trainings. Status: not started. The start of activities was scheduled for the second year; however, the activities did not start because the artificial reefs are still not installed. It is not clear how and when the planned activities will be implemented. GA4.Visibility. Status: progressing according to plan. Two articles were prepared, a leaflets 1,000 pcs leaflets were printed; the project web site was developed operational. After each round table meeting and technical seminar relevant press-releases were distributed to the mass media.

3.3 How well are the outputs achieved?	A	B	C	D

a. Are the outputs delivered as planned and in a coherent manner e.g. logical sequence?

b. What is the quality of the outputs? Are they likely to lead to the intended outcomes?

c. Have the outputs been produced/ delivered in a cost-efficient manner?

d. Are the outputs accessible to the target group?

e. Are they correctly reflected through indicators?

The main project outputs delivered by the project are:
-Opening forum and technical seminar on artificial reefs were organised with participation of 41 participants
-The first round table Black Sea Reefs restoration-Legal and Environmental aspects with 21 Participants held;
-The second two-day round table Black Sea REEFS Restoration - Management and Monitoring Aspects was held in the period 20-22/05/2013 in Romania as scheduled with 22 participants;
- Five country assessment reports on legal and institutional issues delivered but with delay;
- Consolidated report on legal and Institutional aspect was prepared with four months delay;
- The project web site developed;
- Preliminary indicators for the monitoring of the pilot reefs defined;
- Project logo developed and being used in the project documents and publications
- A leaflet of 1,000 pcs was designed and printed in English
- Two articles and several press releases published.

If we compare the timing and the resources spent for the delivery of these outputs, it can be concluded that the project cost efficiency is low, because the delivery of some important outputs is still pending: Feasibility Studies for the pilot artificial reefs were not prepared, no final criteria and methodology for the monitoring of artificial reefs is available, The procurement of diving equipment is 4-5 months behind the schedule, the training plan is not available, Reefs restoration programme and the Action Plan is not finalised; No joint research expeditions were implemented.

3.4. How well are the Partners involved and contributing?		A ○	B ○	C ●	D ○
a. Do the inter-institutional structures (e.g. steering committee, monitoring and reporting system, etc.) facilitate efficient implementation? *b. Is there good communication between partner government, EU, project management and other stakeholders?* *c. If necessary, are specific arrangements (e.g. Memoranda of Understanding, etc.) in place to promote active stakeholder involvement?*	The coordination between the project partners is week. Although a Coordination Committee was created and several meetings were organised, it is obvious that these meetings were not enough and better coordination is necessary, because of weak communication between the leading partner and other project partners in between the regional events. The communication with the Joint Technical Secretariat (JTS) is also week due to the fact that no JTS is available at present, which is one of the main obstacles for the project.				
Note: a = very good; b = good; c = problems; d = serious deficiencies.	Overall conclusion - Efficiency			**C**	

4. EFFECTIVENESS

The extent to which the intervention's objectives (on outcome and project purpose level) are, or are expected to be, achieved.

4.1. How well is the operation achieving its expected outcomes?	A	B	C	D
	○	○	●	○

a. Have the expected outcomes been achieved to date?

b. What is the quality of the outcomes?

c. How do target groups assess their usefulness?

d. Do all target groups (and everybody in the target group) benefit from the operation as expected?

e. Are there any factors which prevent target groups from benefitting?

Progress in the achievement of the planned results is slow and not satisfactory. According to the revised work plan it was expected that artificial reefs would be installed by the end of the first year, however, this process is still quite far from the start, mainly because many important outputs and OVIs are still not delivered or they are delivered with big delays.

The exact locations for the installation of artificial reefs were clarified and a preliminary agreement from the relevant Ministries and local Authorities were obtained in all countries, except Georgia. However, the research study of the pilot site was implemented only in Ukraine. In Turkey the Project Partner did the research work before the project start, hence no additional research was necessary. In May 2012 the project partner in Ukraine installed a small floating artificial reef on their own initiative and own cost, but it cannot be considered as the project result.

In Bulgaria and Romania, the potential locations for the installation of artificial reefs have been determined in consultation with local scientists and without a field study.

In June 2013 the Leading Partner came up with the final design of the pilot artificial reefs to be installed by the project. However, the proposed design is still a draft and some partners have concern regarding the proposed design. It is proposed to install to sizes of floating artificial reefs depending of water depth in the sea shore. However, no feasibility study is available in order to justify the proposed design. In this regard it is not clear why the project partners did not agree on the exact design of the pilot artificial reefs prior to the project start. This could be done on the basis of extensive experience, which exists in many European countries. In this case many problems and delays could be avoided.
A preliminary list of indicators prepared to measure the effectiveness of artificial reefs to improve the water quality and increase biodiversity was defined. It was agreed that before installation of artificial reefs it will be necessary to investigate the bottom community in the research area (macrophytes, zoobenthos and fishes) but due to the fact that the procurement of diving equipment failed three times, no joint research expeditions were implemented.

Taking into account that no activities have been implemented in relation to the Component 3, - Trainings, it is not clear when and how the planned results for Component 3 will be delivered.

As a result only a small number of target groups (mainly scientists and experts who are directly involved in the project implementation) have benefited from the project activities through exchanging ideas and information regarding the development of artificial reefs.

4.2. As presently implemented, what is the likelihood that the project purpose will be achieved?	A	B	C	D

a. To what extent has the project purpose been achieved so far? Is this measurable through the indicators or is there other evidence for this?

b. Given the achievement and quality of outcomes so far, what can be said about the likelihood of achieving the project purpose within the timeline of the operation?

c. To what extent has the operation adapted to changing external conditions (risks and assumptions) in order to ensure the achievement of the outcomes and the project purpose?

d. Are there any unexpected, negative effects on the target group which have occurred or are likely to occur due to the operation? Did project management take remedial action against these?

e. Are there any unexpected positive effects on the target group which have occurred or are likely to occur?

The Project Specific Objective is: to establish long-term partnership platform for scientific, technical, administrative and awareness-raising activities in favor of artificial reefs practice as a way of active support to the self-restoration of the Black Sea ecosystem.

The achievement of the Specific Objective directly depends on the successful implementation of the pilot projects: installation of five artificial reefs in five localities of the beneficiary countries. As mentioned in BCS 2 and BCS 3.1 this process has been seriously delayed, and there is no chance that the artificial reefs will be installed soon. One of the main problems is that the budget for the first installment is still not utilised, and the approval process for the second installment may take 3-4 months.

Theoretically the Specific Objective can be partly achieved without installation of the artificial reefs through creation of the partnership platform and signing of an agreement between implementing partners and potential beneficiary Institutions from all five countries. The leading Project Partner proposed to adopt Reefs Development Programme and Action Plan; the draft documents were prepared and discussed during the round table meetings but without result.

One of the problems which may pertain of the Specific objectives is very limited involvement of other potential project beneficiaries (NGO Community, businesses, local and central authorities) in the project, at least at this stage of the project implementation. Another problem is the distinctive competence between the project partners. Bulgarian and Romanian Partners are NGOs and consequently even if they sign any agreement it will be very difficult for them to provide adequate support, because they lack financial and human resources. The project partners from Ukraine, Georgia and Turkey can sign a partnership agreement, provided that they reach common approach on the development of artificial reefs. However, the necessary preconditions for the development of the artificial reefs are: appropriate legal and regulatory fretwork, and availability of protected areas in the coastal zone. At present none of these preconditions are available, and the project is clearly not in position to facilitate this process.

Note: a = very good; b = good; c = problems; d = serious deficiencies.	Overall conclusion - Effectiveness	**D**

5. IMPACT TO DATE

Likelihood of positive and negative, medium to long-term effects of an intervention, both direct and indirect, intended and unintended.

5.1. What are the operation's direct impact prospects (i.e. contribution at the level of overall objective)?	A ○ B ○ C ● D ○
a. Are there any changes on the level of the Overall Objective which can be observed (through indicators) so far? Can the operation be assessed as having contributed to these changes? *b. Given the progress so far, what direct impacts appear likely by the end of the operation?* *c. Are any external factors likely to jeopardize the operation's direct impact?* *d. Does the operation contribute to the development or improvement of related policies?*	It was not planned to have an impact at this stage of the project implementation, since the achievement of relevant OVIs is expected at the end or after the project completion. Nevertheless, it was possible to achieve more progress by the Partners in promoting legal changes in the national legislations, based on the legal assessment report and recommendations, which were prepared by the project. This could be an important indicator for the impact prospect, since at present artificial reefs are not considered in the national legislation of the participant countries. Without changing of this situation it will be naive to expect the development of national or regional programmes. However, only the Ukrainian Project Partner made some steps to start this process by sending a relevant letter to the Ministry of Ecology. The outcome of this action is still not known but taking into account that the introduction of the necessary changes in the legislation is a lengthy process, it is unlikely that the necessary legal changes may take more time than the project implementation period. Besides, for impact prospects it is important to demonstrate the effectiveness of artificial reefs in practice, hence without successful implementation of pilot projects it will be very difficult to convince the local and central Government to support the development of the artificial reefs on national level.

5.2 To what extent does/will the operation have any indirect (positive/ negative) impact?	A ○ B ● C ○ D ○
a. Is there any unplanned positive impact on the final beneficiaries? *b. Are there any observable or expected spill-over effects? Are there any indications that elements/aspects of the operation will be rolled out to or taken up by other parties?* *c. What are the negative consequences, if any, of the operation on the target group and others? Did the operation take timely measures to mitigate negative impact?* *d. What are the likely environmental, social, cultural, gender and economic long term effects?* *e. Do donor coherence, complementarity and coordination encourage synergies and/or improve the potential impact of the operation?*	The project has a capacity to have several indirect positive impacts. One indirect impact is that during the reporting period the Project Partner in Ukraine has installed and tested a floating reef on its own cost. Although this experiment was not very successful, it clearly demonstrates increased interest of the Ukrainian Project Partner to implement the project successfully.

Note: a = very good; b = good; c = problems; d = serious deficiencies.	Overall conclusion - Impact to date	**C**

6. SUSTAINABILITY TO DATE

Likelihood of the continuation of benefits of an intervention after its completion.

6.1 What is the financial/economic viability of the continuation of benefits after the end of the operation?	A ○ B ○ C ● D ○
a. Is there a viable financial sustainability plan in place and is it being implemented? i.e. if the benefits have to be supported after the operation's end, will funds be available? If so, by whom? By the partner government/project authority? Or is continued donor support required? If so, is it likely to be available? *b. If there are costs for continued access to the benefits, are target groups in a position to assume their share after the completion of the operation?* *c. Are there any external factors that might jeopardize the sustainability of benefits, and if so, have appropriate measures been taken to forestall this?* *d. Are the target groups and/or relevant authorities/institutions able to afford the maintenance or replacement of the technologies/services/outputs introduced by the operation?* *e. Is the financial/economic dimension of the phasing out strategy being adequately addressed and implemented as far as necessary to date?*	The financial and economic viability is very important for the project, since after the installation of five artificial reefs on Black Sea shore of the beneficiary countries all project partners should implement monitoring and research work. These research activities will go beyond the project lifetime; hence it is important for all project partners to have adequate financial and human resources to do the work. At this stage the sustainability prospects are good in Ukraine, Turkey and party in Georgia, because these are state owned institutions and they are financed from the state budget, besides they have also other income from scientific-research activities and grants. Bulgarian and Romanian Partners do not have their own financial or human resources to implement the follow up activities and they fully depend on grant income from international organisations. According to the Leading Partner, they plan to discuss local fisheries institute regarding the future ownership of the artificial reef. The Project Partner in Romania plans to propose to Constantia Municipality to take ownership of the artificial reef after the project completion. However, the sustainability issue is still not clear in Bulgaria, Romania and Georgia.
6.2. What is the level of ownership of the operation by the target group and relevant stakeholders?	A ○ B ○ C ● D ○
a. Is an exit strategy integrated in the design and has the implementation been managed accordingly? *b. Is there any evidence of further commitment of the relevant stakeholders?* *c. Is operation implementation demand-driven or is there simply passive buy-in from target groups?* *d. Do the target groups plan to continue assuming their role in ensuring continued outputs and outcomes? If so, are they likely to materialize?* *e. To what extent have they been actively involved in the implementation and steering process?* *f. How far is the operation embedded in the local structures of the target group (possibly different from institutional structures)?*	The level of ownership is good in Ukraine and Turkey, while in Bulgaria and Romania it is still not enough. In Georgia the project partner demonstrates some reluctance to the implementation of the project tasks

6.3. To what degree does the policy environment support the operation?	A	B	C	D
a. Is the national, local, sector and budgetary policy environment an enabling factor for the continuation of benefits? What specific support is being provided? *b. Do changes in policies and priorities affect the potential sustainability of the benefits? If applicable, has the operation adapted to ensure long-term support?* *c. If relevant, is any public and private sector policy support likely to continue after the operation has ended?*	The policy environment is supportive to the project sustainability. The Governmental Institutions: Ministries and Local Authorities are providing full support to the project implementation and there is no risks that this attitude will be changed. Despite the fact that there is no provisions in national legislation regarding installation of artificial reefs, the Governments' of majority of participant countries gave permission for the installation of reefs.			

6.4. To what extent does the operation contribute to partners' capacity development?	A	B	C	D
a. Does the operation contribute to the development of partner's individual and organizational capacities for sustainable delivery of outputs and outcomes? *b. How far is the operation embedded in institutional structures that are likely to function beyond the life of the operation?* *c. Will an adequate level of qualified human and institutional resources be available in the future in order to continue delivering the operation's stream of benefits?*	The training and capacity building of target groups is considered as one of the main tasks of the project. Component 3 of the project is specifically focused on Training issues. The development of training programme for university students and other target groups is one of the main outputs of the project. However, due to the delay in the installation of reef the start of Component 3 activities is pending. No training plan is available in order to understand when the planned trainings implemented and by whom.			

Note: a = very good; b = good; c = problems; d = serious deficiencies.	Overall conclusion - Sustainability to date	C

7. HORIZONTAL ISSUES

7.1 Quality Systems, Monitoring and Evaluation

a) Were the QSG comments taken into consideration and included in the final design and applied during implementation?	○ *Yes*	○ *No*	◉ *N/A*
b) Are the issues identified by ROM regarding design the same as those addressed in the QSG checklist?	○ *Yes*	○ *No*	◉ *N/A*
c) Have previous evaluations or reviews (such as ROM, reviews by the EU operational manager) led to changes in the operation?	○ *Yes*	◉ *No*	○ *N/A*
d) Is the available monitoring and reporting information on the operation's progress comprehensive and reliable in order to ensure the possibility to evaluate results and learn lessons?	○ *Yes*	◉ *No*	○ *N/A*

Please comment on any of the questions / aspects above, qualitative data is very valuable:

QSG checklist is not available for CBC projects. This is the first ROM report on this project
In 2012 the Join Management Authority implemented a monitoring mission and the field survey report was produced. However, that time the project was implemented according to plan and JMA monitoring mission did not identify any problem and no specific recommendations was prepared.

7.2 Review of Technical Cooperation/Capacity Development Quality Criteria

Adaptation to the context and existing capacity

a) Are there critical constraints in the context which are likely to prevent the CD support from achieving its objectives?	◉ *Yes*	○ *No*	○ *N/A*
b) Is the CD support adequate vis-à-vis the present capacity of the local partner?	◉ *Yes*	○ *No*	○ *N/A*

Demand driven TC/CD and ownership

c) Do local partners effectively lead in the planning of CD support beyond formal endorsement?	○ *Yes*	◉ *No*	○ *N/A*
d) Do local partners provide the inputs (human or physical) that would be required to enable the CD support to be effective?	○ *Yes*	◉ *No*	○ *N/A*

Result oriented TC/CD			
e) Are the outputs or outcomes of the CD support clearly specified and still relevant (or adjusted to changes of context)?	○ *Yes*	◉ *No*	○ *N/A*
f) Are they regularly monitored and/or assessed (e.g. through a joint performance dialogue or an annual reporting)?	○ *Yes*	◉ *No*	○ *N/A*
Harmonisation of TC/CD			
g) Is the CD support taking into account CD interventions from other donors in the same sector?	○ *Yes*	◉ *No*	○ *N/A*
h) Is there a donor coordination mechanism led by local partners and encompassing CD support?	○ *Yes*	◉ *No*	○ *N/A*
Project Implementation Arrangement			
i) Is CD support embedded in the broad institutional context of the local partners and have unnecessary parallel mechanisms been avoided?	◉ *Yes*	○ *No*	○ *N/A*
j) Do contracted experts, project managers and NGO staff take instructions from the partner and not the EC? (while some form of reporting to the EC can still take place)	○ *Yes*	◉ *No*	○ *N/A*

Please comment on any of the questions / aspects above, qualitative data is very valuable:

The project is facing serious problem, which is partly due to the poor management of the project by the lead partner partly very slow utilisation of the project resources.
The project intervention logic is confusing and the proposed activities are not logically linked with the results. The project work plan is very brief and cannot be used for the project management purpose,
There is no complementarity with other projects.

7.3. EC Visibility

Does the operation contribute to promoting EC visibility (e.g. does it comply with the EC Guidelines)?	◉ *Yes*	○ *No*	○ *N/A*

Please comment on any of the questions / aspects above, qualitative data is very valuable:

EC visibility is respected during the organisation of mass events and trainings. The Project followed the well established system of consultation with and approval by JTS before publication of all visibility items.

8. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

8.1. Have practical and strategic gender interests been adequately considered in the operation's strategy?	○ Yes	● No	○ N/A

If so, how and to what effect? If not, why not? If n/a, explain. Please consider the following aspects of gender mainstreaming: *a. Has the operation been planned on the basis of a gender-differentiated beneficiaries' analysis?* *b. To what extent will / could the gender sensitive approach lead to an improved impact of the operation?* *c. What is the likeliness of increased gender equality beyond the operation's end?* *d. According to the OECD Gender Policy Marker how would you classify this operation?*	The gender issue was not properly addressed in the project design and implementation phase. However, one positive fact was noted: approximately 50% of the experts involved in the project implementation are females.

8.2. Is the operation respecting environmental needs?	● Yes	○ No	○ N/A

If so, how and to what effect? If not, why not? If n/a, explain. Please consider the following aspects of mainstreaming environmental aspects: *a. Have environmental constraints and opportunities been considered adequately in the operation's design?* *b. Are good environmental practices followed during implementation (in relation to use of water and energy and materials, production of wastes, etc.)? Does the operation respect traditional, successful environmental practices?* *c. What capacities exist (within the operation, among partners and the operation's context) to deal with critical risks that could affect the operation's effectiveness such as climate risks or risks of natural disasters (in the case of operations in sensitive geographical areas / natural disasters hotspots)?* *d. Has environmental damage been caused or likely to be caused by the operation? What kind of environmental impact mitigation measures have been taken?* *d. Is the achievement of project results and objectives likely to generate increased pressure on fragile ecosystems (natural forests, wetlands, coral reefs, mangroves) and scarce natural resources (e.g. surface and groundwater, timber, soil)?*	The project is entirely designed to address environmental problems through installation of artificial reefs in five locations and to promote the conservation of Black Sea biodiversity.

8.3. Has (good) governance been mainstreamed in the operation?	◉ Yes	○ No	○ N/A
If so, how? If not, why not? If n/a, explain. Please consider the following aspects of governance: *a. Does it take into consideration the differential impact of poverty on disadvantaged groups?* *b. Is the operation designed in such a way that it takes into account potential conflict?* *c. Is regular, transparent, financial reporting built into the operation? Are its results widely circulated and understandable?* *d. Are there effective anti-corruption monitoring tools in place?*	Taking into account that the Leading Partner has serious problem in managing the project, it is hardly to expect that the project can promote good governance among the target groups and implementing partners. Hence, the good governance has been mainstreamed mainly through the implementation of CBC Programme Management Guidelines and PRAG rules, which can contribute to the capacity improvement of the project partners. This includes: project management, reporting, procurement and planning.		

8.4 Does the operation actively contribute to the promotion of Human Rights?	◉ Yes	○ No	○ N/A
If so, how? If not, why not? If n/a, explain. *a. Has there been an analysis of "winners and losers" regarding possible "discrimination" of target groups by the operation?* *b. Will the operation help to ensure respect for any relevant human rights and not cause them to be reduced in any way?* *c. Do any interested parties and observers raise HR concerns?*	The project promotes equal opportunity to provide certain social environment in which people are not excluded from the activities on the basis of immutable traits. None discriminatory approach is respected by the project as key principle for people of different partner countries can work in and benefit from the project, regardless their racial or ethnic origin, religion and belief, disability, sexual orientation and age.		

9. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED/DOCUMENTS ANALYSED	
Name / Position	Institution / other
Laura Bobarnac/Programme Manager	Joint Management Authority
Stela Sachelaresku/Monitoring Expert	Joint Management Authority
Petko Tzvetkov/Project Manager	BBF,Bulgaria
Mariana Stoyanova/Partnership Coordinator	BBF,Bulgaria
Bela Japoshvili/Project Coordinator	Ilia Univeristy,Georgia
Gigi Tevzadze/Rector	Ilia Univeristy, Georgia
Ertug Duzgunes/Project Coordinator	Turkey
Coscun Eruz/Deputy Coordinator	Turkey
Boris Aleksandrov/Coordinator	OBIBSS, Ukraine
Galina Minicheva/Deputy Director	OBIBSS, Ukraine
Marina Kosenko/Financial Manager	OBIBSS, Ukraine
Mihaela Candea/Coordinator	Mare Nostrum, Romania
Gabirela Iosif/assiatant	Mare Nostrum, Romania
Documents Analysed	
CBC Black Sea Programme Documents	
Contract	
Application	
First Interim Report	
Progress Report 2	
Progress Report 3	
Country Assessment Reports	
Consolidate Legal and Institutional Assessment Report	
Promotional Materials	

OVERVIEW OF SUB-CRITERIA GRADES	
Sub-criteria	*Grade*
1.1 Relevance for target groups	C
1.2 Relevance for partner	C
1.3 Relevance for EU	B
2.1 Intervention logic	C
2.2 Partners and Design	C
2.3 Cross-cutting issues	B
3.1 Inputs	D
3.2 Activities	C
3.3 Outputs	C
3.4 Partners and Implementation	C
4.1 Outcomes	C
4.2 Project Purpose	D
5.1 Direct impact	C
5.2 Indirect impact	B
6.1 Financial sustainability	C
6.2 Ownership	C
6.3 Policy support	B
6.4 Capacity Development	D
7.1 a) QSG comments	N/A
7.1 b) QSG and ROM on design	N/A
7.1 c) Evaluations and reviews	No
7.1 d) Progress information	No
7.2 a) TC/CD - constraints	Yes
7.2 b) TC/CD – capacity	Yes
7.2 c) TC/CD – partner lead	No
7.2 d) TC/CD – partner input	No
7.2 e) TC/CD – specified results	No
7.2 f) TC/CD – monitoring	No
7.2 g) TC/CD – other donors' intervention	No
7.2 h) TC/CD - donor coordination	No
7.2 i) TC/CD - embedded	Yes
7.2 j) TC/CD - staff instructions	No
7.3 EC visibility	Yes
8.1 Gender	No
8.2 Environment	Yes
8.3 Good Governance	Yes
8.4 Human rights	Yes