**UN Environment GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2019**

1. July 2018 to 30 June 2019)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Identification** | | GEF ID.: 9545 | Umoja no: SB-007448 | |
| **Project Number + Project Title** | | Implementation of Ecosystem Approach in the Adriatic Sea through Marine Spatial Planning. | | |
| **Duration months** | ***Planned*** | 24 | | |
| ***Extension(s)*** | 31 December 2020 – 15 months | |  |
| **Division(s) Implementing the project** | | Ecosystems Division | | |
| **Executing Agency(ies)** | | UNEP/MAP | | |
| **Names of Other Project Partners** | | MAP Priority Actions Programme Regional Activity Centre (PAP/RAC). | | |
| MAP Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre (SPA/RAC). | | |
| **Project Type** | | Medium Size Project | | |
| **Project Scope** | | National | | |
| **Region *(delete as appropriate)*** | | Europe | | |
| **Names of Beneficiary Countries** | | Albania and Montenegro | | |
| **Programme of Work** | | N/A (UNEP/MAP as MEA follows a specific PoW approved by its contracting parties) | | |
| **GEF Focal Area(s)** | | BD-4 Program 9  IW-1 Program 1  IW-3 Program 6 | | |
| **UNDAF linkages** | | N/A | | |
| **Link to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s)** | | SDG 14 | | |
| **GEF financing amount** | | 1,817,900 USD | | |
| **Co-financing amount** | | 12,017,790 USD | | |
| **Date of CEO Endorsement** | | 14 October 2016 | | |
| **Start of Implementation** | | 01 October 2017 | | |
| **Date of first disbursement** | | 01 October 2017 | | |
| **Total disbursement as of 30 June** | | 655,000 USD | | |
| **Total expenditure as of 30 June** | | 380,152 USD | | |
| **Expected Mid-Term Date** | | N/A | | |
| **Completion Date** | ***Planned*** | 30 September 2019 | | |
| ***Revised*** | 31 December 2020 | | |
| **Expected Terminal Evaluation Date** | | 31 March 2021 | | |
| **Expected Financial Closure Date** | | 30 September 2021 | | |

1. **OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS**

*To be completed by UNEP/GEF Task Manager*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **UN Environment Subprogramme(s)**  *N/A (UNEP/MAP as MEA follows a specific PoW approved by its contracting parties)* | **Specify the relevant Expected Accomplishment(s) & Indicator(s)** *N/A (UNEP/MAP as MEA follows a specific PoW approved by its contracting parties)* |
| *N/A (UNEP/MAP as MEA follows a specific PoW approved by its contracting parties)* | |

**For all GEF 6 and later projects:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **GEF Core Indicators** | **Indicative expected Results** |
| *1. Maintain globally significant*  *biodiversity and the ecosystem goods*  *and services that it provides to society* | 200,000 ha |
| *The characterization phase is still ongoing in Montenegro. This step will allow to prepare a national MSP Strategy in Montenegro which will eventually lead to the improved management of 200,000 ha of seascapes.* | |

*To be completed by Project Manager, as relevant*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Planned linkages with UNDAF** | *N/A* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Planned contribution to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s)** | *The project plans to contribute to the SDG target 14.2, 14.3 and 14.4 by reaching a science-based consensus among sub-regional countries on good environmental status of the Adriatic Sea.* |

*[complete the fiscal year and select: 1st PIR; 2nd PIR; …. Final PIR. Add more columns if needed]*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Implementation Status** | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 2020 |  |  |
| 1st PIR | 2nd PIR | 3rd PIR |  |  |

*[complete the fiscal year in the first line; select* ***HS; S; MS; MU; U; HU; unknown; not rated*** *to rate the progress towards the development objective for the fiscal year you are reporting in the second line. Add more columns if needed]*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Development Objective Rating FY** | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 2020 |  |  |
| **MS** | **S** | **S** |  |  |
| *The outline for the common IMAP for Albania and Montenegro was prepared. Based on the outline, thematic monitoring programmes are being prepared. National experts were trained and supported in their effort of drafting the respective national IMAPs. This is important progress that will allow moving forward the IMAP monitoring programme of the two countries in 2019-2020 and use the data produced as basis for decision-making tools and their implementation in Marine Spatial Planning in selected area.*  *In parallel significant progresses were made in introducing MSP as a tool in the implementation of spatial planning process in the Adriatic sub-region. Relevant stakeholders and representatives of national institutions were involved through trainings and workshop. This is a preparatory work which is deemed necessary to kick start the preparation and approval of Marine Spatial Plan for selected marine areas. To further support the process, an initial draft of the document towards common approach for MSP in the Adriatic sub-region has been prepared and presented during the first sub-regional (Adriatic) meeting on common approach towards MSP, held in Zagreb on 10 April 2019.*  *In terms of outcome 1, the execution of the component 1 of the project will take place over the second semester on 2019 and 2020 after all the preparatory work under outcomes 2 and 3 is completed.*  *For outcome 2, good progresses were made for the improvement of the existing baseline data to be collected in both Albania and Montenegro. This includes the preparation of detailed documentations for the marine surveys in Montenegro and Albania, as well as extensive consultations with national representatives regarding survey needs took place. The International tender for survey in Montenegro was launched in April 2019. Moreover, the project started implementing the activities towards harmonized marine monitoring among Adriatic countries, through the support of the regional Meeting of the Ecosystem Approach Correspondence Groups on Pollution Monitoring, organized by MED POL. Discussions are ongoing between SPA/RAC, GFCM and national coordinators regarding GFCM possible support to the GEF Adriatic project regarding the fishery cluster. In addition to Albanian and Montenegrin representatives, members of other Adriatic countries participated. These steps will allow to provided monitoring and assessment programme to be used by Albania and Montenegro as a solid basis for more integrated decision-making.*  *For outcome 3 key a document towards common approach for MSP in the Adriatic sub-region has been drafted. This is the basis for the sub-regional, as well as the national MSP activities within the project. Sub-regional workshop on MSP training for the Mediterranean countries was organized on 9/10 April 2019. In addition to the other Mediterranean representatives, 2 experts from Albania, 1 from Bosnia and Herzegovina and 4 from Montenegro participated These are the important stakeholders and representatives of relevant national institutions that are/will be involved in the project. In terms of integration and synergies with the existing UNEP/MAP process on GES the project is fully embedded existing UNEP/MAP processes on GES. The Project works in full integration with UNEP/MAP MED POL. Moreover, it is contributing to the other UNEP/MAP GES-related projects (such as EcAp Med II) by implementing GES activities in Adriatic countries not being eligible as part of those projects but being eligible for the GEF.*  *For outcome 4 several training material, reports and analysis were produced and shared with relevant stakeholders, UNEP/MAP system and countries. The project has been presented and contributed to several regional meeting in the framework of the Barcelona Convention and into global meeting in the framework of the IW:LEARN and LME:LEARN process.* | | | | | |

*[complete the fiscal year in the first line; select among* ***H; S; MS; MU; U; HU; unknown; not rated*** *to rate the implementation progress in the fiscal year you are reporting in the second line. Add more columns if needed]*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Implementation Progress Rating** | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 2020 |  |  |
| **MS** | **S** | **S** |  |  |
| *The national Structure for the project execution in Montenegro and Albania were stabilized and secured.*  *New contracts with confirmed national coordinators in Albania and Montenegro were established. Albania and Montenegro set up their National team of experts for each “cluster” of ecological objectives (biodiversity, NIS, fisheries; coast and hydrography; eutrophication and contaminants; marine litter) in coordination with UN Environment/MAP, SPA/RAC and PAP/RAC.*  *The executing partners contracted international marine sectoral experts related to the different Ecological objectives to assist the national experts’ teams to prepare the national knowledge GAP assessment and draft the national monitoring programmes aligned with IMAP. In addition, PAP/RAC contracted an international lead marine monitoring expert to ensure integration of the thematic monitoring programmes into national IMAPs. Contracted experts were also engaged in providing training to the national experts for each ecological cluster.*  *In coordination with the National GEF Adriatic Project Coordinators (Albania and Montenegro), three EcAp training workshops were organized for national teams of experts: EO5 Eutrophication and EO9 Contamination (02-03 October 2018, organized by PAP/RAC), EO10 Marine litter (22 November 2018, organized by PAP/RAC), EO1 Biodiversity, EO2 NIS and EO7 Hydrography (26-27 November 2018, organized by SPA/RAC and PAP/RAC). In total, 56 national experts were trained with a gender balanced composition of 50% female and 50% male.*  *Two additional hands-on training courses were organized for experts on eutrophication, contaminants and marine litter respectively on 28 November 2018 in Montenegro and 17-18 December 2018 in Albania. The meeting in Albania was organized in coordination with UNEP MAP MED POL.*  *Common outlines for gap assessments for all EOs were prepared, shared and communicated with national experts. Continuous support towards preparing national gap assessment was provided. Based on those outlines, the national knowledge gaps related to the different Ecological objectives have been prepared by the national Albanian and Montenegrin experts.*  *GFCM provided support related to the fisheries component. An additional gap assessment outline related to EO3 “fisheries” was prepared and shared with the national experts. The gap assessment is ongoing and will provide complementary data to the IMAP knowledge GAP assessment process. SPA/RAC, in close coordination with GFCM, is providing support on this issue.*  *Common outline for IMAP, with thematic monitoring programmes was prepared by the lead international monitoring expert, shared and further elaborated by the international sectoral experts. Outline was shared and communicated with national experts. The national experts are drafting thematic monitoring programmes closely assisted by the international experts.*  *Tender for undertaking marine survey in Montenegro was published in April. It was published according to Croatian legislation but as international tender (published also on EU electronic tender). However, the only application that was submitted was invalid and the tender need to be canceled. The new tendering procedure is being prepared; it will be simple tender, with so-called negotiation process for contracting the bidder.*  *Tender document for undertaking marine field survey in Albania is under preparation. The call for tenders will be launched by the end of July. The field survey in Albania will also benefit from a budget support provided by MED POL and the Italian Ministry of Environment, Land and Sea (through an additional MSP project implemented within the same area and supported by IMELS funds) to implement additional activities related to the IMAP and MSP*  *The Project supported the organization of regional Meeting of the Ecosystem Approach Correspondence Groups on Pollution Monitoring (CORMON; Podgorica, 2-3 April 2019), led by MED POL. Participants from Albania and Montenegro are participating in this meeting which is an opportunity to work towards joint/agreed monitoring programmes among the Adriatic and the Mediterranean countries.*  *TORs for national and international experts for initiating MSP activities were prepared. Discussion and consultations on the future activities with national authorities in Montenegro is on-going, with two meetings with national authorities organized in Podgorica (25-26 April 2019) and Budva (14 June 2019).*  *Training to raise sub-regional capacities for MSP is being organized (to take place in April), in coordination with other UNEP/MAP PAP/RAC initiatives.*  *Activities towards a join approach for MSP in the Adriatic sub-region are initiated, in coordination with other UNEP/MAP PAP/RAC and SPA/RAC initiatives. Sub-regional meeting was organized in Zagreb (10.4.2019) and initial draft of the common approach document prepared.*  *Contractor for the stakeholder involvement plan selected and work commenced.*  *The Second Steering Committee meeting was organized in Podgorica (15 May 2019). The progress of the project, the expenditure report and the budget revision were reported and agreed by the Steering committee. A no-cost extension until end of December 2020 was also agreed.*  *During the Coast Day celebration in Split (22-26 September 2018), the project was presented and promoted as part of the different awareness raising activities organized.*  *The project was promoted in the region (Mediterranean) and internationally: during regional Coast Day event in Split (September 2018), LME 20 meeting in Marrakech (November 2018), PANACeA workshops (Brussels, December 2018; Herceg Novi, May 2019 ), as part of an exchange meeting with the representatives of Benguela Current Commission (February 2019), the GFCM WGMPA (February 2019), EUSAIR events (Podgorica and Budva, April and May 2019) .*  *In addition to the above activities/events the project was promoted and supported in several through the EcAp MED II project and the MedMPAnet II project. Namely by:*   * *Related to the EcAp process at the regional level: during the Meetings of the Ecosystem Approach Correspondence Group on Monitoring (CORMON) Biodiversity and Fisheries (21 february-01 Mars 2017, Madrid, Spain; 12-13 February 2019, Marseille, France; 21 May 2019, Rome Italy)* * *Related to the MPAs management at the regional level: The Mediterranean MPA Forum from 28 November to 1st December 2016 in Tangier, Morocco; and the meetings of the Ad Hoc Group of Experts for Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean (AGEM) held from 21 to 23 February 2018 and the 15th of March 2019 in Tunisia.*   *In term of visual identity, a Project logo was designed and consistently used in presentations, reports and communications.* | | | | | |

*[complete the fiscal year in the first line; select* ***H; S; M; L;*** *to rate the fiscal year you are reporting. Add more columns if needed]*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Rating** | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 2020 |  |  |
| **M** | **M/L** | **M/L** |  |  |
| *All the risks identified at CEO endorsement stage are at a low or medium level. The execution of the project proved that the Barcelona Convention system is instrumental to convey the required information on EcAp, IMPA and MSP to the countries. This is supported by the specific knowledge and experiences of UNEP/Map, PAP/RAC and SPA/RAC. In terms of climate change, although the issue is still relevant for the whole region (if not globally), it is not expected to affect the Project execution. MSP, together with the other protocols and instruments of the Barcelona Convention take into consideration climate change. The delivery of the co-financing pledges is proceeding well with no specific issues. Finally, the coordination mechanism between the PMU, UNEP/MAP, SPA/RAC, PAP/RAC and the countries proven to be efficient and instrumental to the needs of the project. For this reason, the overall risk for the project is assessed to be medium/low with to be minimized by the end of the project.* | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder engagement** | *Stakeholder engagement is a key element to support the implementation of complex and challenging processes such as the UNEP/MAP Integrated Monitoring Assessment Programme (IMAP), the Marine Spatial Planning (MSP).*  *The GEF Adriatic project deployed significant efforts to ensure that all relevant stakeholders in Albania and Montenegro were involved. Stakeholder involved were mainly from both beneficiary countries, Albania and Montenegro, but also from sub-regional and regional institutions/organizations.*  *In Albania, the main stakeholders involved have been:*   * *Ministry of Tourism and Environment;* * *National Agency of Protected Areas of the Ministry of Tourism and Environment;* * *[National Environment Agency](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Environment_Agency_(Albania)) of the Ministry of Tourism and Environment;* * *Faculty of Natural Sciences;* * *Albanian Geological Survey;* * *Regional Agency of Protected Areas Vlore, Ministry of Tourism and Environment;* * *Ministry of Defense;* * *Ministry of Infrastructure and Energy;* * *Technical Secretariat of National Water Council;* * *UNDP Tirana;* * *Inter-institutional Marine Operational Centre; Ministry of Defense;* * *NGO INCA;* * *The Regional Environmental Center (REC), Albania;* * *Italian Agency for Cooperation and Development AICS Tirana.*   *In Montenegro, the main stakeholders involved have been:*   * *Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism;* * *Institute for Marine Biology;* * *Environment and Nature Protection Agency;* * *Institute for Hydrometeorology and Seismology;* * *Center for Protection and Research of Birds (CZIP);* * *Montenegro Hydrocarbons Administration; Ministry of Economy;* * *Centre for Ecotoxicological Research (CETI);* * *Maritime Safety Department;* * *Ministry of Interior Affairs;* * *Ministry of Economy;* * *Ministry of Fisheries;* * *Public Enterprise for Coastal Zone Management (“Mosco Dobro”);* * *Geological Survey of Montenegro;* * *Faculty of Bar;* * *NGO "Zeleni Crne Gore";* * *NGO RDA-UBA;* * *NGO Green Home;* * *NGO Green step;*   *UNEP/MAP MEDPOL and INFO/RAC were also involved.*  *The project also benefited from additional sub-regional and regional stakeholder involvement ensured by the collaboration with the General Fishery Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM), the Italian Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea, UNESCO IOC, and the institutions involved in the EU Strategy for the Adriatic-Ionian Region.*  *In addition, collaboration was established with the GEF project “Promoting Protected Areas Management through Integrated Marine and Coastal Ecosystems Protection in Coastal Area of Montenegro”.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Gender mainstreaming** | *The Project engaged a gender expert to undertake a gender analysis of the results framework, including providing recommendations related to the mainstreaming of gender considerations in the indicators and targets.*  *This was done to identify relevant entry points in the GEF Adriatic Project for the mainstreaming of gender in technical and policy-related interventions on the ground.*  *The recommendations made by the gender expert included:*   * *Experts selected for the training should reflect gender balance;* * *The Good Environment Status (GES), as stated by the EU does not seem to incorporate a socioeconomic perspective to a great extent. However, it does talk of human activities and their repercussions on the marine ecosystems. In this framework, a good way to gather gender-disaggregated data for marine and coastal ecosystem use, would be to map procedure to see what kind of activities are happening, and their effects + spillover effects in the target countries;* * *Disaggregate the number of experts trained in Marine Spatial Planning in participating countries;* * *Since EcAp focuses on decentralized management, lessons learnt on inclusive and gender-balanced coastal/marine/ecosystem management should be shared through the Project;* * *Highlight the importance of gender work both in GEF and UNEP’s programmatic approaches. This is helping coastal communities – particularly vulnerable groups, to move towards environmentally sustainable and socioeconomically equitable practices.*   *As general principle the execution of the GEF Adriatic projects pays attention to the involvement of a gender balanced groups of national and international experts identified based on their expected contribution and specific technical/institutional experiences. The same approach has been applied to the project management team and the stakeholders in both countries. In the reporting period covered by this report the sample of people involved and engaged by the projects resulted to be gender balanced with a ratio of 50% - 50% approx.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Knowledge activities and products** | *Several reports were produced by the Project focusing on the activities executed and the outputs achieved so far.*  *Training materials and technical reports were elaborated for both countries i.e. the National EcAp Knowledge GAP assessments and the national monitoring programmes documents related to the IMAP EO1, EO2, EO3, EO5, EO7, EO9 and EO10.*  *A Project logo to provide a clear visual identity was also designed.*  *The GEF Adriatic Project has been presented in a large number of regional (Mediterranean) events (for example 2 Mediterranean Coast days, Barcelona Convention Focal Points meetings and Conferences of Contracting Parties among others).*  *Moreover, the project benefitted from and actively contributed to the IW:LEARN and LME:LEARN GEF initiatives by providing presentations, information and data to the LME 18 in 2016, LME19 in 2017 and LME20 in 2018, and to the GEF IWC9 on November 2018 in Marrakech, Morocco.*  *All the data, information and knowledge produced will be linked to the UNEP/MAP web page for reference and ease access.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stories to be shared** | *The GEF Adriatic Project focuses on the implementation of EcAp and MSP. Its main value added is the integrated implementation of these two innovative, complex and challenging processes.*  *The first lessons learned for the project is about the difference that exists between the theoretically time required for the execution on ground of a conjunctive EcAp – MSP process and the real time required. The difference is mainly due to the large amount of institutions and stakeholders that must be involved to reach consensus on highly complex issues with significant political implications.*  *The second lesson learned is about the importance to take a holistic approach from the beginning of the process rather than focusing on each theme separately (IMAP and MSP), and then work on their integration. This requires considering the interconnection between IMAP, MSP, and the beneficiary countries’ needs and priorities. All these elements have to be reflected in a harmonized approach for the monitoring of different clusters of the marine and coastal environment to enable the best diagnosis of the Good Environmental Status (GES) to support informed decision-making processes.*  *A positive mechanism triggered by the GEF Adriatic’s integrated approach is the opportunity to involve heterogeneous groups of national and international experts, which worked together on harmonizing the approaches of the two neighboring countries for their common and long-standing benefit as well as for the benefit of the Adriatic sub-region.* |
|  | |

1. **RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK**

*Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the* ***UNEP Task Manager****[[1]](#footnote-1) will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:*

1. *Progress towards achieving the project Results(s)- see section 3.1*
2. *Implementation progress – see section 3.2*

*Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.*

* 1. **3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project Results(s**) [copy and paste the CEO Endorsement (or latest formal Revision) approved Results Framework, adding/deleting outcome rows, as appropriate]

| **Project objective and Outcomes** | **Indicator** | **Baseline level** | **Mid-Term Target or Milestones[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **End of Project Target** | **Observations/ justification on rating** | **Progress rating [[3]](#footnote-3)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective[[4]](#footnote-4)**  **To contribute to the restoration of the ecological balance of the Adriatic Sea through implementation of the Ecosystem Approach (EcAp as applied by UNEP/MAP) and improve sub-regional management capacity through Marine Spatial Planning.** | 1. Countries agree on targets to reach GES in the Adriatic Sea sub-region and on the monitoring programme as part of UNEP/MAP Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programmer’s (IMAP). | There is no consistent monitoring system based on common indicators. | N/A | IMAP monitoring programme agreed among 2 participating countries; results used to produce basis for decision-making tools and their implementation in Marine Spatial Planning in selected area. | Outline for the common IMAP for two countries prepared and national experts trained and supported for the preparation of national IMAPs. Based on the outline, thematic monitoring programmes are being prepared.  Project supported organization of the regional meeting relevant for the IMAP (Meeting of the Ecosystem Approach Correspondence Group on Pollution Monitoring - CORMON, Podgorica, 2-3 April 2019) with the participation of national experts from Albania and Montenegro.  Integration of national thematic monitoring programmes initiated. | **S** |
| 2. Contribution to the consistent (sub-regional) monitoring programme on common indicators submitted for endorsement by countries. | Countries are not managing their marine areas sustainably. | N/A |  | *The execution of this component will be initiated in the following reporting period* as reflected in the approved (by the 2nd PSC) work plan and budget. | **N/A** |
| 3. Capacities for Marine Spatial Planning raised | Capacities for Marine Spatial Planning are not adequate.  No Marine Spatial Plans are drafted and/or adopted. | N/A | Marine Spatial Planning introduced as a tool in the implementation of spatial planning process in sub-regional countries.  Marine Spatial Plan for selected marine area drafted | In coordination with the other UNEP/MAP and PAP/RAC’s initiatives, MSP training for the Mediterranean countries was organized on 9/10 April. In addition to the other Mediterranean representatives, 2 experts from Albania, 1 from Bosnia and Herzegovina and 4 from Montenegro participated. These are relevant stakeholders and representatives of relevant national institutions that are/will be involved in the project. This activity, funded by other sources of fund of the executing partners, is an important supporting activity for the project, in line with outcome 3, and will be considered as co-financing.  In coordination with the other UNEP/MAP, PAP/RAC and SPA/RAC’s initiatives, initial draft of the document towards common approach for MSP in the Adriatic sub-region has been prepared. It was presented on the first sub-regional (Adriatic) meeting on common approach towards MSP, that took place in Zagreb on 10 April. Representatives of all Adriatic countries participated. This activity, funded by other sources of fund of the executing partners, is an important supporting activity for the project, in line with outcome 3, and will be considered as co-financing.  National activities for MSP started. | **S** |
| **Outcome 1:**  *Science-based consensus among sub-regional countries on good environmental status of the Adriatic Sea).* | 1. Number of countries endorsing identified targets and priorities for action in the Adriatic | Targets for reaching good environmental status of the Adriatic Sea not agreed  B=0 | N/A | Proposed targets for good environmental status and priorities for selected ecological objectives. | *The execution of this component will be initiated in the following reporting period* as reflected in the approved (by the 2nd PSC) work plan and budget. | **N/A** |
| Sub-regional workshop for good environmental status of the Adriatic Sea | *The execution of this component will be initiated in the following reporting period* as reflected in the approved (by the 2nd PSC) work plan and budget. | **N/A** |
| **Outcome 2:**  *Programme on integrated observation and monitoring is agreed among Adriatic countries, including a set of regionally agreed common indicators.* | 1. At least 1 country endorses monitoring and assessment programme. | There is no harmonized marine monitoring among Adriatic countries. | N/A | Improvement of the existing baseline data; new data collected in 2 participating countries. | Detailed documentations for the marine surveys in Montenegro and Albania were prepared. The documents were prepared taking into consideration the contributions coming from extensive consultations with national representatives regarding survey needs.  International open tender for survey in Montenegro was published in April 2019 by PAP/RAC, based on Croatian regulations’ requirements. Tendering procedure is not yet finalized.  Full implementation of the Survey will take place in the following reporting period as reflected in the approved (by the 2nd PSC) work plan and budget.  Integration of thematic monitoring programmes into the a single (integrated) programme was initiated. | **S** |
| Monitoring and assessment programme provides countries of the sub-region, in particular Albania and Montenegro, a solid basis for more integrated decision-making | Project started implementing the activities towards harmonized marine monitoring among Adriatic countries, through the support of the regional Meeting of the Ecosystem Approach Correspondence Groups on Pollution Monitoring, organized by MED POL. In addition to Albanian and Montenegrin representatives, members of other Adriatic countries participated. This gave an opportunity to work towards joint/agreed monitoring programmes among the Adriatic and the Mediterranean countries.  Monitoring programmes in both countries are being prepared:   * International team of experts established. Contracts with 9 international experts made (4 PAP/RAC and 5 SPA/RAC). Support from MED POL staff involved to support implementation of activities for EO 5,9 and 10. * National team of sectoral experts (in addition to national coordinators) established. Contracts with 10 national experts in Albania as well as 3 national experts and 2 national Institutions in MNE made. * 14 national (7 Alb. and 7 Montenegro) gap assessments prepared. * 14 (7 Albania. and 7 Montenegro) thematic monitoring programmes being prepared. | **S** |
| Training workshop organized  T=1. | International experts to conduct the training and assist the national experts hired.  Three trainings organized in Podgorica:   * EO 5 and 9, on 2-3 October 2018; 3 Albanian and 8 Montenegrin national experts were trained; * EO10, on 22 November 2018. 3 Albanian and 7 Montenegrin experts were trained; * EO1, 2 and 7, on 26-27 November (in collaboration with SPA/RAC); 7 Albanian and 28 Montenegrin experts were trained.   Additional 2 hand-on trainings organized:   * 28 November in Podgorica for Montenegrin experts responsible for EO5 and EO9; * 17 and 18 December in Tirana, for Albanian experts responsible for EO5, EO9 and EO10 (organized in collaboration with MEDPOL).   National experts were provided with extensive selection of training materials.  Discussions are ongoing between SPA/RAC, GFCM and national coordinators regarding GFCM possible support to the GEF Adriatic project regarding the fishery cluster.  A common knowledge gap assessment outline related to EO3 had been elaborated and shared with the national team of experts. | **HS** |
| **Outcome 3:**  *Marine Spatial Planning demonstrates how environmental status of all Adriatic countries could be improved.* | 1. Adriatic countries agree on joint approach for utilization of MSP for achieving GES. | Countries have no Marine Spatial Plans prepared and/or adopted. | N/A | Key elements for a common approach in utilization of MSP for GES defined /articulated. | With the contribution of other sources and in coordination with other UNEP/MAP PAP/RAC and SPA/RAC’s initiatives, the document towards common approach for MSP in the Adriatic sub-region has been drafted. It was the basis for the sub-regional, as well as the national MSP activities within the project.  The document was be presented on the first sub-regional (Adriatic) meeting on common approach towards MSP, taking place in Zagreb on 10 April. Representatives of all Adriatic countries participated. This activity is an important activity for the project, in line with outcome 3, and can be considered as co-financing.  Through the GEF Adriatic Project, SPA/RAC and PAP/RAC supported the participation of Montenegrin and Albanian participants to the Regional Meeting on IMAP Implementation: Best Practices, Gaps and Common Challenges which was held from 10 to 12 July 2018 in Rome. | **S** |
| Capacity raised to prepare marine spatial plans. | Institutional and technical capacities for effective planning process integrating MSP and EcAp are insufficient. | N/A | Sub-regional workshop organized. | With the contribution of other PAP/RAC sources, MSP training for the Mediterranean countries was organized on 9/10 April. In addition to the other Mediterranean representatives, 2 experts from Albania, 1 from Bosnia and Herzegovina and 4 from Montenegro participated. These are relevant stakeholders and representatives of relevant national institutions that are/will be involved in the project.  This activity, funded by other sources of fund of the executing partners, is an important supporting activity for the project, in line with outcome 3, and will be considered as co-financing. | **HS** |
| Integration and synergies with the existing UNEP/MAP process on GES | The project is fully embedded in and builds upon existing UNEP/MAP’s processes on GES. For example, in addition to the previously mentioned support to the organization of the MED POL meeting, the Project is contributing to the other UNEP/MAP GES-related projects, such as EcAp Med II project. This is done by implementing GES activities in Adriatic countries not being eligible as part of those projects.  Letter of intent for cooperation between the Adriatic and Portodimare projects in the activities related to the testing tools in support of the development of ICZM-MSP analysis in Montenegro, by capitalizing on previous activities in the area, particularly on the results of EcAp/GES -based work on indicators related to cumulative impact assessments. | **HS** |
| **Outcome 4:**  *Increased national and regional awareness of the usefulness of ecosystem approach and marine spatial planning.* | 1. Project's lessons-learned compiled and distributed nationally and regionally | Established system of exchange of information and lessons learned in the Adriatic sub-region does not exist | N/A | Experts actively exchange lessons learned and good experiences in MSP. | It has been agreed with the EU MSP platform representatives to include information about the project on the MSP platform. Information note is being prepared.  Project logo has been created. | **S** |
| 2. Knowledge shared within and between region and updated on UNEP/MAP knowledge platform. | N/A | UNEP/MAP promotes MSP as a tool in the Mediterranean region. | During the Coast Day celebration in Split (22-26.09.2018) the project was presented and promoted as part of the different awareness raising activities organized.  The project was presented to and contributed to the LME 20 and IWC9 meetings in Marrakech (November 2018) and as part of an ICO exchange meeting with the representatives of Benguela Current Commission (18-22 February 2018) – sponsored by IW:LEARN.  SPA/RAC participated in the workshop organized by PlanBleu/RAC in Brussels the 4th December 2018 within the framework of the PANACeA project promoting the project. During the event, a special session was dedicated to the IMAP implementation approach. The ongoing sub-regional initiative in the Adriatic Sea within the GEF Adriatic project i.e. in Albania and Montenegro was highlighted.  The project activities were also highlighted by SPA/RAC during the GFCM Working Group on Marine Protected Areas (WGMPA) held at FAO HQ in Rome (18-21 February 2019). Possible synergies between the GEF Adriatic project and other ongoing projects related to fisheries in the Adriatic were proposed. A Montenegrin NGO requested to be able to translate to Montenegrin the SPA/RAC document “Fishery activities assessment in Montenegro” to disseminate it to local fishermen within an ongoing project "Empowering legal fisheries in future Montenegrin MPAs". SPA/RAC agreed on this request after consultation with Montenegrin SPA/RAC focal point and the GEF Adriatic project National coordinator.  The project was promoted on the Round Table on Environment Protection in view of IV EUSAIR Forum (25 April 2019) as well as on the IV EUSAIR Forum (7 May 2019).  The project was also highlighted during the 14th SPA/BD Thematic Focal Points meeting (18-21 June 2019, Portoroz, Slovenia). | **S** |

Overall rating of project progress towards meeting project Result(s) (*To be provided by UNEP GEF Task Manager.)*

| **FY2018 rating** [previous] | **FY2019 rating**  [current] | **Justification of the current FY rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **MS** | **S** | *The project execution progressed well and in line with the workplan approved by the 1st Project Steering Committed held in May 2018. All the preparatory work to develop national IMAP, surveys to produce baseline data and outline of MSP plans are almost completed. This will allow to move to the next stage of the Project that will happen in the second semester of 2019 and over 2020. This stage will allow to complete all the activities and reach all the objectives related to IMAP and MSP at both national and regional scale. An element which will be closely monitored over the next reporting is the expenditure which is low as per 30 June 2019. This issue was discussed at the 2nd Project Steering Committee in May 2019 concluding that the bulk of the GEF grants will be used during the second semester of 2019 and first semester of 2020 to support the monitoring surveys. This conclusion has been reflected in the work plan and budget approved by the 2nd PSC. This decision will drive the execution of the Project over the next reporting period. To conclude the project is progressing well and in full alignment with the approved work plan. At the current stage it is expected that all the objective will be achieved by the end of the Project, i.e. December 2020.* |

**Risks to the delivery of results**

The second column should be completed by the Project Manager and the third column should summarize the recommendations that the Project Manager and Task Manager have agreed upon to address the problem/risk. Projects should complete only the relevant sections and are free to add/delete problems/risks. This section should inform the risk rating in section 3.3.

| **Problems/risks identified** | **Description of the problem/risk** | **Agreed recommended actions** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| on achieving targets | No relevant problems/risks are identified at the current stage. |  |
| on stakeholder engagement | No relevant problems/risks are identified at the current stage. |  |
| on gender actions | No relevant problems/risks are identified at the current stage. |  |
| on safeguards | No relevant problems/risks are identified at the current stage. |  |
| on delivering GEF Core Indicators | No relevant problems/risks are identified at the current stage. |  |
| on delivering of PoW EA | No relevant problems/risks are identified at the current stage. |  |
| on sustainability of results | No relevant problems/risks are identified at the current stage. |  |
| others | The low level of expenditure as per 30 June 2019 was discussed at the 2nd Project Steering Committee. Causes and solution were identified and reflected in the approved work plan and budget for the following period. |  |

**3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs**

| **Outputs [[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Expected delivery date[[6]](#footnote-6)** | Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2018[[7]](#footnote-7) | Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2019) | **Progress rating justification** | **Progress rating[[8]](#footnote-8)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 1.1: Updated assessment of the characteristics of good environmental status (GES) in the Adriatic Sea.**  Activity 1.1.1: Organize GES trainings | 30/09/2020 | 0% | 0% | The activity will be implemented in the following reporting periods, following completion of national IMAPs (as reflected in the approved – by the 2nd PSC – work plan and budget. | N/A |
| **Output 1.2:**  **Proposal of measures to achieve good environmental status.**  Activity 1.1.2: Prepare national GES reports with measures to achieve GES | 31/12/2020 | 0% | 0% | The activity will be implemented in the following reporting periods, following completion of national IMAPs (as reflected in the approved – by the 2nd PSC – work plan and budget. | N/A |
| **Output 2.1:** **Methodological framework for the establishment of national marine and coastal monitoring programme towards GES.**  Activity 2.1.1. Setting up a national team of experts and organization of training workshops on monitoring based on IMAP indicators’ factsheets.  Activity 2.1.2. Prepare initial monitoring programmes for Albania and Montenegro. | 31/12/ 2019 | 30% | 80% | National team of experts and organization of training workshops on monitoring based on IMAP indicators’ factsheets has been set and the related activity completed.  Thematic monitoring programmes for each EO for Albania and Montenegro drafted. They are being integrated in a document that will be a important result of the GEF Adriatic Project.  Final site plan for data collection and processing finalized. | **S** |
| **Output 2.2:** **Updated data base on marine and coastal biologically important marine areas in two countries**  Activity 2.2.1. Field survey.  Activity 2.2.2. Update of the Database | 31/12/2020 | 0% | 50% | Tendering documentation for field survey in Montenegro were prepared and published, following official Croatian tendering procedure.  As part of the tendering procedure only one bidder applied for the position. The tender needed to be canceled due to some administrative problems with the application.  Following the official request made by the Ministry for Sustainable Development and Tourism (MSDT) of Montenegro, as a member of the project Steering Committee, as well as legal tendering procedure, the so-called negotiation process for contracting will be applied.  ToRs for field survey in Albania had been prepared but not finalized while waiting the results of the national knowledge gap assessments and the national monitoring programmes which were done by the national experts in between March and June 2019. The ToRs are under discussion with the Albanian representatives to be finalized. A technical (online or in place) meeting is planned by mid-July 2019 for this purpose. The call for Tenders will be launched by the end of July 2019. | **S** |
| **Output 3.1: Marine Spatial Plan in selected sub-regional area.**  Activity 3.1.1. Mobilize national MSP team and preparation of the Scoping Report.  Activity 3.1.2. Define and analyze the existing conditions.  Activity 3.1.3. Prepare the draft Marine Spatial Plan. | 31/12/2020 | 0% | 50% | MSP team mobilized with two national and two international experts. Additional experts will be involved based on activities and its specific requirements.  Meeting of the project team took place on 24/25 May 2019 to discuss the roadmap for the preparation of the MSP. In addition, meeting with the Deputy Minister for spatial planning took place in order to agree the collaboration and join actions for the implementation of the activities.  Outline of the Scoping Report prepared as well as its initial draft.  As reflected din the approved (by the 2nd PSC) work plan and budget, full implementation of the activity will take place in the following reporting period, following the finalization of the scoping report. However, initial communication with the sectors initiated in order to collect the relevant information. Meeting with Public Enterprise for maritime domain Morsko Dobro took place on June 14 in Budva. Modes of cooperation and exchange of information discussed. Series of meeting with the representatives of key sectors (ministries and other national institutions) planned for mid July 2019.  Cooperation with EU Interreg *geoPORtal of TOols & Data for sustaInable Management of coAstal and maRine Environment* (Portodimare) project established in order to upgrade and test tools that could be used for cumulative impacts, relevant for analyzing the existing marine conditions, as part of the MSP process.  Collaboration with another GEF project for Montenegro GEF ID 9762 (Promoting Protected Areas Management through Integrated Marine and Coastal Ecosystems Protection in Coastal Area of Montenegro)  established, primarily for the exchange of data as well as organization of joint events.  The activity is envisaged for the following reporting period. However, in synergy with other UNEP MAP initiatives and funds allocated, preparation of the guidance for the harmonized implementation of MSP in the Adriatic sub-region was initiated. Guidelines prepared within the Adriatic project will be based on and in line with the sub-regional guidance. | **MS** |
| **Output 3.2: Guidance for the implementation of MSP at sub-national level.**  Activity 3.2.1. Prepare of the MSP guidelines.  Activity 3.2.2. Organize workshops and training on MSP | 31/12/2020 | The activity will be implemented in the following reporting period | 20% | The activity is envisaged for the following reporting period. However, in synergy with other UNEP MAP initiatives and funds allocated, preparation of the guidance for the harmonized implementation of MSP in the Adriatic sub-region was initiated. Guidelines prepared within the Adriatic project will be based on and in line with the sub-regional guidance.  However, in synergy with other PAP/RAC projects, regional training on MSP has been organized enabling the engagement of Adriatic participants. | **MS** |
| **Output 4.1: Information, Communication and Outreach Strategy.**  Activity 4.1.1. Prepare the Information, Communication and Outreach Strategy.  Activity 4.1.2. Develop and maintain the web site. | 31/12/2020 | The activity will be implemented in the following reporting period | 10% | In line with the approved work plan the ToR for the contractor to prepare the Information, Communication and Outreach Strategy is being finalized and selection will start over the next reporting period.  The web site of the project will be launched together with the UNEP/MAP revised web site and linked with UNEP HQ and IW:lEARN platforms. | **MS** |

Overall project implementation progress [[9]](#footnote-9) *(To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager.):*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FY2018 rating** [previous] | **FY2019 rating**  [current] | **Justification of the current rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.** |
| **MS** | **MS** | *The Project is consistently moving toward the achievement of all the outputs. The execution of the related activities is well aligned with the approved work plans. The production of the Project is good both in terms of quantity and quality. This is proved by the immediate utilization of the produced material by the national stakeholder and institutions in Albania and Montenegro. As explained in several parts of this report some outputs is still below 50% status because of the structure of the project which require preliminary work to be done at national level before the countries are then able to quickly move toward completion of all activities and therefore the achievement of the outputs.* |

**Risks in implementation**

This section should be completed by the Project Manager and summarize implementation risks (e.g. procurement delays, reputational risks etc.).

The first column should be completed by the Project Manager and the second column should summarize the recommendations that the Project Manager and Task Manager have agreed upon to address the problem/risk. This section should inform the risk rating in section 3.3.

| **Problems/risks identified** | **Agreed recommended actions** | **By whom** | **When** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N/A |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**3.3. Risk Rating** *[Insert the Medium and High Risks and mitigation measures identified at CEO endorsement (e.g. Section A.5) and any relevant risk from safeguards screening and/or management plans.]* *Expand the table to include medium and high risks observed during implementation, e.g. problems identified in sections 3.1. and 3.2.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Mitigation at CEO approval** | **Mitigation at implementation** | **Rank** |
| The proposed EcAp approach may not be fully understood by all the stakeholders | While EcAp is a complex process it is, as developed by UNEP/MAP in close collaboration with the EU, on the basis of the understanding that ICZM and MSP are complementary to it.  The project team selected will have ample experience in developing similar initiatives and will build upon these experiences and established contacts and cooperation to address the proposed project issues.  The project is also based on the understanding that it will require considerable capacity building and awareness raising in order to be implemented successfully. Broad-based consultations already exist with regard to the implementation of Barcelona Convention and its Protocols and they should be continued in order to foster further discussion and buy-in from stakeholders. | The GEF Adriatic Project was structure with UNEP/MAP as executing agency and PAP/RAC and SPA/RAC as executing partners for the specific knowledge and mandate of these organizations. The two RACs are providing all the needed technical assistance to Albania and Montenegro in all the steps of the EcAp implementation process. This is done under the overall guidance of UNEP/MAP and its Consulting Parties. In addition, as part of the project activities, and in coordination with the project's national coordinators, a national team of experts for all EcAp clusters was established. The team had benefited from several trainings organized by PAP/RAC and SPA/RAC and a continuous technical assistance process is ensured by international experts engaged by the Project. By doing so, the national teams of experts developed the EcAp national knowledge Gap assessments and are finalizing the EcAp national monitoring programmes. | CEO: **M** |
| TM:M |
| PM: **L** |
| Risks related to Climate Change and Variability at regional and national (Albania and Montenegro). | Future climatic scenarios indicate that the Eastern Mediterranean region should be one of the most affected by climate change and variability. Visible signs of these impacts are already clear in the Adriatic Sea, e.g. on costal biodiversity, water temperature and circulation. The Project will contribute to the application of the EcAp approach, the ICZM, MSP and MPA in the Adriatic. All these approaches increase the resilience to climate change effects by improving the efficient and sustainable management of coastal and marine areas. It is not expected that climate change and variability will have an impact on Projects execution. Nevertheless, according to several sources, climate change might be contributing to the instability of the region and to the migratory fluxes. Therefore, contingency measures and targeted mitigation measures to manage the potential adverse effects of unanticipated events will be considered during the inception phase of the project. | Climate change is one of the major issues at the global, regional and sub-regional level. This element will be fully mainstreamed in the fields surveys that will happen in the second semester of 2019 and first semester of 2020. This means that these field surveys will also investigate the possible impacts of climate change.  Additionally, within the MSP implementation process, the precautionary approach, taking into consideration the possible climate change impact and assessment will be fully taken into consideration.  Finally, the project is executed under the overall UNEP/MAP supervision which fully considers climate change in its operation. This is a cross-cutting issue of the UNEP/MAP Mid Terms Strategy and PoW. It is mainstreamed in a number of protocols of the Barcelona Convention and reflected in several decisions of the COP like for example the Regional Climate Change Adaptation Framework approve at COP19 on 2016. | CEO: **M** |
| TM: L |
| PM: **L** |
| Co-financing reporting will not fully transparent | This risk will be mitigated by establishing solid reporting mechanism during the inception period, which will include monitoring of co-financing delivery based on the appropriate calculation of co-financing | The PMU developed a template to transparently report the co-financing by both the countries and the partners. As of 30 June 2019, the level of co-financing is at 60%. This is considered satisfactory and well aligned with the project execution. | CEO: **M** |
| TM:L |
| PM: **L** |
| There may be a risk of inadequate coordination because of many institutions being involved at the project,  regional and national levels | The program structure will be designed to ensure that coordination between executing partners is optimized. Furthermore, UNEP-MAP, as an organization involving several of its components in the project, is well positioned to ensure coordination with the executing partners. | So far, the coordination between UNEP/MAP, PAP/RAC, SPA/RAC and all the relevant institutions in both Albania and Montenegro has been in fact a strength of the Project. In this sense the participation of around 100 persons from numerous organizations from both countries at the inception meeting in May 2018 is an example of efficient coordination among the implementing Agency, the executing partners and the countries. Finally, the project is fully embedded in the Barcelona Convention system benefitting of the active role of the national focal points of Albania and Montenegro which supports the project as needed. | CEO: **M** |
| TM:L |
| PM: **L** |
| **Overall Risk Rating**  **Project Manager** | | | **M/L** |
| Overall Risk Rating  Task Manager | | | M/L |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FY2018 rating** [previous] | **FY2019 rating**  [current] | **Justification of the current risk rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.** |
| **M** | **M/L** | NO relevant risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks are expected to prevent the project to deliver the expected results. |

**High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.   
**Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.   
**Modest Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.   
**Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

**Optional Annexes and/or Links:**

* **Project Steering Committee Minutes of the year reported**
* **Half yearly Report**
* **Quarterly Reports**
* **Risk Factor Table form previous template (recommended for substantial and high-risk projects)**

**Risks Factor Table**

*There are two tables to assess and address risk: the first “risk factor table” to describe and rate risk factors; the second “top risk mitigation plan” should indicate what measures/action will be taken with respect to risks rated* ***Substantial*** *or* ***High*** *and who is responsible to for it.*

**High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.   
**Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.   
**Modest Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.   
**Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

|  |
| --- |
| **RISK FACTOR TABLE** |
| ***Project Managers*** *will use this table to summarize risks identified in the* ***Project Document*** *and reflect also* ***any new risks*** *identified in the course of project implementation. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project,* ***as relevant****. The “Notes” column has one section for the Project Manager (****PM)*** *and one for the UNEP Task Manager (****TM)****. If the generic risk factors and indicators in the table are not relevant to the project rows should be added. The* ***UNEP Task Manager*** *should provide ratings in the right-hand column reflecting his/her own assessment of project risks.* |

|  |  |  |  | **Project Manager Rating** | | | | | | **Notes** | **Task Manager Rating** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Factor** | **Indicator of Low Risk** | **Indicator of Medium Risk** | **Indicator of High Risk** | Low | Medium | **Substantial** | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |  | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |
| **INTERNAL RISK** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Project management** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Management structure [Roles and responsibilities] | Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood | Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others | Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM : The PMU is in place, the team of the executing partners as well as the National Coordinators in Albania and Montenegro are fully engaged and work well. | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM:The management structure in place |
| Governance structure  [oversight] | Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs | Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. TOR unclear | Members lack commitment Committee/body does not fulfil its TOR |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM : The 2st Project Steering Committee held in May 2019 in Podgorica, Montenegro. The meeting positively reviewed the progress made and approved a clear way forward including a no cost extension till 31 December 2020 and related work plan and budget. Countries showed ownership and full engagement for the execution of the project over 2018 and 2019. | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: The project steering committee in functioning. |
| Internal com­munications | Fluid and cordial | Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good | Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Work flow  Budget | Project progressing according to work plan | Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable | Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Co-financing | Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time | Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic | A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Although the rate of delivering of the co-financing is good (60%) at the current stage, a close monitoring has to be maintained till the end of the project. | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Budget | Activities are progressing within planned budget | Minor budget reallocation needed | Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Financial management | Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for | Financial reporting slow or deficient | Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: UN rules of procedure are applied. The entire budget is managed in Umoja. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Reporting | Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues | Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues | Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Stakeholder engagement | Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners | Consultation and participation process seem strong but misses some groups or relevant partners | Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: The level of participation of stakeholder from Albania and Montenegro to the trainings, workshops and meetings held over the reporting period. This confirms the full engagement of relevant stakeholders and institutions and their willingness to support the Project. | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| External com­munications | Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress | Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted | Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstand­ings concerning objectives and activities evident |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Short term/long term balance | Project is addressing short term needs and achieving results with a long-term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability | Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term | Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: The long-term sustainability of IMAP and MSP in both the Mediterranean region, including Albania and Montenegro is ensured by the Barcelona Convention. Nevertheless, the practical application on ground in Albania and Montenegro will depend in a long term on pollical support and wills. |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| TM: Long term sustainability issues need to be addressed after the project starting producing impacts. |
| Science and technological issues | Project based on sound science and well-established technologies | Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks | Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: The complexity of IMAP and EcAp approach requires a close monitoring of the technics used by the countries for both collecting and analyzing the samples. |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| TM: The approach needs further mainstreaming. |
| Political influences | Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven | Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated | Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Long terms sustainability of IMAP and MSP national plans on both Albania and Montenegro depends on political support and wills on a long run. | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |

|  |  |  |  | **Project Manager Rating** | | | | | | **Notes** | **Task Manager Rating** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Factor** | **Indicator of Low Risk** | **Indicator of Medium Risk** | **Indicator of High Risk** | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |  | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |
| **EXTERNAL RISK** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Project context** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Political stability | Political context is stable and safe | Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation | Very disruptive and volatile |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Environmental conditions | Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors | Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes | Project area has very harsh environmental conditions |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: The Adriatic Sea is under several pressures which are fully highlighted in the GEF Adriatic Project Document These are not projected to became drastically worst over the lifespan of the project. |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| TM: The envciornmnetal condition in the target region needs to be well taken into consideration. |
| Social, cultural and economic factors | There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results | Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation, but mitigation strategies have been developed | Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Capacity issues | Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners | Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity | Capacity is very low at all levels and partners require constant support and technical assistance |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: The implementation of the IMAP requires specific technical trainings. The same applies to MSP. The project will go ahead supporting national institutions in this task. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Others, please specify |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*If there is a significant (over 50% of risk factors) discrepancy between Project Manager and Task Manager rating, an explanation by the Task Manager should be provided below*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **TOP RISK MITIGATION PLAN** |
| Rank – importance of risk  Risk Statement – potential problem (condition and consequence)  Action to take – action planned/taken to handle the risk  Who – person(s) responsible for the action  Date – date by which action needs to be or was completed |

| **Rank** | **Risk Statement[[10]](#footnote-10)** | | **Action to Take** | **Who** | **Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Condition** | **Consequence** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High) (*Please include PIR risk ratings for all prior periods, add columns as necessary*):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FY2018 rating** | **FY2019 rating** | **Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period** |
|  | Medium/Low | The risks are associated with the environmental situation of the region. |
|  | | **If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period or as a result of the Mid-Term Review/Evaluation please report on progress or results of its implementation** |
|  |

1. For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Some projects are adopting/planning to adopt milestones for tracking the achievement of outcomes. Add the corresponding milestones in this column when applicable to inform the rating. Milestones are optional and may substitute for Mid-Term Target. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (**HS**), Satisfactory (**S**), Marginally Satisfactory (**MS**), Marginally Unsatisfactory (**MU**), Unsatisfactory (**U**), and Highly Unsatisfactory (**HU**). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Add rows if your objective has more than 3 outcome indicators. Same applies for the number of outcomes. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. As per latest workplan (latest project revision) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Implementation may be assessed by qualitative assessments, percentage of delivery, and/or budget expenditure (planned and actually spent). The 2018 assessment should be copied from previous PIR. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Only for Substantial to High risk. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)