

Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Coastal Development and Planning for Sustainable Tourism Development

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10928

Countries

Albania

Project Name

Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Coastal Development and Planning for Sustainable Tourism Development

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

1/18/2023

Review completed by PM

3/9/2023

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

Yes, some minor adjustments in the project design have been made, but these are all acceptable. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

NA.

Agency Response
Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

When reading the Government of Albania cofinancing letter from the protected area authority, it appears that the type of co-financing is in-kind (recurrent expenditures) and not public investment. Please review and correct if necessary.

3/9/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response UNDP response, 8 March 2023:

Thank you for this comment. The co-financing from the Government of Albania has been updated in the CEO ER and Prodoc as 'in-kind' co-financing.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response
Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

At the time of PIF submission, GEFSEC requested that proponents provide an estimate for CI 6. The submission provided an estimate of "zero". Please revise the submission to include the estimation for Target 6.

3/8/2023

The Albania project aims to address key threats and corresponding barriers to biodiversity friendly tourism development in Albania's coastal high value ecosystems, with particular attention on six coastal Key Biodiversity Areas covering 161,838 ha.

The project logframe notes the following benefits:

<p><u>Mandatory GEF Core Indicators:</u></p> <p>Indicator 2: Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness (hectares) (GEF Core Indicators sub-indicator 1.2)</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>67,443 ha</p> <p><i>Karaburun Nature Reserve</i> ha</p> <p><i>Divjak?-Karavasta National Park</i> 22,389 ha</p> <p><i>Patok-Fushe Kuqe Reserve</i></p> <p><i>Kune-Vain-Tale Nature Reserve</i> 3,110 ha</p> <p><i>Buna River-Velipoje Protected Landscape</i>: 19,471 ha</p>
<p><u>Mandatory GEF Core Indicators:</u></p> <p>Indicator 3: Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, excluding protected areas) (qualitative assessment, non-certified) (GEF Core Indicators sub-indicator 4.1)</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>94,395 ha</p> <p><i>Area of KBAs not covered</i></p> <p><i>Narta lagoon</i> - 6,056.65</p> <p><i>Vlor? bay, Karaburun peninsula, Cika mountain (including lagoon)</i> - 48,357.99</p> <p><i>Karavasta lagoon</i> - 2,74</p> <p><i>Patoku lagoon</i> - 158.01</p> <p><i>Drini delta</i> - 91.78</p> <p><i>Vilun marsh</i> - 36,990.34</p>

Core Indicator 6.1 seeks to estimate the carbon sequestered or emissions avoided and therefore in almost all of GEF's biodiversity projects we track this information as projects that maintain ecosystems intact as this proposal is attempting to will provide a mitigation benefit. Given the carbon-rich nature of the ecosystems along the coast of Albania listed in the logframe, it would be remiss of the project not to estimate this benefit.

Please provide.

4/6/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 5 April 2023:

An estimate of the project's mitigation potential has been calculated through the application of the EX-ACT tool. The figures for Core Indicator 6.1 have been updated in the respective tables in the Prodoc and CEO ER.

The full explanatory brief is attached.

UNDP response:

At the PIF stage the project activities were not yet specifically defined, and therefore there was some potential that some project activities could include GHG mitigating benefits. During the PPG phase it was confirmed that the project would focus strictly on the BD strategic priority BD-1-1, the project activities were defined, and there are no activities in this biodiversity project that specifically address GHG mitigation. It is not clear what, if any, project activities would provide any basis for calculating GHG mitigation benefits. Any GHG mitigation benefits linked to the project would be completely inadvertent. The only currently identified potentially relevant benefit would be under Component 2, with the eco-certification of 4 hotels, if the eco-certification process to be applied also includes some climate change actions (e.g. hotel energy efficiency). We have provided an estimate on this basis, as noted in the updated CEO ER Table E. To provide any further analysis and justification, it would be helpful to understand on what basis the GHG estimate for core indicator 1 is being requested, since this is strictly a BD strategic priority project, with no activities that specifically address GHG mitigation.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response
Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

Yes. Program Manager approves UNDP execution services requested by the Government.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response
Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

M&E budget under Section 9 is \$73,200, while in table B, component 4 and under the budget table at Annex E is \$57,200 ? please revise.

Budget table: Project Manager costs are charged to both project components and PMC. Please assess whether the PM costs can be partially charged to the co-financing portion allocated to PMC.

Agency Response UNDP response, 8 March 2023:

Thank you for these comments. The M&E table in Annex E has been clarified to indicate that while the total M&E cost is \$73,200, a portion of this (\$16,000) is co-financed from UNDP cash co-financing, and therefore in Table B, under Component 4, the GEF portion is indicated as \$57,200. Of the \$100,000 in co-financing for Component 4 indicated in Table B, \$16,000 will be from cash co-financing from UNDP, with the balance being in-kind from UNDP.

Regarding the Project Manager costs under PMC, 8% (\$8,000) of the UNDP cash co-financing has been shifted to the PM costs associated with the PMC.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

Yes, with CI embedded in the Framework.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

NA.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

NA.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

NA.

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

NA.

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

NA.

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

NA.

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/30/2023

NA.

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

NA.

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/30/2023

No. Please address the issues raised above and resubmit.

Please also remove the cents from Table D.

3/9/2023

Please address the issue raised above with the core indicators.

Please remove cents from Table D.

4/6/2023

All remaining issues have been addressed; therefore, the project is recommended for CEO approval.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/30/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/16/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The objective of the project is to position the development of the tourism industry in Albania as a positive influence on the status of biodiversity in coastal Key Biodiversity Areas, and as pillar of sustainable livelihoods, through mainstreaming biodiversity in tourism planning and development. The project's components address key threats and corresponding barriers to biodiversity friendly tourism development in Albania's coastal high value ecosystems, with particular attention on six coastal Key Biodiversity Areas covering 161,838 ha. The project will work with a wide array of stakeholders to mainstream biodiversity considerations in spatial planning for tourism development. The project strengthens multi-stakeholder coordination and communication necessary for biodiversity-friendly tourism development in coastal landscapes. The project will also improve the identification and monitoring of multiple data streams related to tourism flows and ecological status. Private sector partners are key in the development of the tourism sector, and the project supports the private sector through multiple initiatives related to biodiversity-friendly tourism development, biodiversity-friendly tourism standards and certifications, and marketing and branding of biodiversity-friendly tourism products and services. The project will delivery Global Environmental Benefits through participatory approaches that ensure the engagement of women and other

disadvantaged stakeholder groups. Direct beneficiaries are expected to include at least 300 individuals from local and national stakeholder groups.