

# Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Coastal Development and Planning for Sustainable Tourism Development

Review PIF 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**

2/28/2022

**Review completed by PM**

4/21/2022

**Program Manager**

Mark Zimsky

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

MSP

## PIF

### Part I ? Project Information

#### Focal area elements

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

##### Indicative project/program description summary

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

##### Co-financing

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

Please revise the cofinancing categorization. Public investment would be investment mobilized, in-kind would be recurrent expenditures, loans and grants would be investment mobilized.

The amount that GEF and cofinance each pays for project management costs should be proportional to the overall ratio of GEF to cofinancing for the entire project.

4/13/2022

Yes. Cleared.

4/26/2022

MOTE entries are duplicate. If this is an error, please remove one entry.

5/15/2022

Cleared.

#### Agency Response

Thank you for the comment. The co-financing categorization has been revised as requested, and the PMC co-financing has also been reapportioned, as requested.

5/13/2022: We removed the co-financier MOTE's double entry from co-financing table and adjusted total cofinance figure in the PIF table A, B and C.

#### GEF Resource Availability

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
3/3/2022

NA.

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
3/3/2022

NA.

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

NA

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

NA

Agency Response

**Project Preparation Grant**

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Core indicators**

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

Please include an estimate for indicator 6.

4/13/2022

The response is noted. By the time of CEO endorsement please complete an estimate for CI 6. However, you have entered text in the Core Indicator which you need to delete so the entire sheet is empty. Please make this revision and resubmit.

#### Agency Response

**4/19/2022:** Thank you for this comment. We removed the text from the CI sheet.

**3/3/2022:** The project is structured as a biodiversity focal area project, focusing on mainstreaming biodiversity in tourism planning and development, and any climate change mitigation results would be secondary co-benefits. The PIF does classify the project under the Rio Market for climate change mitigation because it is anticipated that there would be some mitigation co-benefits. At this stage of project design it is not possible to provide an estimate for indicator 6 (relating to GHG emission mitigation) as the project activities have not yet been designed in detail that would allow a preliminary indication of specifically how and to what extent the project will contribute to GHG emission mitigation. The estimate for indicator 6 will be completed during the PPG phase.

#### **Project/Program taxonomy**

**7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

#### **Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**6. Are the project?s/program?s indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**



**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/26/2022

In the gender section, the box on closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources is checked, however it is unclear from the project proposal how the project is expecting to close these gaps given the focus of the project on mainstreaming biodiversity in tourism. Please either provide additional information and clarifications on how this will be achieved or simply uncheck the box and do not commit to closing these gaps.

5/15/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

5/13/2022 :Thank you for the comment. We unchecked the box on closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources.

**Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be**

**resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/13/2022

We noted that in the table of projects under coordination, one entry is in Euros, please convert this to US\$.

Agency Response 4/19/2022 : Thank you for this comment. We converted the respective entry to US\$.

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed ?knowledge management (KM) approach? in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project?s/program?s overall impact and sustainability?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Part III ? Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country?s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/3/2022

There are two endorsement letters uploaded to the portal. Please delete the letter that is not valid and inform the GEFSEC which letter is the valid letter.

4/13/2022

Noted. We will try and address this from the back end of the portal.

Cleared.

Agency Response

3/3/2022: Thank you for the comment, we are aware of the situation and would like to ask for your kind support with deleting the incorrect document.

To clarify the situation, during the preparation of the MSP PIF submission in GEF Portal we have received an error generated by the system on exceeding STAR Allocation after we have uploaded all documents. Due to this fact we had to revise PIF and related OFP LOE that we re-uploaded to Portal on 23 February. Since the system doesn't allow us to delete the documents once uploaded to project's Roadmap, we would like to ask for your kind assistance to delete the yellow highlighted older versions.

Document Title	Category	Prefix	Classification	Last Modified Date
PIMS 6584_PiF Albania_CoastalMainstreaming_rev_27 Jan 2022	Project Document	MSP PIF document	Official Use Only	2/23/2022 10:05 AM
LOE_PIMS 6584_ALB_Wetlands Management_25 Jan 2022	Project Supporting Document	OFP's Letter of Endorsement - [Country name]	Official Use Only	2/23/2022 9:57 AM
PIMS 6584_PiF Albania_CoastalMainstreaming_17 Nov 2021	Project Supporting Document	Others	Official Use Only	12/3/2021 8:46 PM
LoE_Albania	Project Supporting Document	OFP's Letter of Endorsement - [Country name]	Official Use Only	12/3/2021 8:46 PM
GEF Checklist AlbaniaCoastalBDTourismMainstreaming Final_RBEC COST 27	Project Supporting Document	Others	Official Use Only	12/3/2021 8:43 PM
PIF	Project Document	MSP PIF document	Public	2/10/2022 11:47 AM
SESP Pre-Screening	Project Supporting Document	ESS Supporting Document	Official Use Only	11/25/2021 11:22 AM

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and

**conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
3/3/2022

NA

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
3/3/2022

No. Please revise and resubmit.

4/13/2022

No. Please address the minor issues above and resubmit.

4/26/2022

No. Please address the cofinancing issue and the gender issue identified above, revise, and resubmit.

5/15/2022

PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>3/3/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/12/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/20/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/26/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/15/2022</b>	

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

The objective of the project is to mainstream biodiversity in tourism planning and development.

The geographic focus of the proposed project is Albania's coastal zone, and specifically the areas around Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) along the coastal landscape.

The project objective will be achieved through project components that: (i) build a stronger enabling environment for sustainable tourism that is aware of, respects and conserves biodiversity as an essential asset for tourism; (2) demonstrates a model for biodiversity sensitive and biodiversity-friendly tourism that integrates improved standards for planning, operating and monitoring tourism within ecological limits, with the promotion and development of community-based tourism experiences and products that are biodiversity-friendly and help generate financing for biodiversity conservation and communities; and (3) establish and strengthen tourism sector and tourist awareness of the significance of biodiversity to tourism, and put in place knowledge management platforms to support replication and upscaling of biodiversity sensitive sustainable tourism throughout Albania.

The project demonstrations will support improved tourism management and revenue generation for biodiversity conservation across 100,000 ha. These benefits will be focused in the Albania's biodiversity rich and highly sensitive coastal landscape, targeting six Key Biodiversity Areas covering 33,209 ha and 67,000 ha (~55,000 ha of KBA buffer zones, plus ~12,000 ha of adjacent coastal ecosystems, to be confirmed at PPG) in riverine, estuarine, and other coastal habitats under threat from unsustainable tourism development.

Adequate COVID-19 risk mitigation strategies are proposed for PPG and the eventual MSP.