

# Implementing the Strategic Action Programme of the Drin Basin to Strengthen Transboundary Cooperation and Enable Integrated Natural Resources Management

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10881

**Countries**

Regional

**Project Name**

Implementing the Strategic Action Programme of the Drin Basin to Strengthen Transboundary Cooperation and Enable Integrated Natural Resources Management

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

2/3/2023

**Review completed by PM**

5/2/2023

**Program Manager**

Taylor Henshaw

**Focal Area**

International Waters

**Project Type**

FSP

**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**

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): Yes, but please address the following:

(1) Global Water Partnership should not be categorized as "Government". In the project information section, please correct executing entity type to "Other".

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Not addressed. Please change to "Other", not to "CSO".

27th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Addressed.

**Agency Response**

19 April 2023

(1) There was an upload error. Addressed

27 April 2023

Addressed.

**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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): Partly, please address the following in Table B:

(1) The expected output 1.5 is not phrased as an output. Please consider "Scenarios developed/designed/..."

(2) The expected output 1.6 is too vague. "Improved System" is not quantifiable. Please revise the output to make it quantifiable.

(3) The expected output 2.1 is not clear. Will the legal instrument be prepared for consideration or is the legal instrument prepared and the output will facilitate the consideration? Please clarify and quantify what this output is.

(4) The expected output 2.1 is not clear. Has the joint coordination mechanism already been developed? What does operationalization of the mechanism mean? Please clarify and quantify what this output is.

(5) The expected output 2.4 is not clear. Will the project support the development of flood risk management actions? How will the project integrate these actions into the Drin Plan? It is not clear what the actions are to realize this outcome.

(6) The expected output 2.5 is not clear. What is the quantifiable output?

(7) The expected output 4.2 is not clear. Are "Water and Gender Action Plans, indicators and capacity building" being developed?

(8) The expected output 4.2 is not clear. Are "Annual events for the coordination with other ongoing initiatives, and the monitoring of progress" being carried out?

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

- (3) Addressed.
- (4) Addressed.
- (5) Addressed.
- (6) Addressed.
- (7) Addressed.
- (8) Addressed.

### Agency Response

19 April 2023

- (1) See revised Output now reading: 1.5 ? A dialogue to discuss scenarios for the operation of dams to enable optimization of water and flood risk management, and energy production.
- (2) See revised Output now reading: 1.6- An improved information management system to support transboundary basin management is established.
- (3) See revised Output now reading: 2.1 - A legal instrument consolidating official cooperation among the Drin Riparians is finalized and considered for signing by the Riparians.  
The draft legal instrument was prepared through the foundational project and will be put forward for negotiation by the Drin Riparians. The description of the Output under the Alternative Scenario provides more details.
- (4) See revised Output now reading: 2.2 Establishment/operation of the joint coordination mechanism  
The description of the Output under the Alternative Scenario provides more details.
- (5) See revised Output now reading: 2.4- Flood risk management actions for the White Drin sub-basin identified and integrated in the Drin Basin Flood Risk Management Plan. Flood management plan for the White Drin in Kosovo will be integrated in the Drin flood risk management plan that is being prepared under the AF/UNDP Drin flood risk management project (that doesn't cover Kosovo/White Drin Basin). The description of the Output under the Alternative Scenario provides more details.
- (6) See revised Output now reading: 2.5- Harmonization of management planning tools for adjacent nationally established protected areas in Skadar/Shkoder subbasin.  
  
Work will involve establishment of joint technical groups to discuss and reach an agreement for the harmonization of the zoning system and related regulations including on enforcement measures and monitoring of compliance. The description of the Output under the Alternative Scenario provides more details.

- (7) See revised Output now reading: 4.2 - Actions to mainstream Gender in project execution.  
A set of Gender actions are included in the Gender Action Plan. These will be implemented through this output and as part of other project outputs. The description of the Output under the Alternative Scenario provides more details.
- (8) See revised Output now reading: 4.3- Actions to enable coordination with other ongoing initiatives and projects  
Annual events will be one of the activities to enable coordination with on-going projects and initiatives. The description of the Output under the Alternative Scenario provides more details.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): Partly, please address the following:

- (1) The GWP-Med co-financing letter explains that the \$600,000 in-kind co-financing comes from activities from the Adaptation Fund project ?Integrated climate-resilient transboundary flood risk management project in the Drin River Basin in the Western Balkans?. Please explain what these activities are and how they contribute to the GEF project.
- (2) In Table C, the column Investment Mobilized has not been filled in. Each co-financing line should be classified as "recurrent expenditures" or "investment mobilized". Please classify all in-kind co-financing as recurrent expenditures. Identification of all investment mobilized should be described in the field below the table.
- (3) The North Macedonia co-financing includes both in-kind and cash co-financing. These figures are incorrectly grouped together in Table C. Please amend Table C accordingly and explain associated investment mobilized in the field below Table C.
- (4) Co-financing from Austrian Development Agency comes from a project that was completed in August 2022. Please remove this co-financing from Table C because it will not take place during the project implementation period.

(5) The co-financing letter from Swiss Cooperation Office in Kosovo indicates a co-financing approximation figure. Please secure a new co-financing letter with an exact figure.

(6) It is not clear how the in-kind co-financing from each entity will support project implementation. Please explain this support in the field below Table C.

(7) There is no investment mobilized currently classified in Table C, yet the field below the table briefly notes how investment mobilized was identified. Please review the cash portion of the North Macedonia cash co-financing and explain how this investment mobilized is identified in the field below Table C.

(8) There is little investment mobilized co-financing secured for this project. Please explain why and explain what actions will be taken in the early stages of implementation to secure additional resources.

(9) At PIF, the Agency noted in the review sheet that "in-kind co-financing will be discussed with and agreed with Greece during the PPG phase". Co-financing from Greece is not included in Table C. Please explain/amend accordingly. How will Greece be involved in the project?

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

(3) Addressed.

(4) Addressed.

(5) Addressed.

(6) Addressed.

(7) Addressed.

(8) Addressed.

(9) Addressed.

#### Agency Response

19 April 2023

(1) Addressed ? a new co-financing letter has been obtained by GWP-Med

(2) Addressed.

(3) Addressed

(4) It was wrongly assumed that the cost of activities of projects that contribute to the aims and objectives of the GEF Drin II project, that run during the PPG phase after the GEF Drin II project approval from the GEF council, can be accounted for as co-financing. The ADA co-financing letter and respective amount is removed from the CEO Endorsement document.

(5) Although requested, it has not been possible to secure a new co-financing letter. The Agency feels confident that the stated co-financing figure will be delivered by the Swiss Cooperation Office in Kosovo.

(6) Addressed. See explanation under Table C.

(7) Addressed. See explanation under Table C.

(8) There are on-going investments of considerable size in the beneficiary Drin Riparians. This is presented/can be seen in *Annex G.4: Ongoing baseline projects and initiatives relevant to the objectives and activities of the project* (for example the Rehabilitation and Construction of Municipal Water and Sanitation Infrastructure project in Montenegro (EU, EIB, EBRD, 141m euros)); all known to the GEF Drin II Project on-going projects and investments are presented therein, including the linkages to the Project. It has been either not possible to obtain or the institutions/organizations approached were not able to provide co-financing letters. Yet, the listed institutions and organizations that implement the projects are aware of the results of the foundational GEF project, notably the SAP development and the operation of the Drin Core Group, and the fact that a new GEF Project to accelerate the implementation of the GEF SAP was approved by the GEF council and it is likely to be initiated within 2023. The efforts described under Output Component 4.3 will be used to enable additional co-financing to the project during the initial phase of the project.

(9) There were discussions with Greece for the provision of a co-financing letter. Greece was positive to provide one, but due to reasons beyond the control of the Agency, such as slow institutional procedures, it was not possible for the letter to be obtained in time. Greece signed the Drin MoU and has been participating/contributing to all Drin Core Group meetings (at least twice per year) and Expert Working Group meetings since the establishment of the joint body and its Expert Working Groups in 2011. The Drin Core Group meetings will serve also as the Project SC meetings hence Greece will be involved in the steering of the Project ensuring coordination of actions across the Drin Basin. Greece has been and is committed to continue providing know-how on the implementation of the Water Framework Directive including the development of Basin Management Plans. Greece has done so during the foundational project for the development of the transboundary Lake Ohrid Management Plan.

#### **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 12th of March 2023 (thenshaw):

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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address the following:

(1) The amount spent to date for the Component C validation workshop is higher than the budgeted amount. Please explain. Further, the amount committed exceeds the budgeted amount minus the amount spent to date. Please revise accordingly.

(2) The amount spent to date for the Components A and B are the exact same. Below the table, please explain how this is possible and what exactly these activities are.

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

Agency Response

19 April 2023

(1) The actual cost for Component C validation workshop was higher than the one anticipated due to the higher than anticipated participation of stakeholders and inflation that resulted in higher prices than the ones anticipated. To cover related costs there was a redistribution of funds from other Components.

Further, there was a calculation error; figures are revised as per GEFSEC comment.

(2) There was a calculation error; figures are revised as per GEFSEC comment.

The following consultants/experts were engaged during the PPG phase:

- PPG Team Leader/International Waters Specialist
- International Waters Specialist/ Project Document Preparation Specialist
- Social and Environmental Standards Specialist
- Gender Specialist
- Stakeholders Engagement Specialist / Communication Specialist
- PPG National experts in each of Albania, Kosovo\*, Montenegro, North Macedonia

The following activities were carried out:

*Component A: Preparatory Technical Studies & Reviews*

The following technical studies, reviews and processes were conducted.

- a. Desktop and field-based studies and data collection
- b. Gender Analysis
- c. Social and Environmental Standards: Screening and Assessments
- d. Demonstration activities identification/Identification of project sites
- e. Financial planning, co-financing and investment mobilized



- f. Stakeholder analysis
- g. Appraisal and formulation of the most appropriate project implementation and execution modality

*Component B: Formulation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document, CEO Endorsement Request, and Mandatory and Project Specific Annexes*

The following were developed:

- a. Stakeholder Engagement Plan
- b. Gender Action Plan and Budget
- c. Social and Environmental Standards: Screening and Management Measures
- d. Population of the GEF and LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators table
- e. Completion of the required official endorsement letters
- f. Preparation of mandatory Annexes
- g. Determination of Project Management Arrangements
- h. Development of Project Document and CEO Endorsement Request document

*Component C: Validation Workshop*

- a. Organization of a validation workshop.

**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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address the following:

(1) In the field below the Core Indicator Table, please explain each calculation and methodology used.

(2) For Core Indicator 2, 418,243 ha is targeted at PIF and 0 ha is targeted at CEO Endorsement. It is likely that this core indicator was an error at PIF and the target is now correctly "0". Please explain.

(3) For Core Indicator 7, "1" shared water ecosystem under new or improved cooperative management is targeted at PIF and "0" targeted at CEO Endorsement. Please revise accordingly.

(4) For Core Indicator 7.1, "2" is rated at PIF and "\_\_\_" is rated at CEO Endorsement. Please revise accordingly.

(5) For Core Indicator 7.2, "2" is rated at PIF and "\_\_\_" is rated at CEO Endorsement. Please revise accordingly.

(6) For Core Indicator 7.3, "1" is rated at PIF and "\_\_\_" is rated at CEO Endorsement. Please revise accordingly.

(7) For Core Indicator 7.4, "1" is rated at PIF and "\_\_\_" is rated at CEO Endorsement. Please revise accordingly.

(8) For Core Indicator 11, the targets at CEO Endorsement are significantly lower than PIF. Please explain why in the field below the Table.

\*Please use these Core Indicator targets to communicate the Global Environmental Benefits of this project (in other sections of the document)

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Not addressed. The field below the core indicator table is empty. Please revise accordingly

(2) Upload error remains. Please address accordingly

(3) Upload error remains. Please address accordingly

(4) Upload error remains. Please address accordingly

(5) Upload error remains. Please address accordingly

(6) Upload error remains. Please address accordingly

(7) Upload error remains. Please address accordingly

(8) Please explain the methodology to reach these figures.

27th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

(3) Addressed.

(4) Addressed.

(5) Addressed.

(6) Addressed.

(7) Addressed.

(8) Addressed.

Agency Response  
19 April 2023

(1) In the field below the Core Indicator Table, the calculations and methodology used are now explained. The text below was introduced.

Core Indicator 7 - Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management. The number is 1: the Drin Basin

Indicator 7.1 - Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) formulation and implementation. The indicator is rated '2' at the PIF Stage as there is a TDA and SAP developed during the foundational project, '2' for the endorsement stage as there are no significant changes expected in between, and '4' at the end of the project as an updated TDA will be ready while many of the actions under the SAP will be implemented and others catalysed as a result of the implementation of the new GEF project.

Indicator 7.2 - Level of Regional Legal Agreements and Regional Management Institutions to support its implementation. The indicator is rated '2' at the PIF Stage as there is a joint body -the Drin Core Group (DCG)- that is functioning, serviced by the GWP-Med being its Secretariat. The activities planned under the project is expected to lead to the establishment of an organizational structure that will gradually assume responsibilities that currently GWP-Med has, under its role as the DCG Secretariat. A legal document in the form of an updated MoU or an International agreement will be put forward for negotiation and signing to legally and operationally enable these changes. The activities to be implemented throughout the project implementation are expected to gradually deliver results hence, the indicator is rated '3' and '4' for the MTR and TE milestones.

Indicator 7.3 - Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees. The indicator is rated '1' at the PIF Stage as there are Interministerial Committees formulated during and as a result of the foundational project. There are also on-going processes in relation to reforms of the water and natural resources management at the national level. The activities planned under the project are expected to contribute to these reforms through the generation of knowledge regarding the Drin Basin ecosystem, the development of technical and policy tools, the development of transboundary institutional settings and policy instruments and the testing of novel management approaches that could be replicated/upscaled. The activities to be implemented throughout the project execution are expected to gradually deliver results hence the indicator is rated '2' and '3' for the MTR and TE milestones respectively. The indicator can't be rated '4' as the national reforms can be influenced but can't be controlled by the project.

Indicator 7.4 - Level of engagement in IWLEARN through participation and delivery of key products. The indicator is rated '1' at the PIF Stage as although there are linkages with the IWLEARN project (that has just recently commenced its activities), the project do not yet deliver products to feed the IWLEARN thus the IW community. There is going to be full scale engagement in IWLEARN activities immediately after the initiation of the project implementation thus the indicator is rated '4' for both the MTR and TE milestones.

Core Indicator 11 - Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment. The number of beneficiaries (individuals that are directly (physically/income) impacted by the project -usually individuals/communities/families living in pilot (watershed mngt etc.), people living in floodplains (for flood early warning systems) etc.)) equals to population in the areas where pilots will be implemented and was calculated using a GIS tool. The disaggregation between genders was done -in the absence of related data- using the generic percentages of 51% for women and 49% for men.

(2) Indeed, it was an error - there is no activity for the establishment of a marine protected area

(3) There was an upload error

(4) There was an upload error

(5) There was an upload error

(6) There was an upload error

(7) There was an upload error

(8) The numbers regarding Core Indicator 11 included in the CEO Endorsement request document are indeed different than those included in the PIF. The one included in the latter was a *provisional number that is as close as possible to the reality* until the demonstration areas area selected. This was done in line with the advice received and response in the PIF GEFSEC review sheet (see below the respective excerpt):

**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

SH (9.21.21): Please address the below two points:

1. GEF Core Indicator 7.4: Please adjust the value to 1.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared

2. GEF Core Indicator 11: Please recalculate the number of expected project beneficiaries. Please stick with real, direct and quantifiable (countable and verifiable) numbers of beneficiaries and to avoid basin wide large numbers. This then means that direct beneficiaries should be defined narrowly as those that are directly (physically/income) impacted by the project ? so this would usually be participants in pilots such as communities/families living in pilot (watershed mngt etc.), people living in floodplains (for flood early warning systems), and so on.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared

Agency Response

**UNDP response 21 October 2021**

1. Addressed

2. The ?demonstration and/or priorities solutions? will be implemented/focus on areas to be selected by the Drin Core Group during the PPG phase using support of the implementing and executing partners after related consultation with the stakeholders. The areas selected will define the direct and quantifiable (countable and verifiable) number of beneficiaries. Till this is done, we have added a provisional number that is as close as possible to the reality.

27 April 2023

(1) Addressed

(2) Addressed

(3) Addressed

(4) Addressed

(5) Addressed

(6) Addressed

(7) Addressed

(8) Core Indicator 11 ? Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment.

The following definition was used (provided by PIF GEFSEC review sheet (see below under (8) in this section the respective excerpt)) with regard to "direct beneficiaries": *"real, direct and quantifiable (countable and verifiable) numbers of beneficiaries (...). This then means that direct beneficiaries should be defined narrowly as those that are directly (physically/income) impacted by the project ? so this would usually be participants in pilots such as communities/families living in pilot (watershed mmgt etc.), people living in floodplains (for flood early warning systems), and so on.?"*

The direct beneficiaries for this project equals to population of the areas where pilots will be implemented. The broad areas that the pilots will be implemented are defined and described in Component 3. A Geographic Information System (GIS) tool was used to calculate the direct beneficiaries using population related data acquired through the foundational project (for the development of the TDA). The disaggregation between genders was done -in the absence of related data- using the generic percentages of 51% for women and 49% for men.

## **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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address the following:

(1) Please note all deviations from PIF and provide reasons for deviations.

(2) The barriers that need to be overcome are not specific enough (i.e., "insufficient monitoring, low level of enforcement"). Please explain the "why". Why is there insufficient monitoring? Why is there a lack of emergency planning? Will the project address all of the barriers listed? Please clarify. This will help the reader better understand what the project sets

out to achieve. For guidance on the level of detail, please see the barriers section of GEF ID 10782 - Caribbean BlueFin.

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

#### Agency Response

19 April 2023

- (1) There were no deviations from the PIF apart from the ones that were done by mistake and noticed/commented by the GEFSEC and the ones requested by the GEFSEC in this review sheet.
- (2) The reasons/causes of the barriers listed in the CEO Endorsement request document (i.e., "insufficient monitoring, low level of enforcement") are described in the part *Baseline scenario and associated baseline projects*. The project addresses part of these barriers using actions agreed by the Drin Riparians and contained in the Drin SAP.

More details on the barriers are provided in the CEO Endorsement request document. A list of impediments towards sustainable management of the basin, that substantiate the barriers are given and these are clustered in four groups to enable the reader linking the impediments/barriers to be lifted by the project with the Components/Outcomes of the Project.

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): Yes

Reviewer Note: Annex H of the Agency Project Document provides a comprehensive baseline scenario for this project. A detailed memo of the Drin TDA-SAP approach is found in Annex B of the Agency Project Document.

#### 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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): Partly, please address the following:

(1) Under Component 3 in the portal, please include the full text of Annex G of the Agency Project Document, which describes the on-the-ground activities in detail. The CEO Document should be able to be read as a standalone document.

(2) Please see gender comment below and revise this section accordingly.

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Not addressed. Please include the full description of each of these outputs (the full Annex G in the Project Document) in the CEO Endorsement Request

(2) Addressed.

27th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

Agency Response

19 April 2023

(1) Addressed ? see below.

(2) Addressed ? see below.

27 April 2023

(1) Addressed

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address the following:

(1) Please explain how the project is aligned with focal area objective 3. This is partly answered in the alternative scenario section. Please include and expand on that text here in this section.

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Addressed.

#### Agency Response

19 April 2023

(1) Addressed

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address the following:

(1) Please include and complete the phrase: "Without the GEF increment...". What is the value add of involving the GEF?

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Addressed.

#### Agency Response

19 April 2023

(1) Addressed

**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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address the following:

(1) This section is far too general. Please include the specific targets the project aims to achieve against the GEF core indicators to describe the global environmental benefits in more detail.

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Addressed.

#### Agency Response

19 April 2023

(1) Addressed



**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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): 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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): Yes

Reviewer Note: maps for pilots/demonstrations under Component 3 are found in Annex G of the Agency Project Document.

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

N/A

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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): Yes, but please address the following:

(1) The field below "In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution..." is not populated. Please place appropriate text from the current write up below each prompt. Prompt 1 "provide the stakeholder engagement plan". Prompt 2 "provide a summary of how stakeholders will be consulted".

Reviewer note: detailed report on stakeholders engaged during design phase and plan for stakeholder engagement during implementation phase is documented in Annex 7 of the Agency Project Document, which is uploaded to the portal as a standalone document.

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Addressed.

## Agency Response

19 April 2023

(1) Addressed; existing text was placed under the Prompt 1 "provide the stakeholder engagement plan" and Prompt 2 "provide a summary of how stakeholders will be consulted". A detailed stakeholders engagement plan is provided in Annex G.7 including an overview table. The latter -comprising three A4/landscape view pages could be included in the CEO Endorsement Request Document.

### **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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address the following:

(1) Please include the full Gender Action Plan in the CEO Document/portal

(2) The submission notes that the project "will mainstream gender in all Components through revision of key documents produced where gender issues could be potentially introduced. Further, it is envisaged that the project will promote gender equality in the areas of management, governance and policy development." Please reflect gender perspectives in all the project components, in particular in the following outputs: 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 3.1, 3.3, and 3.5.

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

## Agency Response

19 April 2023

(1) and (2)

The Gender Action Plan is included in the CEO Document and in the portal.

Indeed, the project aims to mainstream gender in all Components. The Gender Action Plan that is now included in the CEO endorsement request document includes related interventions.

Gender perspectives are included/reflected in all project components in the CEO Endorsement request document indicating gender activities that will be implemented under different Outputs.

## 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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): 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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address the following:

(1) The tables are outside the portal margins. Please reformat to fit within the margins

(2) Please provide the covid opportunity analysis to this section

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

Agency Response  
19 April 2023

(1) Addressed

(2) Addressed

**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  
12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): Yes

(1) Please ensure GWP is classified as "executing entity" and not "implementing partner".

(2) Please explain whether Greece, as a Drin riparian, will have a role in the project coordination arrangements.

(3) Please add the project management unit composition and defined roles to this section.

(4) The coordination with other GEF projects and non-GEF initiatives description could be strengthened. Please, in this section, consolidate the text throughout the document in this regard.

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

(3) Addressed.

(4) Addressed.

Agency Response  
19 April 2023  
(1) Addressed

- (2) Addressed: Copy pasting from the revised CEO Endorsement Request text: The officially appointed members of the Drin Core Group (DCG) or the officially appointed members of a body that may succeed this should the draft international agreement text is signed and ratified by the parliaments of the Drin Riparians, will be members of the Project Board/Steering Committee so as it is ensured that the DCG and the SC actions are aligned.

Greece is one of the signatory parties of the Drin MoU fully participating in the work of the DCG

- (3) Addressed

- (4) Addressed

#### **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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): Yes

Reviewer note: A comprehensive table in Annex D of the Agency Project Document describes the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans

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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): Partly, please address the following:

- (1) The table is outside the portal margins. Please reformat to fit within the margins
- (2) Please include a high res version of the KM Cycle figure. It is difficult to see the output numbers.
- (3) A project knowledge management timeline is present. However, in table format, please provide a timeline for implementing listed knowledge management and communication activities/products. Please also clarify the budget allocated to each KM and communication product/activity (using the same table).

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

(3) Addressed.

#### Agency Response

19 April 2023

(1) Addressed

(2) Addressed

(3) A communications plan will be developed in the initiation period of the Project hence it is not possible to provide a timeline of communication activities and the respective budget. Still the communication and KM related budget is included now in the CEO Endorsement Request in the KM section.

A timeline for implementing listed knowledge management activities and delivering products is given in a table format, including the budget allocated to KM product/activity.

#### **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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): Yes, but please address the following:

(1) The Part A and Part B tables are outside the portal margins and columns are too narrow to properly read text. Please revise accordingly.

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Not addressed. The tables are still outside the portal margins. Please address accordingly.

27th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

#### Agency Response

19 April 2023

(1) Addressed

27 April 2023

(1) Addressed

**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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): Partly, please address the following:

(1) The M&E Table 3 and the project budget table are not fully aligned. The budget table includes a line item "Mid-term and terminal evaluation (\$35,000) and spot checks/audits (\$35,000)" (for a total of \$35,000, which does not add up) and a line item ""Mid-term and terminal evaluation (\$35,000) and spot checks/audits (\$35,000)" (for a total of \$80,000, which does not add up). The M&E Table includes \$50,000 for project steering committee meetings, \$20,000 for a TE, \$15,000 for a MTR and \$30,000 for an inception workshop and report. Please ensure these tables are congruent/match exactly.

(2) Please ensure GWP is classified as "executing entity" and not "implementing partner."

(3) Please remove yellow highlight from M&E Table 3.

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

(3) Addressed.

Agency Response

19 April 2023

(1) Addressed

(2) Addressed

(3) Addressed

## **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

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): Partly,

(1) Please explain how the project is socioeconomically benefitting the 300,000 people targeted per GEF Core Indicator 11.

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

19 April 2023

(1) Addressed

## **Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address the following:

(1) Annex E Project Budget. Finance officer should be mapped to PMC and not technical components. Please revise accordingly. Please also explain where the Program Assistant falls, as it is not clear in the project budget. Based on the ToR, it appears this position should be mapped to PMC.

(2) Annex E Project Budget: As noted above, the M&E Table 3 and the project budget table are not fully aligned. The budget table includes a line item "Mid-term and terminal evaluation (\$35,000) and spot checks/audits (\$35,000)" (for a total of \$35,000, which does not add up) and a line item ""Mid-term and terminal evaluation (\$35,000) and spot checks/audits (\$35,000)" (for a total of \$80,000, which does not add up). The M&E Table includes \$50,000 for project steering committee meetings, \$20,000 for a TE, \$15,000 for a MTR and \$30,000 for an inception workshop and report. Please ensure these tables are congruent/match exactly. There appears to be double counting of the MTR and TE in the budget table. Please explain.

(3) Annex E Project Budget: Please enlarge text in table, if possible.



25th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

(3) Addressed.

## Agency Response

19 April 2023

(1) Addressed. Finance Officer is moved to the PMC. Program Assistant doesn't fall in the PMC. The ToR was slightly rephrased so as its technical/project tasks and responsibilities to be more clear:

### **Project Assistant (PA)**

Under the guidance and supervision of the CTA/PM the PA will provide technical and organizational support for the implementation of the project.

#### Duties and Responsibilities

The PA will carry out the following tasks:

- ? Assist in monitoring of the delivery of the project, documentation and reporting: research, locate, compile, review and update information and data used in the development of project related documents, work plans, reports and budgets; report on project delivery, statistics and/or projections for use and scrutiny by the supervisor.
- ? Assist in the preparation of quarterly/annual technical progress reports by acquiring and assembling the necessary information from project officers using reporting templates.
- ? Draft project documentation including for the procurement -and contracting of- services and goods and provide to the GWP administration for processing, procurement, contracting.
- ? Facilitate contacts and liaise with partners and GWP teams/divisions as needed for the implementation of the project. In this regard draft routine official correspondence/documents as per project needs.
- ? Manage the contact lists of project and thematic activities stakeholders.
- ? Assist in providing inputs for publications, presentations, briefings, speeches and missions, including news and outreach materials, as needed.
- ? Support the organization and set up meetings, events, workshops organized in the framework of the project, including the preparation and dissemination of information, and their follow-up communications.
- ? Prepare all related background materials for discussions, correspondence and briefing sessions.
- ? Take minutes of meetings.
- ? Assist in the organization of field visits and staff missions as required by the project and thematic activities.
- ? Cooperate with the Communications Department for related tasks, including related to updating projects' website.
- ? Prepare and maintains in cooperation with the GWP Finance & Administration Department, the Project's service providers payment log file and ensures that contract files including procurement, deliverables, reports etc. are effectively stored.
- ? Assist in the procurement of needed supplies, including office equipment and furniture (including communication and audio equipment, supplies etc.).
- ? Ensure flow of information and dissemination of materials with all concerned.

? Undertake any other tasks or assignments necessary for the successful implementation of the project.

Required skills and experience:

? Bachelor's degree in the field of management or business administration or natural resources management or other relevant academic discipline.

? At least 5 years of work experience in administrative and management support of office operating preferably within international or foreign projects or organizations.

? Strong computer skills, in particular mastery of all applications of the MS Office package and internet search.

? Experience in handling web-based management systems.

? Very good inter-personal skills.

? Excellent language skills in English (writing, speaking and reading).

(2) Addressed.

(3) Addressed.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address the following:

(1) The Annex A table is outside the portal margins. Please reformat to fit within the margins. Please use the screenshot and paste method rather than cut and paste.

(2) Please ensure the Core Indicator targets (many of which are not populated at CEO Endorsement) match the targets presented in the Annex A Results Framework.

(3) Please fix the formatting in Annex A per the Core Indicators. The target figures are not aligned in the table with their corresponding indicators. Please use the screenshot and paste method rather than cut and paste.

(4) Please specify that at least 1% of project budget is allocated to [IW:LEARN](#) activities.

(5) Per Table B comments, please ensure any revised output wording is captured in Annex A Results Framework

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

(3) Addressed.

(4) Addressed.

(5) Addressed.

Agency Response  
19 April 2023

(1) Addressed

(2) Addressed

(3) Addressed

(4) Addressed

(5) Addressed

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response  
**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None

Agency Response  
**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address the following:

(1) Please include a table matrix directly into Annex B in the portal that specifically shows how each STAP comment has been addressed (rather than referring the reader to Annex B1 and B2 in the documents section). Please remove "stickers" from table and embed comments in the matrix itself.

(2) Further to (1), please be very specific on how each STAP comment has been addressed. Please do not only refer the reader to certain sections where the revision has taken place. Please explain in detail, in the matrix, how the comment has been addressed. Only then can a full assessment of whether the proponents have addressed the STAP comments can be conducted. (Example: "ToC has been revised" is not a sufficient response. Please note precisely how the ToC has been revised).

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Please respond to the STAP comment: "The approach appears incremental; it is unclear how this will address the pace of change in the basin".

27th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(2) Addressed.

#### Agency Response

19 April 2023

(1) Addressed

(2) Addressed

27 April 2023

(2) Addressed

#### **Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None

#### Agency Response

#### **Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None

#### Agency Response

#### **CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None

#### Agency Response

#### **Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address the following:

(1) The amount spent to date for the Component C validation workshop is higher than the budgeted amount. Please explain. Further, the amount committed exceeds the budgeted amount minus the amount spent to date. Please revise accordingly.

(2) The amount spent to date for the Components A and B are the exact same. Below the table, please explain how this is possible and what exactly these activities are.

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

### Agency Response

19 April 2023

(1) The actual cost for the Component C validation workshop was higher than the one anticipated due to the higher than anticipated participation of stakeholders and inflation that resulted in higher prices than the ones anticipated. To cover related costs there was a redistribution of funds from other Components.

Further, there was a calculation error; figures are revised as per GEFSEC comment.

(2) There was a calculation error; figures are revised as per GEFSEC comment.

The following consultants/experts were engaged during the PPG phase:

- PPG Team Leader/International Waters Specialist
- International Waters Specialist/ Project Document Preparation Specialist
- Social and Environmental Standards Specialist
- Gender Specialist
- Stakeholders Engagement Specialist / Communication Specialist
- PPG National experts in each of Albania, Kosovo\*, Montenegro, North Macedonia

The following activities were carried out:

#### *Component A: Preparatory Technical Studies & Reviews*

The following technical studies, reviews and processes were conducted.

- a. Desktop and field-based studies and data collection
- b. Gender Analysis
- c. Social and Environmental Standards: Screening and Assessments
- d. Demonstration activities identification/Identification of project sites
- e. Financial planning, co-financing and investment mobilized
- f. Stakeholder analysis
- g. Appraisal and formulation of the most appropriate project implementation and execution modality

#### *Component B: Formulation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document, CEO Endorsement Request, and Mandatory and Project Specific Annexes*

The following were developed:

- a. Stakeholder Engagement Plan
- b. Gender Action Plan and Budget

- c. Social and Environmental Standards: Screening and Management Measures
- d. Population of the GEF and LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators table
- e. Completion of the required official endorsement letters
- f. Preparation of mandatory Annexes
- g. Determination of Project Management Arrangements
- h. Development of Project Document and CEO Endorsement Request document

*Component C: Validation Workshop*

- a. Organization of a validation workshop.

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12th of March 2023 (thenshaw): Yes

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

N/A

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 N/A

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 N/A

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

5th of February 2023 (thenshaw): Please address portal upload issues and resubmit. Thank you.

28th of March 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

25th of April 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

27th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Yes

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>		<b>4/19/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		<b>4/27/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**