

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

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10881

**Countries**

Regional (Albania, Kosovo, Montenegro, North Macedonia)

**Project Title**

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

**GEF Agency(ies)**

UNDP

**Agency ID**

UNDP: 6300

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

International Waters

**Program Manager**

Steffen Hansen

# 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

SH (9.21.21): Yes, the project is in alignment with the IW objective 3 and will enhance water security in freshwater ecosystems. Please address the below two points:

Currently all funding is allocated towards Obj 3-6. Please consider an appropriate spread of IW funding across the three strategic actions specific to IW objective 3.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared.

On Project information: If the Global Water Partnership is an inter-governmental organization, it should be categorized as “Government” and not “Others”.

SH (10.26.21): Not cleared. In PIF part 1, please reclassify as government.

SH (10.28.21): Cleared.

##### Agency Response

UNDP response 21 October 2021  
Done.

## 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

SH (9.21.21): Table B and the description there off is both sound and well crafted, however, some edits are required. Please address the following points:

1. Please further sharpen relevant output deliverables (e.g. 1.1., 1.2, 2.1, 2.3) with an aim to introduce language such as “presented for adoption to....” etc.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared.

2. Please add tangible numbers (e.g. # of N removed/avoided) specific to outputs under component 3.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared with the expectation that the CEO End submission will include stress reduction numbers to be tracked as part of project implementation.

3. Specific to output 3.3- Toxic emissions reduction, please explain if this output will deliver on GEF C&W targets and help countries meet their commitments relevant to C&W conventions? Also, to increase IW eligibility ideally this output will also deliver toward water use efficiency and/or reuse. Please explain if this is the case and refine the output title/description to make this clear.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared

4. Output 3.1: Waste removal and management - Identification and piloting of high-priority interventions in waste management (with particular focus on plastics stream via borders and to the sea) in accordance with EU acquis related commitments of the project beneficiaries. Please remove this output as it is not IW eligible. The output may be financed via project co-finance contributions.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared

5. On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5.0%, for a co-financing of \$51,360,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$2,568,000 instead of \$0 (which is 0%). No funds, from the co-financing portion, have been reserved for the PMC. As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional,

which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion. A more definitive estimation of PMC will be presented and adjusted at CEO Endorsement stage.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared

6. Please clarify if output 2.2 should be titled “Operationalization of a joint coordination mechanism”?

SH (10.26.21): Cleared

7. Output 4.4: Please consider removing the number “800” from the output and which appears misplaced.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared

Once these edits have been introduced please update all relevant PIF sections.

## Agency Response

UNDP response 21 October 2021

1. Done.

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 *tangible numbers* requested above as the nature and level of pressures to be addressed by the “demonstration and/or priorities solutions” differ among different areas. Based on the above, we hope that it is accepted that the *tangible numbers* are identified through the PPG phase and included in the Project Document.

3. In relation to output 3.3- Toxic emissions reduction: It is planned to deliver capacity building activities and trainings to selected industries (that will be identified/contacted during project implementation) that will accept to participate, to strengthen their understanding and knowledge with regard to the emissions to the environment with the aim to understand the existence of and implement practices that are easy to be applied and lead to emissions’ reduction. The decision to apply such practices lie with the industries and is linked to their compliance to related legislation. There are no investments/“hard” interventions planned so it is not feasible to assess the type and level of emission reductions hence, the extent to which the activity will assist delivering on GEF C&W targets and the countries in meeting their C&W related obligations.

The Output’s narrative amended so the Output delivers toward water use efficiency and/or reuse.

4. Done.

5. Done, now there is proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC.
6. Indeed. Corrected.
7. Done.

**UNDP response 28 October 2021**

2. The Project Document will include stress reduction numbers to be tracked as part of project implementation.

**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**

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

1. Please include in table C the UNDP co-finance contributions to this project.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared with the expectation that UNDP cofinance letter will form part of the CEO Endorsement submission package.

2. There are five Drin riparians, but only four have committed cofinance towards the project. Please explain how Greece (non GEF eligible) will be involved in the project (?) and if they are expected to contribute co-finance?

SH (10.26.21): Cleared with the expectation that the Greece co-finance is reflected in table C at the time of CEO Endorsement.

3. If the category for GWP-Med2 is corrected to "Government", then this will also have to be reflected in Table C.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared

**Agency Response**

**UNDP response 21 October 2021**

11. Done

The co-financing letters will be available during PPG phase for CEO endorsement.

2. Greece is committed to supporting the rest of the Drin riparians for the implementation of the SAP using as appropriate and feasible the experience developed through the EU WFD implementation (the EU WFD is fully implemented in Greece); analytical and technical information contained in the national management plans as well as accompanying technical documents will be used and feed into the technical and analytical activities described in the PIF. Greece is also committed to participating in the actions for the enhancement of institutional and legal arrangements and as such participates in the work of the DCG and its Expert Working Groups, in meetings commenting documents, etc.

The above will be form the framework for the co-financing coming from Greece.

The amount of in-kind co-financing will be discussed with and agreed with Greece during the PPG phase.

3. Done

#### **UNDP response 28 October 2021**

1. The co-financing letters will be available during PPG phase for CEO endorsement.
2. Greece co-finance will be reflected in table C at the time of CEO Endorsement

#### **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 SH (9.21.21): Cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion SH (9.21.21): Cleared.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 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 SH (9.21.21): 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

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 mmgt 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. Done

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.

## **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**

SH (9.21.21): Please add private sector taxonomy TAGs.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared

#### **Agency Response**

UNDP response 21 October 2021

Done

### **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**

SH (9.21.21): Yes, root causes and barrier are well described and have been informed via a highly inclusive and collaborative TDA/SAP process. Cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

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

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (9.21.21): Please address the below points:

1. PIF Baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects section: the first two para's reference several obsolete strategies. Please have a look at this section as to make sure that the information provided is fully updated.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared

2. The elaborated baseline is substantive. During PPG a more detailed analysis should be made as to determine if table C can be further expanded to reflect all relevant ongoing investments in the region.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared

3. PIF Baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects section: Please clarify the below sentence and explain how this SAP implementation project remains critical (investment and coordination wise) as part of a much larger funding GAP? Please consider ways in which this narrative can be translated into the PIF re-submission.

"The full implementation and compliance with the EU water acquis is estimated to cost more than 1 billion EUR over the period to 2035, representing more than 50% of the total cost of full compliance with the entire environmental acquis."

SH (10.26.21): Cleared

4. PIF Baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects section: The UNDP/GEF Dinaric Karst Aquifer system SAP imp project (GEF ID 9919) has recently been GEF CEO endorsed. Likewise, the WB/GEF Save Drina SAP imp project (GEF ID 10553) is undergoing endorsement. As relevant please ensure coordination and synergies during PPG.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared

## Agency Response

### UNDP response 21 October 2021

1. Understanding that the strategies' dates may lead to this assumption, to the best of our knowledge and understanding, the strategies referred to in that para are not obsolete; there are no new strategies replacing the ones referred to in the PIF. The strategic documents having "obsolete" dates are still valid.

2. Effort will be put during the PPG phase to expand (as necessary) table C to reflect all relevant ongoing investments in the region.

3. The sentence *"The full implementation and compliance with the EU water acquis is estimated to cost more than 1 billion EUR over the period to 2035, representing more than 50% of the total cost of full compliance with the entire environmental acquis."* refers specifically to Montenegro. The cost of the water related EU acquis accounts for more than 50% of the cost for the implementation of the environmental EU acquis. It is assumed that the same is true (there is no precise related information available) for the rest of the GEF beneficiary Drin Riparians. Major part of this amount is for capital investments in the area of waste management (both liquid and solid; the latter having

potential positive effect to groundwater through the construction of sanitary landfills). Specifically for wastewater, related EU directives provide for the construction of waste-water treatment plants for all agglomerations with population >2,000 inhabitants.

Many of the actions for implementing the EU acquis are included in the SAP. Further, the SAP implementation will contribute to the creation of the enabling environment for the implementation of the EU acquis. SAP actions implemented through this project will allow the Drin Riparians testing/replicating technologies (e.g. constructed wetlands) assisting in rationalizing choices in terms of wastewater technology to be selected for agglomerations that are not easily connected to large (for cities) wastewater treatment plants (WWTP). This could assist in lowering overall related costs (capital investment and operation costs). Knowledge to be developed through the SAP implementation regarding floods, pollution, ecosystems etc. as well as the development of a transboundary River Basin Management Plan will assist the Riparians in prioritizing their investments and informing their decisions in terms of the exact position of the WWTP (for the latter to be climate/flood risk "proofed"). The coordination mechanisms to be established and management tools to be developed will allow prioritization of interventions and coordination of related assistance coming from the ODA donors, and assist in maturing investment plans to apply for financing by the EU.

The above narrative is reflected under PIF's **II.1a.5 Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing.**

4. There is no -known- hydraulic connection between the Drina Basin and the Drin Basin.

UNDP being the implementing agency for both DIKTAS and the proposed Drin SAP project will ensure coordination between the two projects. There has been close cooperation in terms of project execution, with GWP-Med being involved in the first DIKTAS project and UNESCO IHP being involved in the execution of the Drin Project. There are already discussions between GWP-Med and UNESCO for the avoidance of overlaps and the creation of synergies.

See text included in the PIF under:

- *Table in "II.1a.2 Baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects"*

6. *Coordination*

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

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (9.21.21): Overall yes this section is well developed and all the expected components and outcomes are sufficiently described at this stage. However please address the below question and take note of the other comments.

Question: Please explain the extent to which this project will support a Drin Joint Commission and how this work is reflected in table B output descriptions?

SH (10.26.21): Cleared

Comment: Thank you for inserting a detailed Theory of Change into the PIF. If approved by council and during PPG, please further refine the ToC to include causal linkages between the various Outputs and Outcomes, and to explain how public/private investment may be incentivized to scale some of the pilot measures supported/piloted by the project. Further, during PPG please revise the ToC figure so that it

is not a “left to right” depiction of table B Outcomes and Outputs, but becomes a more dynamic figure that better depicts interdependencies between barriers, various outputs etc. As inspiration, please see this previous project approved during the June council meeting:

file:///C:/Users/wb439285/Downloads/f2293d46-858c-eb11-a812-000d3a58bd38\_PIF%20(5).pdf

SH (10.26.21): Cleared

## Agency Response

### UNDP response 21 October 2021

Question:

Following related advice up, the title of Output 2.2 changed into “2.2 Operationalisation of a joint coordination mechanism”.

The respective alternative scenario narrative under Component 2 is “ The Component will provide support for the operation/establishment of a sustainable joint coordination body in the form of the current institutional arrangement or an evolved one that may be the result of the successful negotiation and signing of an international agreement for the management of the Drin Basin”.

The project will provide support for the Drin Riparians to:

- establish a Drin Joint Commission should the negotiations for the signing of an International Agreement conclude positively (the draft text was prepared through the Drin foundational project and the Drin Riparians committed publicly to initiate negotiations for its finalization and signing).
- if the negotiations described above don’t conclude positively, take full ownership of the work for the implementation of the Drin MoU or of a renewed MoU, through the establishment of a joint coordination body that will substitute/continue the work of the DCG.

The support to be provided by the project may include all or part of the following:

- Studies/technical documents for the establishment of the joint body (e.g. feasibility study; ToR, etc.)
- Costs for providing day-to-day technical support to the joint body and its secretariat for their operation with the aim for these to becoming gradually autonomous
- Travel costs for meetings
- Capacity building of members of the joint body and the Officers of the secretariat
- Possible coverage of a part of the salary of the Officers of the secretariat of the joint body; the part covered by the project will gradually be reduced till the end of the Project.
- Joint body’s/Secretariat’s office equipment

The above is reflected in the PIF narrative under II.1a.3 Proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project.

Comment:

Noted that the above is reflected in the PIF narrative under II.1a.3 Proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project.

Noted; the comment will be taken into consideration for the revision of the IoC during the PPG phase; suggested changes will be reflected in the Project Document.

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

SH (9.21.21): 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**

SH (9.21.21): 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**

SH (9.21.21): Yes, however please address the below comment.

The project will contribute to climate adaptation via several actions, including new climate scenarios and flood risk management plans. Subsequently, please consider adjusting the CA Rio marker to a value of 1.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

UNDP response 21 October 2021

Done.

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

SH (9.21.21): Sustainability is clearly explained within the context of country support for the SAP implementation process and the institutional framework specific to the Drin basin, while also highlighting the anticipated pilots and private sector partnerships. In addition, please address the below two questions:

Specific to the anticipated RBMP plan output, please explain how a coordinative and dynamic platform is secured between the regional institutional structures and that of national level Min of Planning, Finance, Agriculture, Water/sanitation etc. and with a view towards developing effective messaging and supportive national policies and investments within the framework of the SAP? Please also explain how this SAP project will act to enhance overall donor coordination within the basin and in support of SAP implementation?

SH (10.26.21): Cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

UNDP response 21 October 2021

##### **Response to the first question:**

The proposed project is not aiming to create new bodies that will result in increasing the institutional burden and complexity, rather use existing bodies and processes.

The following will be used as a “coordinative and dynamic platform”: (i) DCG (or the joint body to succeed this) and its Expert Working Groups (ii) already established national level processes and institutions; this will enable coordination not only among the Drin Riparians, but also between the regional level and the national institutions responsible (directly or indirectly) for natural resources management

also between the regional level and the national institutions responsible (directly or indirectly) for natural resources management.

- All Drin Riparians have prepared or will soon prepare RBMPs for the part of the Drin basin extending in their territory.
- There are institutional mechanisms and processes for the implementation of national RBMPs, provided by the national EU WFD related legislation allowing the coordination among ministries (responsible for Planning, Finance, Agriculture, Water/sanitation etc.).
- The National RBMPs are nevertheless, not coordinated among each other.
- The development of the Drin RBMP was requested by the DCG (the officially appointed members are the heads of bodies responsible for the implementation of the EU WFD at the national level). The Drin RBMP will not substitute the national RBMPs (the Danube basin and Sava basin experience will be followed in this regard). The Drin RBMP will be used to coordinate work for the implementation of the national RBMPs and to inform the development of the next cycle of the national RBMPs. The DCG (or the joint body to succeed this) will be the body responsible to coordinate work for the implementation of the Drin RBMP. The members of the DCG having also the responsibility of the implementation of the national RBMPs will ensure coordination with national activities as well as national institutions in line with the national legislative framework (Min of Planning, Finance, Agriculture, Water/sanitation).

#### **Response to the second question:**

The Drin Riparians requested and publicly committed during the Partner's Conference -with which the foundational project concluded- to have at least one DCG/Donors coordination meeting organized per year to enable synergies and avoid overlaps among donors, and to keep them informed on the SAP related priorities. The proposed project will support the organization of related work (through Output 4.3) as well as the organization of this annual coordination meeting. The PIF was informed with the narrative presented above to make clearer the way that donor coordination for the implementation of the SAP will be fostered; see in Component 4 under "II.1a.3 Proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project".

## **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**

SH (9.21.21): 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**

SH (9.21.21): 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**

SH (9.21.21): Please elaborate the PIF gender section to include some concrete examples of gender gaps specific to the water sector across the Drin basin, and include examples of organizations which may be involved in gender related activities.

SH (10.26.21): Gender gaps have been explained specific to plans in place, but still little detail has been provided specific to gender sector barriers that need to be addressed. Further, this section references an "Annex 2 of a gender strategy", but the strategy appears not to have been annexed. During PPG, a substantive gender analysis should be performed with a view towards developing Gender-responsive measures (gender action plan or equivalent), while the project should also look towards developing gender-sensitive indicators and sex disaggregated targets.

SH (10.28.21): Cleared.

**Agency Response**

**UNDP response 21 October 2021**

Done – see PIF under “3) Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment”

Done – see PIF under “3) Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment”

**UNDP response 28 October 2021**

Done – see PIF under “3) Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment”

## **Private Sector Engagement**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

SH (9.21.21): 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**

SH (9.21.21):

1. In the project document, please be more specific on COVID risks and clarify if/how the projects soft/hard (pilots etc.) will contribute to the short-long term “build back green” better agenda.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared

SH (10.26.21): Cleared.

2. Within the context of the above question, please introduce additional text specific to how the build back better agenda can be linked to the expected €9-billion EU Economic and Investment Plan for the Western Balkans? Further, please expand the Project Risk table to include COVID-19 considerations and consider including following considerations:

- o Does the intervention have a plan in place to manage a possible re-instatement of COVID-19 containment measures?
- o Government capacity as human resources are mobilized elsewhere;
- o Change in capacity of other executing entities and the effectiveness of the overall project implementation arrangement;
- o Limited capacity and experience for remote work and online interactions as well as limited remote data and information access and processing capacities that projects will need to strengthen
- o Changes in project implementation timelines;
- o Changes in baseline (both ongoing and forthcoming projects);
- o Change in conditions of beneficiaries;

SH (10.26.21): Cleared.

3. Please attach an annex in the form of a preliminary Climate Risk Screening and which explains how short-medium-long term climate scenarios have been factored into the different components of the project.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

**UNDP response 21 October 2021**

3. Done, see (i) revised narrative and table under section “5. Risks in the PIF” (ii) Annex E.

## **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**

SH (9.21.21): Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

**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**

SH (9.21.21): 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**

SH (9.21.21): Yes, cleared.

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

Please upload to the list of documents the terminal evaluation from the previous TDA/SAP foundational project phase.

SH (10.26.21): noted.

Please upload to the list of documents the approved Drin SAP.

SH (10.26.21): Cleared. The SAP contains over 100 agreed policy and technical actions and was endorsed by countries April 2020. Elements of the SAP are captured as part of Annex C, however, during PPG the breath and structure of the SAP content should be presented in a clearer way.

### **Agency Response**

#### **UNDP response 21 October 2021**

Terminal Evaluation of TDA/SAP foundational project phase will be submitted officially.

#### **UNDP response 28 October 2021**

The Project Document will better explain the SAP

## **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**

SH (9.21.21): There is no mention of COVID-19 in the ESS. Please explain if this is an oversight?

SH (10.26.21): Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

#### **UNDP response 21 October 2021**

COVID-19 related considerations and risks to project implementation are included in the PIF ((i) revised narrative and table under section “5. Risks in the PIF” after related comment in the review sheet. It is assessed that there is no environmental and social risks related to COVID-19 because of project implementation.

### **art 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**

SH (9.21.21): Four LOEs have been submitted. Please address the below point:

On Part III: Please change the names of the Minister of Macedonia and PFP of Montenegro for the names of the OFPs of each Country: for Macedonia Ms. Vesna Indova and for Montenegro Ms. Jovana Zarić.

SH (10.26.21): Not cleared. The names of the Macedonia and Montenegro OFPs have switched. Please address.

SH (10.28.21): Cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

UNDP response 21 October 2021  
Done

UNDP response 28 October 2021  
Done

### **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**

NA

**Agency Response**

UNDP response 21 October 2021

UNDP CO in Albania will lead the project, and take care jointly with other UNDP COs.

**EFSEC 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**

SH (9.21.21): Please address comments and resubmit.

In addition and on the UNDP checklist: kindly note the uploaded checklist from the CO in Albania. Since this is a Regional project involving 4 countries, please clarify if CO in Albania is the responsible for the whole project or if this is going to be managed by a regional UNDP office?

SH (10.26.21): Please address comments and resubmit.

GEF notes that the UNDP CO in Albania will lead the project.

SH (10.28.21): PM recommends 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

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval