



GEF-6 GEF Secretariat Review For Enabling Activity Proposal

GEF ID:	10024		
Country/Region:	Macedonia		
Project Title:	Fourth National Communication and Third Biennial Update Report on Climate Change under the UNFCCC		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	6222 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$852,000
Co-financing:	\$350,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,202,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Milena Vasquez	Agency Contact Person:	Mr. Yamil Bonduki

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	MGV, March 19, 2018: Yes, Macedonia is eligible.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	MGV, March 19, 2018: Yes, Ms. Vesna Indova endorsed the project on January 29, 2018.	
Project Consistency	3. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?	MGV, March 19, 2018: Yes, the project is aligned with GEF-6 Climate Change Strategy, CCM-3, Program 5.	
	4. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV, March 19, 2018: Yes, the project is aligned with Macedonia's previous reports to the UNFCCC including its INDC, as well as relevant laws and strategies related to climate change.	
Project Design	5. Are the components in Table A	MGV, March 19, 2018: Components	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>in Table A are sufficiently clear. However please address the two comments below:</p> <p>a) There is no reference of the International Consultation Analysis(ICA) process that Macedonia underwent for its BUR 1 and of its key conclusions. Please include and note how the project will incorporate findings from its participation in the second cycle of the ICA.</p> <p>b) We note that even though Macedonia submitted its third National Communication on March 2014, it waited until now to submit a request to support its fourth National Communication. Further, it appears that the period between the submission dates of its national communications has been getting subsequently longer, the opposite trend from its BUR submissions. Please comment on why this has been the case and how the project will strengthen capacities to improve that.</p> <p>MGV, April 5, 2018:</p> <p>a) Reference to the ICA process has been added, including key conclusions and recommendations, which were taken into account for the SBUR and any conclusions and recommendations from the ICA process for the SBUR will also be integrated into the implementation of the Third BUR with this project.</p> <p>Comment cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		b) Request for supporting its Fourth NC was delayed due to recent political crisis and local elections, which affected the process. Comment cleared.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MGV, March 19, 2018: Yes, CSOs will be consulted and gender elements are integrated into the project.	
	7. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	MGV, March 19, 2018: yes, the Climate Change Office at the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning will execute the project.	
	8. Is indicated cofinancing appropriate for an enabling activity?	MGV, March 19, 2018: cofinancing is not required for this enabling activity, however, cofinancing of \$350,000 is included.	
Other Comments	9. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for the financial management and procurement assessment ¹ .	N/A	
Resource Availability	10. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	MGV, March 19, 2018: This project is requesting \$932,940 from the CCM Regional set aside.	
	• The focal area allocation?	MGV, March 19, 2018: This project is requesting \$932,940 from the CCM Regional set aside.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		

¹ Question 9 is applicable only to direct access proposal while question 10 (on fees) is not applicable to direct access proposal.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area set-aside? 	MGV, March 19, 2018: This project is requesting \$932,940 from the CCM Regional set aside. There are enough resources available to support this project.	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation	11. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>MGV, March 19, 2018: Please address comments on question 5.</p> <p>MGV, April 5, 2018: All comments have been addressed. P.M recommends CEO Approval.</p>	
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 19, 2018	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 05, 2018	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.**