



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4483		
Country/Region:	Regional (Albania, Montenegro, Macedonia)		
Project Title:	Enabling Trans-boundary Cooperation and Integrated Water Resources Management in the Extended Drin River Basin		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4482 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$4,500,000
Co-financing:	\$221,829,721	Total Project Cost:	\$226,429,721
PIF Approval:	October 03, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	November 15, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Vladimir Mamaev

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the three mentioned countries are eligible.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin): Yes Albania, FYR Macedonia and Montenegro are eligible.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the operational focal points of Albania, FYR Macedonia and Montenegro have endorsed the project proposal.  Has other countries in the region expressed interest in part taking in the project, and if so, will the project during its implementation work towards including additional countries? Please clarify.	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, it is evident in the PIF, that UNDP has the comparative advantage in capacity building and technical assistance, which will enable UNDP to support governments in implementing the project successfully.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin): UNDPs comparative advantage has not changed since PIF.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): N.A.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin): NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): This is a regional project, which will be coordinated from UNDP Bratislava office, with executing partners based in GWP MED and UNECE.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin): Yes, this is a regional project, that will be coordinated out of UNDPs regional office in Turkey, with execution arrangements with the global GWP office as well as the regional GWP MED office.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the funds are available within the IW focal area.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the funds are still available.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the suggested project proposal is aligned with the GEF5 IW results framework and hence applying the IW Tracking Tool Indicators.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin): Yes, this is a classic IW project, working towards facilitation the formulation of a TDA followed by a SAP to enable transboundary cooperation in a complex

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>basin.</p> <p>The project will be delivering outcomes and outputs that are fully aligned with the IW results framework. However, please include more specific outputs on component 4. The detailed demonstration project descriptions include some outputs that should be included.</p> <p>Please note that the "Social and environmental screening forms" attached to the submission seems not completely filled out. Also, will there be a partial/limited social and environmental screening of the demos as well or only for the overall project? Note also, that the SAP very well could be seen as an upstream strategy that could have downstream impacts, UNDP may need to review this against their own safeguards in future.</p> <p>Endorsement of SAP - The results Framework states that the SAP is to be endorsed by the to be established Drin Core Group (outcome 2. 2, page 48) - please add a note that the SAP is to be approved on ministerial level in each country.</p> <p>1st of October 2014 (Cseverin): Above points addressed in UNDP Prodoc</p>
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the suggested project proposal is aligned	31st of July 2014 (cseverin): The project is still aligned with the 3rd Objective of

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	objectives identified?	with the GEF5 IW Strategy's third objective, namely e.g. "supporting foundational capacity building for joint, ecosystem-based management of trans-boundary water systems"	GEF 5 IW, and will be expected to at least deliver political commitment, a shared vision and institutional capacity towards IWRM of the Extended Drin Basin.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project is consistent with the national and regional strategies.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the project development process have continued to engage with the countries and made sure that the project is relevant to the participating countries as well as aligned with the national (and regional) priorities.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, indeed, as the main project outcomes are primarily targetted towards building regional capacity and consensus.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin):Yes, capacity building is identified as a central part of enabling IWRM in this complex basin, both in the scope of this project and on the longer term.
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the baseline projects are sufficiently described.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin):The baseline has not changed since PIF stage and is reinforced by the national strategies and activities towards addressing the sustainability of the natural resource issues linked to the IWRM.
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		31st of July 2014 (cseverin):Yes, the concept is featuring a cost effective approach, that has been tested and verified in numerous basins across the world. Working towards addressing Water related issues through a transboundary process will be more costeffective than trying to deal with all water issues in a national context as that will not take into account all the external factors coming from the neighboring countries.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the main activities mentioned under incremental reasoning seem to further address the main identified issues in the PIF.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin):Yes, the planned activities continues to be based on the incrementality principle, as described at the time of the PIF.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes the project framework is sound and clear, and delivers a sound base for further developing the components and associated indicators during preparation.	<p>31st of July 2014 (cseverin): The Results framework is sound and clear, however, please include wording to the effect that the project will be spending atleast 1% opf the GEF grant towards IWLEARN activities, such as participation in IWC, setting up a Homepage, following IWLEARN guidance, development and delivery of atleast two experience notes.</p> <p>Further, the Results framework needs to include quantifiable output indicators and be a bit more more explanatory on what the demonstrations will entail, as identified in the detailed descriptions in Annex 5.</p> <p>1st of October 2014 (Cseverin): Above points addressed in UNDP Prodoc</p>
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the assumptions for the description of the GEBs in the proposed regional transboundary water management project are sound and appropriate.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin): yes
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, a clear description has been included on the socio-economic benefits that the project activities will effect.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin):Yes, partly. The socio economic benefits of the planned activities including the gender dimensions have been detailed described. Among others the Drin Core Group and other consultative bodies

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	additional benefits?		<p>have good participation from both genders, while also applying gender mainstreaming approaches throughout the project implementation.</p> <p>However, please do expand the gender mainstreaming with a few more tangible outputs aligned with the IW GEF 6 strategy.</p> <p>1st of October 2014 (Cseverin): Above points sufficiently addressed in UNDP Prodoc</p>
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, they have been described and will be addressed properly during the proposed project activities.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the stakeholder analysis undertaken during the project prep phase provides a good overview of the highly diverse stakeholder group in the region. Further, the project takes stakeholder groups participation into account when identifying and setting up the institutional structures for implementation of the project. Local stakeholder groups will especially be active during the implementation of the demonstration projects.
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, potential risks have been identified, rated and a mitigation strategy included. Climate Change will most likely not have a direct impact on the main project outcome and outputs, except for on the proposed demonstration projects, where the possible impacts of Climate change will be fully considered and incorporated.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin): The project includes a matrix outlining potential risks and associated mitigation measures.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes	31st of July 2014 (cseverin):Please include updated information on the coordination with other initiatives in the region. One would think that during the PPG phase other initiatives have materialized in the region.  1st of October 2014 (Cseverin): Above point properly addressed in UNDP Prodoc
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, this has been adequately described.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin):Yes
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		31st of July 2014 (cseverin): Yes and the changed that have been carried out have been substantially described and backed by sound arguments.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		31st of July 2014 (cseverin):NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the PM budget is appropriate and in accordance with the GEF Guidance.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin):Yes, the PM budget follows the GEF guidance.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed funding levels seems to be adequate.	31st of July 2014 (cseverin):Yes, even though the co-financing for Component 4 seems extremely high. It is ofcourse understood why the primary part of the national co-fiancing will be supporting these demonstrations.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): The indicated co-financing at PIF stage seems to be adequate and notably includes in kind contributes from each of the three countries that will be directly involved in the project, as well as from a bordering country and a	31st of July 2014 (cseverin):Most of the cofinancing is confirmed by co-financing letters, please forward the co-financing letters from Albania (\$ 51,754,000) and the GIZ (\$6,700,000).  Please elaborate on the extreme high co-

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		number of agencies.	<p>financing (in kind) from KfW. Further, please also elaborate a bit more on the fact that UNESCO have not opted to join this effort. UNESCO-IHP is seen as important partners in this project.</p> <p>1st of October 2014 (Cseverin): KfWs massive inkind co-financing have been detailed described, however, it should be noted that there is a bit of a miscalculation (estimating the contribution 7 mio lower than the exchange rates merit), however, this is counter balanced by another co-financing source (Albania) than in turn is a bit too high ~ 4 mio)</p> <p>UNESCOs role have also been described (in ProDoc and GEF request for CEO Endorsement,and what is planned to keep working towards its participation.</p>
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the agency is bringing in a portion of cash co-financing to the project budget, and has been able to raise considerable cofinancing to this project that is setting out to foster transboundary cooperation on the DRIN River Basin.	<p>31st of July 2014 (cseverin):Yes, however, please split the cofinancing amount into cash and co-financing. The system can not process requests when they are lumped together.</p> <p>1st of October 2014 (Cseverin): Have still not been addressed in the Request for CEO Endorsement. Please address and resubmit.</p>
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant		31st of July 2014 (cseverin):Yes the IW tracking tool have been submitted, however it does not reflect upon any



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	indicators, as applicable?		<p>stress reduction, please include demonstration activities if these have any measurable stress reduction.</p> <p>1st of October 2014 (Cseverin): Above points addressed in UNDP Prodoc, however, please do update IW TT and resubmit within the first year of implementation, at which time the details on the demos and the baseline should be much clearer.</p>
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		31st of July 2014 (cseverin):Yes
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		<p>31st of July 2014 (cseverin) Partly. The text on the NEXUS with regards to TDA formulation is o.k., but could be carried over to SAP (Output 2.5) - as per STAP comment. This goes along with the background analysis and important trade-offs between hydropower, water for food, water for cities, and flood protection in the overall basin (with different emphasis/relevance to this in each sub-basin).</p> <p>Further, it may be useful to list the core sectors to be represented in the inter-ministerial committees. In addition, involvement of ministries of finance and/or planning would aid in SAP implementation down the line.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			1st of October 2014 (Cseverin): Above points addressed in UNDP Prodoc
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> <li>• Council comments?</li> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p><b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b></p>	<p>22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the PIF is recommended for CEO Approval.</p> <p>6th of April 2011 (Aduda): The Drin Dialogue Project is used as co-financing. It is not clear what they entails. The PIF should be revised to clarify the activities of the Drin Dialogue as co-financing and how the GEF incremental activities complement that baseline. The project is not recommended for work program inclusion."</p> <p>August 15, 2012 (IZavadsky): The revised PIF clarified the activities of the baseline project "The Drin Basin dialogue" and how the GEF grant will complement the outcomes of the baseline project. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		31st of July 2014 (cseverin):No, please address comments  1st of October 2014 (Cseverin): Yes, CEO Endorsement is being recommended
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed PPG activities are appropriate for project preparation of the full size project.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the budget is justified.
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the PPG is being recommended.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.