



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 Transboundary 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:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,500,000
Co-financing:	\$22,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$27,000,000
PIF Approval:	October 03, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ivan Zavadsky	Agency Contact Person:	Vladimir Mamaev

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	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.	
	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.	
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 UNDO to support governments in implementing the project successfully.	
	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.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): This is a regional project, which will be	

		office, with executing partners based in GWP MED and UNECE.	
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.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		
	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.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the suggested project proposal is aligned 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"	
	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.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes	

	will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	primarily targetted towards building regional capacity and consensus.	
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.	
	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?		
	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.	
	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.	
	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.	
	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	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, a clear description has been included on the socio-economic benefits that the project activities will affect	

	achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous 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.	
	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.	
	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	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	21st of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, this has been adequately described.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	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.	
Project Financing			

	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.	
	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 contributos from each of the three countries that will be directly involved in the project, as well as from a bordering country and a number of agencies.	
	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.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the PIF is recommended for CEO Approval. 6th of April 2011 (Aduda): The Drin Dialogue Project is used as co-	

		<p>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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval 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	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed PPG activities are appropriate

	2. Is itemized budget justified?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the budget is justified.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	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.