GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	**9545**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Albania, Montenegro)**		
Project Title:	**Implementation of Ecosystem Approach in the Adriatic Sea through Marine Spatial Planning**		
GEF Agency:	**UNEP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-4 Program 9; IW-1 Program 1; IW-3 Program 5;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	**$1,817,900**
Co-financing:	**$12,017,790**	Total Project Cost:	**$13,835,690**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Steffen Hansen**	Agency Contact Person:	**Christine Haffner-Sifakis**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	SHansen 7.18.2016: No, while this project is well aligned with the biodiversity strategy, please include SMART indicators that align with the Aichi Targets. Shansen (9.2.2016): addressed. The project fits within Obj 1 program 1 of the IW strategy and targets Outcome 1.1: Political commitment/shared vision and improved governance demonstrated for joint, ecosystem-based management	

[1] For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		of transboundary water bodies.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	SHansen 7.18.2016: Yes, the structure is logic with component 1 focusing on the development a science based agreement on the status if the Adriatic along with a set of monitoring indicators, component 2 aims at implementing Marine Spatial Planning demonstrations (with the aim of integrating MSP into planning process and increasing country capacity) and component 3 deals with knowledge management and dissemination of results on the national, regional and global level.	
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	SHansen 7.18.2016: Please include more than a cursory reference to national NBSAPs, at least for the countries contributing STAR BD resources. Otherwise, yes it is consistent with other strategies. Shansen (9.2.2016): addressed	
	4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	SHansen 7.18.2016: Yes, the project will focus on disseminating innovative technologies/state-of-the-art techniques in managing the marine waters across the target countries. Sustainability is to be achieved through strengthening of relevant national institutions, along with an agreement between the countries on the long term strategic actions, which they will be implementing to protect the Adriatic Sea.	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	SHansen 7.18.2016: Please do not overstate the value of the sites included	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Design		in this project - they may not be "some of the world's most important biodiversity hot spots" but instead globally significant sites for biodiversity. Otherwise, the incremental reasoning is sufficiently described. Shansen (9.2.2016): addressed	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	SHansen 7.18.2016: Yes, overall the project components are clear and appropriate to achieve the project objectives. However, the GEF would ask that UNEP please address the below points: 1. Please insert text in the project document explaining the mandate of the "Joint Slovenian â€“ Croatian â€“ Italian â€“ Montenegrin Commission for the Protection of the Waters of the Adriatic Sea and Coastal Waters against Pollution" within the larger Barcelona convention framework and elaborate on the following: 1) will the project will link to and support the Commission and 2) will the project will work towards Albanian membership of the commission? 2. Please add additional text in the project document specifying that strong coordination with a potential new phase of the MedPartnership project will be secured during implementation. 3. If possible, please consider changing the name of the "country coordination offices" to "national inter-ministerial committees. This language	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		fits better with the GEF IW internal reporting requirements. 4. Taking into account the relatively limited size and timeframe of this project it is important to secure optimal uptake of information and results on the national level and across relevant ministries. Within this context, please specify the nature of the project country coordination offices, i.e. how will broad participation from relevant ministries be secured and will the min reps be of sufficient rank? 5. It seems important to reflect on the value added (from a sustainability perspective) of maintaining coordination offices after project closure, which would require securing national funding prior to project closure. Please consider adding language to this effect under the Sustainability section and component 3. 6. Finally, with reference to the Table A and the section titled "PART I; PROJECT IDENTIFICATION": in the row titled "Integrated Approach Pilot", please un-match the boxes titled "IAP-Cities", "IAP-Commodities" and "IAP-Food Security". 7. Please provide information about what data sources will be used to define biodiversity priority areas and how these will be incorporated in decision making. Shansen (9.2.2016): 1. Addressed. 2. Addressed. 3. A satisfactory explanation has	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		been provided. Please consider point three as addressed. 4. A satisfactory explanation has been provided. Please consider point four as addressed. 5. Addressed. 6. Addressed 7. Addressed. Shansen (9.2.2016): - In table E box 6, please under "project targets" readjust the "Number of Countries" from 2 to 0 and resubmit the package (this should be done for both rows under box 6"). Shansen (10.2.2016): addressed - GEF requests UNEP to incorporate the below information into the MSP CEO approval request document (in the form of annexes) and resubmit. For this particular one step MSP, the MSP CEO approval request document should also serve as the project document, which UNEP subsequently approves following its own internal procedures. Information to be incorporated into the MSP CEO approval request: - project implementation arrangements - key deliverables and benchmarks - M&E budget and work-plan - project logical framework	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		- Detailed GEF budget - Detailed Cofinance budget - Project Implementation Arrangement - ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS CHECKLIST - ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS - Project Timetable - Supervision Plan - Procurement Plan Please note that the IW and BD tracking tools + the different co-financing letters should not be integrated in the MSP CEO approval request, but submitted to the GEF in the form of separate annexes. Shansen (10.2.2016): addressed Shansen (10.2.2016): Please note that GEF, following the project inception workshop and subsequent dialogue with countries on the operationalization of the project, request UNEP to send any updated project documents along side of the submission to the GEF OFPs.	
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	SHansen 7.18.2016: Yes, socio-economic benefits will occur by allowing marine industries access to designated places, generating wealth while taking into account environmental considerations. Yes, a gender specialist will be hired during the project inception and provide input at important milestones - including	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		involvement in the review and update of the results based framework and relevant indicators and targets. Yes, NGOs and other members of civil society will play a substantive role in the implementation of the project.	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	SHansen 7.18.2016: Yes, the project objective matches the relative small size of funds available under the project. Also, it is likely that by having UNEP/MAP execute the project, including its PAPs/RACs, which is located in the sub-region, scale-up can be achieved more effectively.	
	9. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	SHansen 7.18.2016: Please in the "risk" section include text that describes climate change risks and how the project will mitigate such risks. Shansen (9.2.2016): addressed.	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	SHansen 7.18.2016: No, please also provide co-financing letters for the UNEP related in-kind co-finance. Shansen (9.2.2016): addressed.	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	SHansen 7.18.2016: Please note that the project cannot participate in IW events, i.e. GEF IWC, Training, Twinning before it starts implementation. Consequently, please adjust the rating in row 20 to from "3" to "1". Shansen (9.2.2016): addressed.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		Also, on the BD TT under general data please only use a 1 or a 2 for the sectors the project will have some impact on. Otherwise leave the space blank. Shansen (9.2.2016): addressed.	
	12. *Only for Non-grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	SHansen 7.18.2016: NA	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	SHansen 7.18.2016: Yes	
	14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	SHansen 7.18.2016: No, the M&E plan appears not to be included in the package, please submit. (in the project document the M&E plan is referenced as Annex G). Shansen (9.2.2016): addressed.	
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	SHansen 7.18.2016: Please specify in the project document if an Information, Communication, and Outreach Strategy has been produced (in which case it should be annexed) or if the project intends to produce this document in its inception phase? Shansen (9.2.2016): addressed.	
Availability of Resources	16. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	SW 7.26.2016 Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	• The focal area allocation?	SHansen 7.18.2016: Yes	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	SHansen 7.18.2016: No, please address comments and resubmit. Shansen (9.2.2016): No, please address comments in box 6 and resubmit. Shansen (10.2.2016): Yes, the project is recommended for CEO approval. Please note that GEF, following the project inception workshop and subsequent dialogue with countries on the operationalization of the project, request UNEP to send any updated project documents along side of the submission to the GEF OFPs.	
Review Dates	First Review	July 26, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		