



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*

## UNDP Country Office Skopje

### Minutes of Meeting – Local Project Appraisal Committee

**Meeting date:** 5 July 2018

**Project Title:** 4<sup>th</sup> National Communication and 3<sup>rd</sup> Biannual Update Report on Climate Change

#### 1. Attendance

Name	Title
<b>LPAC Chair</b>	
Narine Sahakyan	Deputy Resident Representative
<b>LPAC Members</b>	
Anita Kodzoman	Head of Unit, Energy and Environment
Pavlina Zdraveva	Project Manager, Energy and Environment Unit
Emil Angelov	Program Analyst, Democratic Governance Unit
Jasmina Belcovska Tasevska	Innovation and Monitoring & Evaluation Associate
Sandra Ismanovski	Communication Officer
Zoran Samardziev	Operations Manager
Ilmiasan Dauti	Project Manager, Democratic Governance Unit
Biljana Cvetanovska Gugoska	Project Manager, Democratic Governance Unit

#### 2. Project Proposal was presented by:

Anita Kodzoman, Head of Unit, Energy and Environment, and  
Pavlina Zdraveva, Project Manager, Energy and Environment Unit

#### 3. General introduction

Mrs. Sahakyan opened the meeting and went over the nature of the meeting acknowledging creative contributions from program staff, as well as compliance maintenance contributions by operations staff. Current format of the LPAC includes only UNDP Programme, Operations and project staff but it might be reconsidered in the future on order to provide an opportunity to include beneficiaries and/or partners in the LPAC meetings.

#### 4. 4<sup>th</sup> National Communication and 3<sup>rd</sup> Biannual Update Report on Climate Change

The goal of the project is to assist the country in mainstreaming and integration of climate change consideration into national and sectorial development policies by providing continuity to the institutional and technical capacity strengthening process. This project will additionally improve the sustainability for preparation of future National Communication/Biennial Update Reports on Climate Change and will facilitate the reporting requirements to UNFCCC.

The immediate objective of the project is to assist the country in the preparation and submission of its Fourth National Communication and Third Biennial Update Report on Climate Change to the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) for the fulfilment of its obligations to the Convention under FCCC/CP/2002/7/Add.2 and Dec.2/CP. 17 Annex III.

The project will build upon the results of the Third National Communication to the UNFCCC, the Second Biennial Update Report on Climate Change, and the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions. However, it will not repeat the analyses already done as part of recent projects but will focus on sectors which are not analyzed in-depth in the previous documents.

The planned duration of the project is 2018-2022, and the amount of the GEF resources to be allocated to this project is \$852,000. The project is implemented through the Support to NIM modality. The Ministry of Environment and Physical shall be a responsible party.

The UNDP office will provide substantive as well as administrative support services for activities within the Project Document/Annual Work Plan and in accordance with the regulations, rules and procedures of UNDP and GEF. Letter of Agreement between UNDP and the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning for provision of support services will be signed together with the Project document.

The National Climate Change Committee (NCCC) which is established by the Government, will continue to be the overarching political platform, providing a high-level support for the development and realization of the climate change activities. It comprises of the key stakeholders from national institutions, research and educational entities, private sector and civil society. The NCCC will also provide policy guidance to the project strengthening the inter-institutional coordination on climate change thus giving sustainability to the preparation process of national communications and biennial update reports.

The project Board will consist of high level representatives of the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning (Executive) and UNDP (Senior Supplier), and the Chair of the National Climate Change Committee (Senior Beneficiary).

## **5. SUMMARY OF LPAC MEMBER COMMENTS / REVIEW OF THE QA ASSESSMENT**

- The project is fully supported by the PAC members, subject to revision as per the comments given at the LPAC meeting to be integrated in the final project document.
- Suggested to include a clear link to SDG no.13, considering i) GHG emissions are part of Third BUR, and ii) the Macedonian Government regularly reports to UN on GHG emissions as part of SDG obligations.
- Suggested to consider additional efforts for inclusion of local authorities in the process and dissemination of the findings and recommendations from the analyses.
- Suggested to review and revise some of the indicators of the Project Results Framework in order to make them SMART.
- Suggested to review and change some of the budget accounts in order to fully comply with UNDP corporate policy, rules and regulations.

A detailed comments log is annexed to the minutes.


## 6. Final LPAC recommendation:

Based on the review of the project documents shared prior to the meeting, and in line with the Project QA Assessment Report, the LPAC members found the project of sufficient quality to continue as planned and recommend its approval. The comments raised by the LPAC members will be duly addressed in the project document prior to their final approval and signature.

Prepared by: Marijan Djima, Project Assistant, UNDP Energy and Environment Unit

Cleared by: Anita Kodzoman, Head of Unit, Energy and Environment

LPAC minutes are approved by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson of the meeting  
Narine Sahakyan  
Deputy Resident Representative

**Annex 1: Comment Log to the draft Project Document for the UNDP-GEF Project 4th National Communication and 3rd Biannual Update Report on Climate Change**

Comments from LPAC members	Response by Project Proposal Presenters
<p>1. Is there a link to SGDs? If so, it should be included in the report. (by <i>Narine Sahakyan</i>)</p>	<p>The report is directly contributing to the achievement of SDG 13 as the detailed GHG emissions reports are prepared within both Fourth National Communication and the Third Biennial Update Report on Climate Change, serving as main data source/indicator for SDG13. Reference to the SDG 13 shall be included in the Project Document.</p>
<p>2. What is the the level of implementation of the activities stipulated in the previous climate change reports? (by <i>Narine Sahakyan</i>)</p>	<p>Progress reviews/monitoring the level of implementation are part of each subsequent report. However, progress is difficult to monitor given that MOEPP doesn't collect data regularly or systematically, mostly because there is no legal obligation nor system set in place. However, the MOEPP is starting development of a new Strategy and Law on Climate Action that would include legal provisions creating an obligation for collecting data from all relevant national entities.</p>
<p>3. Do any municipalities report regularly on GHG emissions? Consequently, are there regional climate change relevant reports available? (by <i>Ilmiasan Dauti</i>)</p>	<p>Only 14 municipalities have prepared GHG inventories and climate change strategies. However, almost all of them are project based (haven't been updated since 2012) and therefore are outdated. Only the City of Skopje is regularly assigning their own funds for regular update of their GHG inventory and implementation of activities stipulated within their Resilient Skopje – Climate Change Strategy. Moreover, GHG has proven to be valuable tool for verification of GHG reduction (as signatory of the Covenant of Mayors) and for the level of success of relevant actions the City is implementing (such as increasing energy efficiency in buildings).</p>
<p>4. Consider putting more focus on municipal participation in project activities and enable more experienced municipalities to transfer their knowledge and experiences to other municipalities. (by <i>Ilmiasan Dauti</i>)</p>	<p>Agreed. This suggestion shall be further deliberated during the project implementation, and at this point does not require changes in the project document. Additional efforts shall be put on specific public awareness activities targeting local governments.</p>
<p>5. Review baseline and indicator relations. There seems to be specific occurrences where they have been swapped. (by <i>Emil Angelov</i>)</p>	<p>Agreed; will review and revise as needed.</p>
<p>6. Review budgetary allocation vis-à-vis UNDP corporate policy, rules and regulations, regarding (e.g. miscellaneous, travel):</p>	<p>Agreed. will review and revise as needed</p>
<p>a. <b>Miscellaneous</b> - must keep it at minimum, and only for expenses otherwise not specified. (by <i>Zoran Samardziev</i>)</p>	<p>a. Agreed.</p>

<p>b. <b>Audit:</b> As per UNDP requirements, at least 10,000\$ should be budgeted. <i>(by Zoran Samardziev, Narine Sahakyan)</i></p>	<p>b. Allocated funds of 5,000\$ in total shall remain to avoid having funds locked and unusable because it is assumed that the project will not be selected for an internal audit due to the total budget value. c. However, if the project is selected for an internal audit, additional amount shall be allocated through a budget revision.</p>
<p>c. <b>Travel costs for international consultants:</b> make sure they are budgeted <u>separately</u> from IC accounts, as IC amounts are further subject to 4.25% security charges. <i>(by Zoran Samardziev)</i></p>	<p>d. Agreed.</p>
<p>d. <b>Staff salary amounts;</b> make sure you budget relying on reference values from monthly pro-forma pay grade reference document. If budgeted less, mark position as "part-time" and replenish from other projects, as adequate. <i>(by Zoran Samardziev)</i></p>	<p>e. Agreed.</p>
<p>e. <b>International consultants;</b> fee estimate seems to low. <i>(by Zoran Samardziev)</i></p>	<p>f. Estimate is based on previous experience with international consultants.</p>
<p>f. <b>DPC;</b> needs to be clearly budgeted. <i>(by Zoran Samardziev, Narine Sahakyan)</i></p>	<p>g. DPC has been fixed on 10,000\$. This was agreed during the preparation of the PIF, it was as such approved by the GEF and could not be changed.</p>