



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

GEF ID:	<b>5638</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Albania</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Establishing Albania's Environmental Information Management and Monitoring System aligned with the global environmental reporting</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5308 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CD-2;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$30,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$970,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$5,250,500</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$6,250,500</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Tom Twining-Ward,</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes. Albania ratified the CBD on January 5, 1994, the UNFCCC on October 3, 1994 and the UNCCD on April 27, 2000.  Cleared 12/09/2013	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes. with letter dated June 17, 2013.  Cleared 12/04/2013	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A	

\*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>Yes. CCCD allocation.</p> <p>Cleared 12/09/2013</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	N/A	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>The project is aligned with the CCCD framework and strategic objectives.</p> <p>Cleared 12/09/2013</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>		
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>To some extent. What are the global environmental threats that afflict Albania and how will the project help to resolve them? In addition, what is the contribution of co-financing and of existing investment to the baseline? With little environmental data and indicators available, how will that baseline be</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>sufficiently robust so that the GEF increment can build upon it?.</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 12/09/2013</p> <p>Clarifications provided. Cleared 03/05/2014</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>Same comment as #6 applies here. The components, outputs and outcomes in Table B seem to refer to data and information needed for national purposes (domestic use).</p> <p>Please provide clarifications as to where the line between national information and that needed for global environmental conventions lies.</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 12/09/2013</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 03/05/2014</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>Not entirely. Once the baseline is reviewed, please revise the incremental reasoning and the GEB.</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 12/09/2013</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 03/05/2014</p>	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes. Cleared 12/09/2013	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes. Cleared 12/09/2013	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. Cleared 12/09/2013	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up are not clear,</p> <p>Please provide additional information. 12/09/2013</p> <p>Additional information provided. Cleared 03/05/2014</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Once Table B has been reviewed as requested above, please review the funding and co-financing.  12/09/2013  Reviewed. Cleared 03/05/2014	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	Yes. The Agency is bringing significant cash co-financing as so is the Ministry of Environment. Cleared 12/09/2013	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Yes. Cleared 12/09/2013	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Yes. PPG is within the norm.  Cleared 12/09/2013	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Not yet. Please address the questions posed above.  12/09/2013  Yes. The project is being technically cleared and recommended. 03/05/2014	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Coordination mechanism among experts (CBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD).	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	December 09, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 05, 2014	
	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.**

