



ADAPTATION FUND

Project Performance Report

Overview

Period of Report (Dates)	1/1/2023 - 12/31/2023
Project Title	Integrated climate-resilient transboundary flood risk management in the Drin River basin in the Western Balkans
Project Summary	<p>The Drin River Basin (DRB) is a transboundary river basin, which is home to 1.6 Million people and extends across Albania, Kosovo, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Greece. The DRB countries and entities (Riparians) are increasingly exposed to the impacts of climate change. Climate change and climate variability have been increasing the frequency, intensity and impact of flooding in the basin. The objective of the project is to assist the riparian countries in the implementation of an integrated climate-resilient river basin flood risk management approach in order to improve their existing capacity to manage flood risk at regional, national and local levels and to enhance resilience of vulnerable communities in the DRB to climate-induced floods. The countries will benefit from a basin-wide transboundary flood risk management (FRM) framework based on: improved climate risk knowledge and information; improved transboundary cooperation arrangements and policy framework for FRM and; concrete FRM interventions. As a result, the Adaptation Fund project will improve the resilience of 1.6 million people living in the DRB (direct and indirect beneficiaries).</p>
Database Number	AF00000126
Implementing Entity (IE)	UN Development Programme
Type of IE	Multilateral Implementing Entity
Country(ies)	Regional (Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia)
Relevant Geographic Points (i.e. cities, villages, bodies of water)	Drin/Drim River Basin in Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia
Name of Implementing Entity Focal Point	Ms. Clotilde Goeman (01-Jan to 30-Nov 2023) Nataly Olofinskaya (as of 01-December-2023-present) Ms. Gulsah Isik

Project Milestones

AFB Approval Date	3/15/2019
IE-AFB Agreement Signature Date	5/7/2019

Start of Project/Programme	10/22/2019
Actual Mid-term Review Date (if applicable)	8/22/2022
Original Completion Date	10/21/2024
Revised Completion Date after approval of extension request (if applicable)	10/22/2025

Were there any approval condition for this Project?

No

List each approval condition, if any, and report on the status of meeting them	
Category of condition	
Condition or Requirement	
Current Status	
Planned actions, including a detailed time schedule	

List (only) inception report/ extension request(s)/ MTR that have been prepared for the project and provide date(s) of submission for each

Inception Report with Annexes, submitted on 23 November 2020 Midterm Review (MTR) Report with Annexes, submitted on 31 January 2023 (in the same year as 3rd PPR as per Project Document)

List the Website address (URL) of project

<https://www.adaptation-undp.org/projects/integrated-climate-resilient-transboundary-flood-risk-management-drin-river-basin-western>

Project Contacts			
National/Regional Project Manager/Coordinator	Name	Email	Date
Executing Agency	Mr Stanislav Kim	stanislav.kim@undp.org	2/28/2024
Regional Project Manager	Mr Bojan Kovacevic (until 24-Nov-2023)	bojan.kovacevic@undp.org	7/8/2020
Government(s) DA	Ms Gerta Lubonja	gerta.lubonja@ambu.gov.al	11/27/2020
Government(s) DA	Mr Zeljko Furtula	zeljko.furtula@mpsv.gov.me	5/30/2019
Government(s) DA	Mr Ylber Mirta	ymirta@gmail.com	5/30/2019
Government(s) DA	Mr Arduen Karagjozi	arduen.karagjozi@ambu.gov.al	5/30/2019
Government(s) DA	Ms Ivana Stojanovic	ivana.stojanovic@mrt.gov.me	5/29/2019
Government(s) DA	Ms Ljupka Dimovska Zajkov	dljupka@gmail.com	5/29/2019
Regional Project Manager	Ms Odeta Cato (interim)	odeta.cato@undp.org	11/26/2023
Implementing Entity	Ms Nataly Olofinskaya	nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org	12/1/2023

Financial Data

Disbursement of AF grant funds	
Cumulative total disbursement from Trustee to IE as of date (\$)	\$9,011,537.00
Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs as of date (\$)	\$5,347,740.00
Project disbursement rate (%)	69.79

Project execution rate (%)	58.45
Add any comments on AF Grant Funds	Since the commencement of the project the total of US\$ 8,278,246 of the AF grant funds were received through first (US\$ 2,711,022.5), second (US\$ 1,902,912.5), third (US\$ 1,771,981) and fourth (US\$ 1,892,330.00) payment tranches. Project disbursement during the reporting period was US\$ 1,239,429.08 Given the cumulative total disbursement of US\$ 5,347,740, 64.59 % of the received funds (including 4th tranche) and 58.45 % of the entire budget (Project Document) have been disbursed by the end of the reporting period. The project aims to reach 70% of the received funds during the Q2 2024 and thus request the fifth and last payment tranche together with the submission of this PPR.
Investment Income (\$)	\$0.00
Cumulative Investment Income since inception (\$)	\$0.00

Expenditure Data	
Output	Amount (\$)
Output 1.1. Strengthened hydrometric monitoring networks in the riparian countries	\$48,888.06
Output 1.2. Improved knowledge of CC-induced flood risk and risk knowledge sharing through the introduction of river basin modelling tools 129,653.98and technologies for strategic flood risk assessment	\$129,653.98
Output 1.3. GIS-based vulnerability, loss and damages assessment tools and database	\$146,990.25
Output 2.1. Drin River Basin FRM Policy Framework and improved long-term cooperation on FRM	\$83,213.07
Output 2.2. Regional, national and sub-national institutions are trained in climate-resilient FRM, responsibilities clarified and coordination strengthened	\$69,619.26
Output 2.3. Drin River basin Integrated CCA and FRM Strategy and Plan developed	\$99,179.58
Output 3.1. Introduction of appraisal-led design for structural and non-structural measures	\$153,753.38
Output 3.2. Construction of structural risk reduction measures in prioritized areas	\$77,699.73
Output 3.3. Strengthened community resilience to flooding through the participatory design and implementation of non-structural resilience, adaptation and awareness measures	\$272,747.25
IE fee (\$)	\$96,509.00
Execution cost (\$)	\$157,684.52

Planned Expenditure Schedule		
Output	Projected Cost (\$)	Estimated Completion Date
Output 1.1. Strengthened hydrometric monitoring networks in the riparian countries	\$44,023.28	12/31/2024
Output 1.2. Improved knowledge of CC-induced flood risk and risk knowledge sharing through the introduction of river basin modelling tools and technologies for strategic flood risk assessment	\$259,986.29	12/31/2024
Output 1.3. GIS-based vulnerability, loss and damages assessment tools and database	\$98,905.35	12/31/2024
Output 2.1. Drin River Basin FRM Policy Framework and improved	\$265,463.64	12/31/2024

long-term cooperation on FRM		
Output 2.2. Regional, national and sub-national institutions are trained in climate-resilient FRM, responsibilities clarified and coordination strengthened	\$142,854.19	12/31/2024
Output 2.3. Drin River basin Integrated CCA and FRM Strategy and Plan developed	\$115,425.59	12/31/2024
Output 3.1. Introduction of appraisal-led design for structural and non-structural measures	\$316,031.77	12/31/2024
Output 3.2. Construction of structural risk reduction measures in prioritized areas	\$1,793,834.68	12/31/2024
Output 3.3. Strengthened community resilience to flooding through the participatory design and implementation of non-structural resilience, adaptation and awareness measures	\$238,641.49	12/31/2024
IE fee (\$)		\$44,459.00
Execution cost (\$)		\$175,179.28

Actual co-financing (if the MTR or TE have not been undertaken this reporting period, do not report on actual co-financing)	
Does this Project have Co-Financing ?	No
How much of the total co-financing as committed in the Project Document has actually been realized? (\$)	\$0.00
Estimated cumulative actual co-financing as verified during Mid-term Review (MTR) or Terminal Evaluation (TE). (\$)	\$0.00
Add any comments on actual co-financing in particular any issues related to the realization of in-kind, grant, credits, loans, equity, non-grant instruments and other types of co-financing.	

Risk Assessment

Identified Risks		
List all Risks identified in project preparation phase and what steps are being taken to mitigate them		
Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk
Government change and/or administrative reforms in the beneficiary countries result in changing priorities that are not fully aligned with the expected results of the project	Low	The project priorities, mainstreamed through the Drin Basin Strategic Action Programme, were reconfirmed during regular consultations with the national focal points (NFPs), as well governments-appointed representatives to the Drin Core Group (DCG)/ Regional Project Board at its session held on 27 June 2023. All relevant project deliverables were shared with the DCG and its subsidiary, Expert Working Group for Floods (EWGF), for endorsement, while major progress, challenges, budget revisions and updates to the Multi Year Work Plan (MYWP) were presented at the DCG sessions. DCG/RPB reports were signed and disseminated. Meetings and consultations were regularly carried out with the key implementing partners and national stakeholders, such as directors of National Water Agencies, National Hydrometeorological Services (NHMS) either virtually or in person. Project continued

		lobbying and advocating in support of CC adaptation, EWS and DRR at all aforementioned occasions.
Unexpectedly strong extreme climatic events threaten/destroy hydrometeorological and/or flood defense infrastructure	Moderate	The project has addressed Climate change (CC) aspects in the Optimized Drin River Basin hydrometric network plan Assessment, so that the new hydro-meteorological monitoring stations were procured and installed fully taking into account the disaster and climate risks, e.g. extreme weather proof locations were selected based on the climate-change responsive modeling for the newly installed hydrological and meteorological stations. Appraisal-led design of the project implemented structural flood defense measures was based on the climate-change responsive hydrological and hydraulic modeling using several climate scenarios and even higher number of flood return periods than the recommended by EU directives. Further, modelling was verified and calibrated using the acquired historical hydrometeorological data sets and, moreover, the digital satellite imagery to complement the historical data and cover the temporal and spatial gaps.
Absorption and operational capacities of national project beneficiaries stay inadequate to properly run and maintain modeling, forecasting and EWS	Moderate	All key national partnering and benefitting institutions have been needs-assessed, e.g. based upon the Assessment of the Hydro-Meteorological Monitoring Networks and the Institutional Assessment on the Operation and Maintenance of the Hydro-Meteorological Monitoring Networks, the Optimized Design of the Hydro-Meteorological Monitoring Networks was developed by the Key International Hydromet Network Expert, detailing manpower, financial requirements, and training needs, development of tailor-made trainings and manuals, etc. Thus, in addition to the strengthened hydrometeorological monitoring networks by procurement and installation of new monitoring stations, roadmap and foundations for capacity development of the National Hydrometeorological Services were laid down. Furthermore, under the Outcome 2, GWP-Med, as the Responsible Party, has completed an assessment and gap analysis of functional, resourcing, technical and financial capacity of regional, national and sub-national institutions, and developed a long-term Institutional capacity development plan addressing resourcing, technical, and financial needs in each Riparian and a training programme for climate risk management and flood risk management, which will be embedded in relevant national/regional institutions to improve the technical capacity and knowledge base for climate risk management and a long-term adaptation planning for flood risk management. The IE/PMU has continuous discussions with government partners in all riparians at the central and local level, to ensure commitment and funding for ongoing capacity development activities post-project, these are reflected in Steering Committee meetings, the Drin Core Group/Regional Project Board meetings, Technical Working Group on Floods, and the Joint Technical Group in the framework of the agreement between the Republic of Albania and Montenegro on Water Management of Common Interest. These engagements aim to ensure that the programs are sustained and integrated into future governmental budget planning. The project remains committed throughout its duration to advocate for the necessary resources to sustain and enhance our climate and flood risk management efforts. This, however, remains an active risk, depending on the government's commitment/ability to fund the programmed capacity development activities in the afterlife of the project.
Changes and turnover in government staff	Moderate	The Drin Core Group (DCG), though the custodian for Drin River Basin initiatives, lacks the authority of a permanent international body, a limitation highlighted in various reports. In order to further support and

		<p>sustain transboundary cooperation in the Drin River Basin, facilitate establishment of a coordination mechanism and implement the Drin River SAP, the 2d phase of the GEF-funded IW project has been developed and approved by the GEF “Implementing the Strategic Action Programme of the Drin Basin to strengthen transboundary cooperation and enable integrated natural resources management”. The project will be implemented by UNDP and GWP-Med. The GEF SAP implementation project will support above all the establishment of effective transboundary cooperation mechanisms among Drin Riparians. In addition to the transboundary cooperation mechanisms to be established, the project will enable the enhancement of long-term sustainability of achievements through the implementation of mechanisms for stakeholder’s participation, gender mainstreaming, dissemination, coordination and monitoring of progress and trends. The Drin Riparians requested the GEF project to: develop a Drin River Basin Management Plan, and initiate actions for the establishment of a sustainable joint coordination body in the form of the current institutional arrangement or an evolved one - a Drin Commission. It will also support the negotiation over the draft international agreement text by the Drin Riparians -that was developed through the foundational Drin project (2016-2021)- and its submission for signature and ratification to the relevant authorities of all the Drin Riparians, should negotiations be successful. Establishment of the legal joint management body (as a next step in enhancing cooperation and coordination on the basin level) was requested from the Drin riparians in 2019 by the decision of The Drin Core Group (DCG) that is mandated to coordinate actions for the implementation of the 2011 MoU for the Management of the Extended Transboundary Drin Basin,</p>
<p>Local communities are not interested to be engaged in community-based flood risk reduction measures and EWS</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>With the completion of the socio-economic Community Risk Prioritization Model (RPM) and development of the Flood Risk Maps, the Project has reached out to the most vulnerable communities and engaged them in implementation of community-based flood protection measures, both structural and non-structural. Some of the most vulnerable communities, such as municipalities of Ulcinj and Niksic in Montenegro, Shkoder and Lezhe in Albania and Ohrid, Struga and Debrca in North Macedonia have already been actively involved in the appraisal-led design of structural and non structural flood protection measures, some of which have already been completed. Both regional and national teams and key experts have regularly met with relevant community representatives throughout the reporting period, both in person or online. Furthermore, the project foresees continued implementation of several (non)structural measures in the communities at high flood-risk. The communities have expressed great interest in development of particular non-structural measures as a follow up on the flood risk maps, such as the municipal flood risk management plans that would include spatial zoning plans (Lezhe, Debrca, Ohrid, Struga). Also, the concerned communities earmarked funds from municipal budgets for operation and maintenance of the built flood protection structures, confirmed through the Letters of Commitments that the municipal mayors also discussed with the Mid-term Review Expert.</p>
<p>No finances are available for proper operation and maintenance of the upgraded</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>The assessment of the National Hydromet Services' (NHSs) institutional arrangements and capacity for the operation and maintenance (O&M) of the hydrometric network by the Key International Hydromet Network Expert has already identified lack of funds for proper O&M. As stated above, the Institutional capacity development plan for hydrometric</p>

hydrometeorological network, EWS and flood protection structures		network O&M was developed, detailing manpower, financial requirements, and training needs, development of tailor-made trainings and manuals, etc. The plan was presented to the Drin Core Group (DCG)/ Regional Project Board with an aim for the DCG members to advocate with their respective Governments on broadening the financial support to already underfunded national hydromet services. Certain trainings, such as those on hydraulic modeling, have been successfully delivered, not only to the representatives of public institutions, but also to academia, non-government sector, etc. However, as stated above, the DCG has no legal authority nor budgetary means to impose and follow up on actual recommendation in a way of implementing recommended measures, thus leaving this risk still valid. The set-up of a formal and permanent body under the GEF-funded project is expected to mitigate this risk. The proposed extension request will enable for the project to advocate for the introduction of the O&M of the equipment in discussions and to formalize the responsibility of the different stakeholders.
Failure to engage the private sector in financing mechanisms	Moderate	Basin-wide risk financing and risk transfer mechanisms strategy developed during the reporting period has pointed out the lack of robust collaboration with private sector on flood and recommended a few risk financing and risk transfer mechanisms, the practical applicability of which will further be assessed and verified through feasibility studies relying on detailed socio-economic risk, damages and losses assessment completed under the project Output 1.3. The Drin Basin Flood Risk Financing and Risk Transfer Strategy Report proposes twelve solutions aimed at facilitating critical reforms. Among these, we have prioritized two mechanisms—S1: Tax Benefits and S2: Linking Grants to Insurance— to support their further implementation by providing more information on the necessary actions and their associated impacts (legal, economic, and fiscal) in each of the Drin riparian settings. The two above-mentioned feasibility studies will commence within May 2024. In the meantime, the risk remains open.

Critical Risks Affecting Progress (Not identified at project design)

Are there any critical risks with a 50% or > likelihood of affecting progress of project? Yes

Identify Risks with a 50% or > likelihood of affecting progress of project

Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk
COVID-19 pandemic, the outbreak of which nearly coincided with the commencement of the project, extended well into 2021, thus negatively affecting timeliness of delivery of project outcomes.	Moderate	During 2020 and Q1 2021, the Project team switched to teleworking and telecommuting work modalities, which allowed for maintaining momentum over the activities that had already started and initiating the new ones. Majority of meetings moved onto on-line platforms thus enabling regular communication with internal and external stakeholders, vendors, etc. When conditions for safe travel having been met in the Q3&Q4 2021, the international key experts, PMU and national teams were deployed in the field to conduct assessments related to the Outcome 1. Project timeliness having been affected, the Multi Year Work Plan (MYWP) and budget were revised several times since inception and presented to the Drin Core Group/ Regional Project Board for endorsement/approval. Although project implementation significantly picked up in 2022 and 2023 and most activities were set back on track, for construction of structural flood

		protection measures in Albania under the Output 3.2, additional implementation time will be needed. Thus, the project will have to seek a no-cost extension in the length of one year. This measure has been assessed and recommended by the Mid-term Review Report and approved by the Drin Core Group/ Regional Project Board at its 25th session on 27 June 2024. The project will submit a timely request for the no-cost extension to the Adaptation Fund.
Inexistence of a permanent river basin coordinating body (e.g. river commission), that would take over from the Drin Core Group (entity based on an MoU signed a decade ago), and enforce outcomes of this project (but also other projects) on the authority stemming from an international legal framework agreement, threatens the outcomes sustainability.	Moderate	The project has communicated this risk externally through several reports, studies and events. Moreover, the project supported the development of a new GEF-funded project and is ready to assist building a river coordination body during its remaining lifetime, which overlaps with the start of the new project.

Risk Measures

Were there any risk mitigation measures employed during the current reporting period? If so, were risks reduced? If not, why were these risks not reduced?

As stated above, major risk mitigation measures employed during the current reporting period still followed the impacts caused by prolonged Covid-19 pandemic during the first two years of project implementation. These measures proved efficient as they help maintain momentum over the implementation of project activities and intensify implementation of activities between the pandemic peaks, especially in the Q3 and Q4 2021. The measures encompassed not just use of virtual management and meeting tools, but also activities such as the e-procurement, monitoring over the work of contractors by using real-time editing/reviewing software tools, e.g. on-line review of components of detail design and safeguards of structural flood protection measures, etc. The risk imposed by the pandemic having been reduced, the project implementation pace picked up in accordance to the revised Multi Year Work Plan and the revised budget.

ESP Compliance

Section 1: Identified ESP Risk Management

Was the ESP risks identification complete at the time of funding approval? No

1. Compliance with the law

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable	Yes

impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Poor maintenance of completed flood protection infrastructure by responsible authorities
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	1. Mitigation: Project to obtain commitment from the concerned municipalities to cover O&M costs of the built flood protection structures.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	No. of Commitment Letters for co-financing costs of O&M of constructed flood protection structures earmarked in the budget of the responsible municipalities
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Letter of Commitment to co-finance O&M of flood protection infrastructure on Sasteska River obtained from Debrca municipal authorities 2. There were no new commitment letters received in 2023 as the implementation of the preselected structural measure—reconstruction of the embankments along the Montenegro side of the Bojana/Buna River, and structural measures for the Albanian Drin River basin—is scheduled for execution in 2024.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No residual impact has been recorded by the project.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
2. Access and equity	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	

3. Marginalized and vulnerable Groups	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Fluctuating, albeit small population of marginalized Roma community may be excluded from fully participating in decisions that may affect their settlements with no fixed shelter or access to basic services in the flood-vulnerable areas of the DRB.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	<p>1. Avoidance of physical and economic resettlements</p> <p>2. Mitigation - in case of impacts on Roma settlements (or those of any other vulnerable group or beneficiary) that may lead to economic resettlement, stakeholders will have access to compensation</p> <p>3. Manage: stakeholders will be informed of the project-level Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), which will be advertised in the informal settlements</p> <p>4. Manage: Public insight into the design documents will be advertised and facilitated by designated authorities and overseen by project</p> <p>5. Manage: Following public insight into design documents, public debates will be announced in local and wider media and facilitated by authorities designated by law. Public debates' minutes will be publicized</p>
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	<p>1. No. of physical either voluntary or involuntary resettlement recorded</p> <p>2. a. Project Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) developed, approved by DCG/RPB and fully functional; b. number of grievances recorded and successfully resolved through GRM; c. number of public consultations/debates facilitated by designated municipal authorities; d. number of public insights into the design documentation, including ESIA, facilitated by designated authorities</p> <p>3. ESIA and public debates contained reference to GRM</p> <p>4. Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIA) developed with detailed design for each structural intervention, published in local media and posted on the local and national institutions web sites for public insight before public debates are held.</p> <p>5. Number of public debates conducted by designated public authority, recorded, and overseen by the project</p>
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. 0 2 a. 0 b. 0 c. 0 d. 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	<p>1. No physical resettlement measures were foreseen by the appraisal-led design of 2 preselected structural measures in N. Macedonia and Montenegro during the implementation period</p> <p>2. No economic resettlement measures were foreseen by the design of 2 structural flood protection measures</p> <p>3. Local</p>

	<p>authorities informed population in the concerned settlements on the availability of the project GRM - GRM was fully in place during the reporting period. No grievances were recorded 4. Public insight into Detailed design of Sateska riverbed relocation in the Municipality of Debrca in North Macedonia advertised and facilitated by designated authorities, in line with the law requirements, as evidenced by the media announcement 5. Public debate on the Detailed design of the Sateska River structural measure facilitated by designated municipal authorities, in line with the law requirements, as evidenced by the media announcement and the public debate minutes, attached to the design documentation</p>
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No residual impact has been recorded during the reporting period.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
4.Human rights	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
5.Gender equality and women's empowerment	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard	The direct environmental and social risks associated

<p>measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)</p>	<p>with capacity building or training activities are minimal although there is a risk of gender bias in training due to a lack of access, gender equity and women empowerment in training provided.</p>
<p>List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.</p>	<p>1. The project will use Gender Assessment and Action Plan (GAAP) prepared during the project development phase and regularly (at least annually) updated during the project implementation during as a tool to manage gender mainstreaming and mitigate related risks 2. Use the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) mechanism to capture any grievances and mitigate risks related to gender discrimination 3. The project will tailor all capacity building and training activities to include gender mainstreaming component</p>
<p>List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.</p>	<p>Project Objective-level indicators: 1- Women's representation (%) in consultation meetings on (i) hazard analysis, risk awareness and assessment and vulnerability/capacity analysis; (ii) developing the risk and hazard maps; and (iii) identification of indicators for assessing gender specific aspects of risk and vulnerability Target: At least 30% of women and members of vulnerable groups represented in consultation process and activities defined above 2- Percentage of females and those belonging to vulnerable groups participating in decision-making processes. Target: Women make at least 50% of members of coordination and decision-making bodies, such as the Regional Project Board, National Project Boards, etc. Component 1 - Flood hazard and risk knowledge management tools - level indicators 1- Representation of women and marginalized groups in survey sampling strategies Target: At least 30% of female and members of vulnerable groups targeted in all survey samples 2- Female representation in the Participatory Vulnerability Approach (PVA) tools Target: At least 30% of female persons among those contacted in the PVA 3- Awareness/perception of the climate change among women and vulnerable groups Target: At least 30% of women among those with satisfactory level of CC-related knowledge, based on meeting assessment requirements 4- GIS-based vulnerability assessment tools comply with EUFD standards for addressing GSI dimensions (receptors, exposure, infrastructure, etc.) 5- The recommended adaptation options consider the needs of women. Target: at least 30% of proposed adaptation options in the GSI report refer to women in particular Component 2 - Transboundary FRM institutional, legal and policy framework - level indicators 1. Basin-wide and sectoral FRM policies include actions to address gender equality and social inclusion. Target: All FRM policies distinguish women and vulnerable groups as separate beneficiaries 2. GSI indicators, distinguishing women</p>

	<p>as separate beneficiaries, developed for stakeholders' assessment Target: gender disaggregated data obtained at a stakeholder institution management level, general personnel level, gaps and capacity development needs identified 3. Institutional capacity development and training project(s) i) increase knowledge of and capacity to use GSI methods and tools, ii) are relevant to the geographic and/or functional mandates of different stakeholders. Target: 5 Institutional lesson learned reports and training material produced on gender responsive flood impact 4. Increased participation of women as well as men in institutional capacity development and training activities, particularly among practitioners and community participants. Target: Women make up at least 30% of trainees Component 3 - Community-based CC adaptation and FRM interventions - level indicators 1. Involvement of women in (i) community-based flood risk management procedures and activities for flood preparedness and response/contingency plans; (ii) the development of action plans for post flood recovery; (iii) the dissemination of information to the communities; (iv) all capacity development activities; and (iv) flood monitoring/warning activities Target: Provision and arrangement are made to ensure that min. 40% women are involved in the above activities 2. Level of awareness at the local community level of GSI dimensions of FRM and EWS including the needs, priorities and contributions of women and other social, particularly vulnerable groups Target: Increased level of knowledge as reported in the meeting satisfaction cards based on separate questions on GSI mainstreaming 3. Female involvement (%) in the identification, prioritization and design of community-level infrastructure (such as small embankments, drainage, flood barriers, etc.); and subsequent regular operations and maintenance. Target: At least 30% of women involved in the above activities 4. Female participation in all training in all training on flood risk assessment and analysis Target: At least 30% of female trainees in all training on flood risk assessment an analysis 5. Training activities contain separate syllabus on GSI dimensions of FRM and EWS Target: At least 20% of the training session is dedicated to GSI dimensions of FRM and EWS 6. Zero tolerance to violation of core labor standards by the selected contractors on implementation of structural measures</p>
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	n/a
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. GAAP updated and approved by the DCG/Regional Project Board during the reporting period 2. GRM fully operational - no grievances received during the reporting period 3. Trainings in

	advance climate risk management planning and flood prevention measures (covering hydraulic modelling) conducted in three riparian states (North Macedonia, Albania and Montenegro) during the reporting period were tailor-made to gender mainstreaming, thus resulting in 57% of women among the attendees, as evidenced by the trainings reports 4. The regional workshop taking place in Oct 2023, focused on a participatory review of the "Flood Risk Management Strategy and Plan for the Drin Basin," involving national stakeholders from the basin's riparian countries. The event featured active engagement and commentary on the report, with women comprising 44% of the attendees, as noted in the attendee list.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No residual impact has been registered during the reporting period
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
6. Core labour rights	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
7. Indigenous people	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard	

measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
8.Involuntary resettlement	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
9.Protection of natural habitats	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	1. Some particular infrastructure or structural measures for flood control, including ongoing

	<p>activities of dredging of riverbeds, or the creation of new channels as part of flood control measures may have serious ecological consequences (degradation of water quality, exacerbation of riverbed erosion processes, disturbance of fish spawning etc.) affecting critical habitats and offer only temporary solutions to ongoing erosion and siltation processes.</p> <p>2. Possibility of disturbance to critical habitats and/or sensitive environmental areas, as structural measures are proposed in proximity to important birding and spawning areas, including legally protected areas. Narrow focus on flood control may not integrate aspect of water management to account for water availability to wetlands.</p>
<p>List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.</p>	<p>1.1 Avoidance - As part of the project design, all proposed structural measures with significantly adverse environmental and social impacts were eliminated 1.2 All structural measures will be positioned in a way to avoid environmentally sensitive areas and all green infrastructures will use a diversity of native species for planting 1.3 An integrated landscape management approach will be emphasized for flood control without a narrow emphasis on structural measures that may decrease erosion in own areas while increasing erosion in another 2. Manage - Special attention will be given in the transboundary basin-wide hydrological modelling to understand and subsequently prioritize adequate hydrological flows to wetlands to maintain ecosystem functions</p>
<p>List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.</p>	<p>1.1 No structural interventions with adverse environmental and social impacts 1.2.a distance of river structures from the environmentally sensitive areas; b. no clearance of vegetation outside of the designated clearing boundaries (50m from both side of each bridge), c. no damage to native fauna as a result of clearing activities; d. no loss of important vegetation areas 2.1.a. Biodiversity assessment as an integral part of ESIA made for each structural measure, b. daily inspections of erosion by Contractor, drainage and sediment control measures as part of the Daily Check Procedure; and b. weekly site inspections on a or after rainfall events exceeding 20mm in a 24-hour period by Construction supervisor, c. number of eventual non-conformances to ESMP or any applicable Erosion and Sediment Management Plan</p>
<p>State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period</p>	<p>1.1 Environmental and social impacts having been re-assessed during the detailed designs of the two (2) pre-selected structural flood protection measures that were finalized during the reporting period (Relocation of the Sateska riverbed in North</p>

	Macedonia and Reconstruction of the embankments along the Montenegro side of Bojana/Buna River), no significant adverse impacts were identified. Project ESMP remains unchanged. 1.2 All structural measures were positioned away from the environmentally sensitive areas 1.3 Integrated landscape management approach has been applied during the design of the two structural measures in North Macedonia and Montenegro during the reporting period, thus decreasing erosion in the area of intervention and downstream 2. Project has maintained basin-wide focus on the flood risk management by, among other things, developing a general 1D hydraulic model for the entire Drin River Basin (using HEC-RAS software). That way basin-wide hydraulic flows have been synchronized with the ones identified through the more detailed hydraulic modelling of the prioritized high-risk flood areas.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No residual impact has been registered at this stage.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
10.Conservation of biological diversity	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Project interventions are also planned within or in proximity to sensitive wetland environment that act as important bird breeding grounds. If water requirements are not taken into considerations in modelling and integrated flood management measures, wetlands may not receive adequate water to fulfil ecosystems functions.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	1.1 Manage - All structural measures will be positioned in a way to avoid environmentally sensitive areas and all green infrastructures will use a diversity of native species for planting 1.2 Manage - all construction activities will be carried out with respect to national regulations, including Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) as required.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1.1.a Biodiversity assessment as an integral part of ESIA prepared for each structural measure, b. distance of river structures from the environmentally sensitive areas; b. no clearance of vegetation outside of the designated clearing boundaries, c. no damage to native fauna as a result of clearing activities; d. no loss of important vegetation areas

State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	n/a
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	To strengthen biodiversity conservation during the execution of the works, separate Biodiversity Impact Assessment with Mitigation Measures was commissioned to be prepared for Bojana/Buna River Embankments Reconstruction structural measure. The study was completed in September 2023 and posted for 30-days public disclosure, with ESIA and ESMP. Based on the findings of the Study, the ESIA and ESMP were complemented with specific biodiversity data on species, habitats and biodiversity values that have to be preserved during construction works. Overall biodiversity related risk was assessed as moderate, so number of mitigation measures were listed and incorporated in the Environmental and Social Management Plan, that will be part of the tender dossier for the contractor in 2024.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	n/a
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
11. Climate change	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Most of the existing structural measures do not account for future projections of floods, exacerbated by climate change.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	1. Avoid - The project activities represent a paradigm shift in flood control planning by introducing the appraisal-led design for structural and non-structural measures using climate risk information (among other criteria) for detailed design
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	n/a
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	n/a
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Flood Risk Maps developed by the prioritized flood risk areas of the Drin River Basin, have taken into account future projections of floods affected by different climate changes scenarios within various flood return periods. Maps are based on the basin-wide hydrological model developed as part of the project (in HEC-HMS software), while successfully addressing the temporal and spatial intermittency in the obtained hydromet data series, which limited data quality for assessment and modelling purposes, by using satellite imagery that provides for the climate

	parameters assessment for creating virtual rain/snow gauges over the DRB at various time steps and preparing long time series with enough data to be processed and calculate both statistical rainfall values at virtual gauges and variograms related to rain heterogeneity, depending on the altitude and the distance to the sea. Rainfall values of recent flood events gathered this way were used for validation of hydrological and hydraulic models. Climate risk information obtained this way was used during the appraisal-led design of structural flood protection measures.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No residual risks were registered during this stage.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
12.Pollution prevention and resource efficiency	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	During the construction of the structural interventions, it may be necessary to undertake small scale earth works to redesign river course and remove sediment within the water course. There is the potential for the release of chemicals, nutrients, heavy metals and other material from the sediment and for these to enter waterways and groundwater systems during the works.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	1. Manage - water quality monitoring plan will be developed to ensure chemicals are not released. This will involve testing sediment prior to movement and planning so that the works are not undertaken during rain events 2. Mitigate - where rainfall is anticipated, appropriate material should be placed under the sediment prior to excavation to ensure there is no seepage into groundwater systems 3. Mitigate - water quality monitoring for the sources will be designed to identify potential impacts so that management measures can be proactively rather than reactively enacted upon
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1.a. Water quality monitoring plan in place; 2. number and type of interventions on protection of water from seepage recorded in the daily construction log 3.a. before the start of the works, contractor to hire an accredited laboratory to record the baseline quality of the river; b.twice a year during the construction phase quality of the river water measured
State the baseline condition for each monitoring	n/a

indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Water Quality Monitoring Plan was developed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment, and implemented during the execution of works on the preselected structural measure on relocation of the Sateska riverbed in North Macedonia. No release of harmful substances was registered during the plan monitoring activities. 2. During the civil works on the aforementioned structural measure on relocation of the Sateska riverbed, appropriate designed geotextiles were used as anti-seepage measures during the excavation works. No seepage incidents were recorded. 3. Water quality monitoring measures were developed during the detailed design and implemented during the works execution. No deterioration of water quality was recorded during the implementation of works.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No residual risks were registered during this stage.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
13.Public health	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
14.Physical and cultural heritage	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require	

management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
15.Lands and soil conservation	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	1. Likelihood of sediment movement during the construction activities 2 Accelerated erosion by increasing the speed and volume of channel flow and influence river hydraulics in unpredictable and ways, including the increase of bank erosion.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	1.1 Manage - Prepare an Erosion, Drainage and Sediment Control Plan (EDSCP) and 1.2 Mitigate - Install silt curtains to restrict sediment movement from the site and covering of sediment where practicable 2.1 Avoid significantly altering flow regimes in ways that prevent water resources from fulfilling their functions for upstream and downstream ecosystems and their services to local communities. This will be achieved by detailed hydraulic modeling of the areas of intervention 2.2 Manage - achieve natural hazard mitigation (e.g. flood prevention, peak flow reduction, soil erosion and landslide control) through detail designs of small-scale structural measures
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. EDSCP in place for each executed structural measure
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	n/a
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1.1 EDSCP in place during the execution of works on the preselected structural measure on relocation of

	the Sateska riverbed in North Macedonia 1.2 There was no need for installation of the silt curtain in the Sateska riverbed since the civil works were conducted in the old, dry riverbed, which was prepared for the river diversion 2.1 Flow regime was established following detailed hydraulic modelling of the Sateska river 2.2 Natural hazards mitigation achieved through proper detailed design of structural measures
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No residual risks identified during this stage
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a

Section 2: Monitoring for unanticipated impacts / corrective actions required

Has monitoring for unanticipated ESP risks been carried out?	Yes
Have unanticipated ESP risks been identified during the reporting period?	No
If unanticipated ESP risks have been identified, describe the safeguard measures that have been taken in response and how an ESMP has been prepared/updated	

Section 3: Categorisation

Is the categorisation according to ESP standards still relevant?	Yes
If No, please describe the changes made at activity, output or outcome level, approved by the Board, that resulted in this change of categorization.	

Section 4: Implementation arrangements

What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?	(i) As per the ESP Principle 5 (Gender), the GAAP has been updated by the Gender Expert (GE), engaged by the GWP as Responsible Party. (ii) As per the ESP Principles 1, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 15 against which potential negative impacts were identified in relation with the structural flood protection measures, according to both the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (SES) principles and the AF Environmental and Social Policy (ESP, Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) that foresaw adequate ESP safeguard measures were developed. (iii) The designated ESP safeguard measures for the Rehabilitation of the Sateska Riverbed in North Macedonia were fully implemented during the construction process. Implementation of ESP safeguard measures was supervised and signed off by a safeguard specialist supervising engineer, member of an independent construction team.
---	--

Have the implementation arrangements been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?	N/A - UNDP performed both IE and EE roles.
Have the implementation arrangements at the EEs been effective during the reporting period?	No

Section 5: Projects/programmes with unidentified sub-projects (USPs). This section needs to be completed only if the project/proramme includes USPs.

Have the arrangements for the process described in the ESMP for ESP compliance for USPs been put in place?	Yes
Is the required capacity for ESMP implementation present and effective with the IE and the EE(s)? Please provide details.	Yes
Have all roles and responsibilities adequately been assigned and positions filled?	Yes
Has the overall ESMP been updated with the findings of the USPs that have been identified in this reporting period?	No

Identified USPs in the reporting period	Application of ESMP to the USP	ESP risks identified for the USP	Has an impact assessment been carried out?	Consultation held for risks and impacts identification for USP	Gender disaggregation to identify risks and impacts	Safeguard measures identified for the USP	Monitoring indicator(s) for each impact
N/A							

Section 6: Grievances

Was a grievance mechanism established capable and known to stakeholders to accept grievances and complaints related to environmental and social risks and impacts?	Yes
Were grievances received during the reporting period?	Yes

List all grievances received during the reporting period regarding environmental and social impacts; gender related matters; or any other matter of project/programme activities	For each grievance, provide information on the grievance redress process	Provide the status/outcome
A grievance has been filed by SOS Ohrid NGO on	The decision letter from the UNDP Administrator on the SECU case is approved and posted on the SECU website (https://secu.info.undp.org/case-file/secu0021). In response to the Administrator's decision, UNDP North Macedonia prepared a	Resolved

<p>environmental impact of the preselected Sateska River structural flood protection measure, directly to the UNDP HQ Social and Environmental Compliant Unit (SECU).</p>	<p>Management Response that includes key actions and timelines to address the SECU recommendations based on the decision letter from the UNDP Administrator (https://secu.info.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke461/files/2024-11/Final%20Management%20response%20to%20SECU%20reccomendations.pdf). The actions include commissioning a biodiversity study within the project timeframe, providing legal support for agreements on the diversion's maintenance within the project time-frame, and ensuring any future projects comply with national laws and UNDP standards. Implementation of the recommended actions have started.</p>
---	---

Comments

Section 5: * Is the required capacity for ESMP implementation present and effective with the IE and the EE(s)? Please provide details. * Have all roles and responsibilities adequately been assigned and positions filled? "Project has not physically executed any USP so far. For one USP - Reconstruction of bridges and regulation of riverbed in the downstream Gračanica River in Montenegro - detailed design and ESIA only have been delivered, as reported in the 2nd PPR. Nevertheless, the required capacity for ESMP implementation has proved effective with adequate roles and responsibilities having been assigned to the members of the Project Implementation Unit (PIU): Regional Project Manager (RPM) and Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), both civil engineers with experience in managing FRM projects, together with National Coordinators and the Hydrotechnical Engineers monitoring the design of the pre-selected structural measures in Montenegro and North Macedonia, including development of the Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIA), in line with both UNDP Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) and the 15 AF E&S principles and national E&S legislation requirements. The developed detailed design and E&S safeguards were reviewed by an independently commissioned third party design review team that included certified E&S safeguards specialist, before relevant construction permits were granted. Project Quality Assurance (QA) role is performed by the UNDP IRH QA Unit, Regional Programme Manger, Chief Technical Advisor, Hydrotechnical Engineer and E&S Safeguards Specialist, and the NCE Regional Technical Advisor (RTA). As identified under the Project's Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), Annex 6 to the Project Document, the project initiated the Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) processes: (i) detailed screening/identification of risks and applicable principles (UNDP S&E screening from Annex 6 was updated and a screening against AF 15 principles was conducted in line with the AF Guidance for IE on compliance with the AF ESP) for each structural measure (ii) Impact assessment (scope of ESIA was determined based upon the results of risk screening for specific site-based measures and ESIA developed accordingly) and site-specific ESMPs were developed (iii) monitoring over the implemented construction works and designed safeguards was ensured on site by an independently commissioned supervisory team that included a certified safeguard specialist, UNDP civil engineer, national project coordinator and PIU."

GP Compliance

Section 1: Quality at entry

Was an initial gender assessment conducted during the preparation of the project/programme's first submission as a full proposal? Yes

Does the results framework include gender-responsive indicators broken down at the different levels (objective, outcome, output)? Yes

List the gender-responsive elements that were incorporated in the project/programme results framework

Gender-responsive element	Level	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Rated result for the reporting period
To assist the riparian countries in the implementation of an integrated climate-resilient river basin flood risk management approach in order to improve their existing capacity to manage flood risk at regional, national and local levels and to enhance resilience of vulnerable communities in the DRB to climate-induced floods	Objective	Total Number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (disaggregated by sex) with reduced vulnerability to flood risks	0	Direct beneficiaries: 190,000 people (50.6% are women) / 12% of the DRB population	Good
Improved climate and risk informed decision-making, availability and use of climate risk information	Outcome	Level of implementation of the systematic gender-responsive socio-economic vulnerability assessment in the DRB	0	At least 30% participants of consultations are women	Good
Improved institutional arrangements, legislative and policy framework for climate-resilient FRM, and development of CCA and FRM strategy and plans at the basin, sub-basin, national and sub-national levels	Outcome	Number of staff from targeted institutions trained to respond to impacts of climate-related events	0	At least 50 officials and other key national/regional stakeholders trained on improving the enabling environment (minimum 30% women)	Good

Section 2: Quality during implementation and at exit

List gender equality and women's empowerment issues encountered during implementation of the project/programme. For each gender equality and women's empowerment issue describe the progress

that was made as well as the results.

Gender equality and women's empowerment issues	Rated result for the reporting period	Provide justification of the rating provided
No gender equality and women's empowerment issues were encountered during the reporting period.		n/a

Section 3: Implementation arrangements

<p>What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP</p>	<p>(i) Gender competencies of each project team member have been assessed and knowledge improved through UNDP's mandatory training courses, e.g: The Gender Journey: Thinking outside the box, UN Course on Prevention of Harassment, Sexual Harassment and Abuse of Authority, Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse of the Local Population and UN Human Rights and Responsibilities (ii) Gender competencies were mainstramed through all ToRs whether those be for recruitment of the team members or external individual or company consultancies accross all project components (iii) The Gender Expert prepared the Drin River Basin Social and Gender Vulnerability Report, that analyzes the progress made in implementing GAP and highlights the accomplishments, findings, and challenges. It also provides recommendations to be considered during the upcoming implementation period of the project. The report was peer reviewed by the project staff, as well as the Gender Focal Points from the participating UNDP Country Offices in Montenegro, Albania and North Macedonia. (iv) Gender responsiveness of the poject budget was assessed during the budger revision process, confirming that project activities were adequately funded to address both men's and women's differentiated adaptation needs. (v) The activity of the socio-economic and flood marks data collection (groundtruthing) in the flood affected areas treated gender disaggregated data wherever possible. (vi) Thus, the delivered flood risk maps for the targeted communities at flood risk are gender sensitive. (vii) Adaptation planning through development of community Flood Risk Management Plans is fully gender responsive. (viii) Trainings delivered by the project were tailored in a way to ensure at minimum 50% of women among the participants (ix) Finally, the AF Principle 5 - gender equality and women's empowerment has been reviewed against during the social and environmental screening and development of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) for each of the structural or non-structural measures implemented.</p>
<p>Have the implementation arrangements at the IE been effective during the reporting period?</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP?</p>	<p>Project has been marked as GEN 2 gender project, meaning that gender equality is significant project objective. In line with the Gender Action Plan, initially developed as part of the Project Document and annually updated, the project has completed the following GP safeguard measures during the reporting period: Outcome 1: 1. Ensuring that knowledge tools and products prepared on flood risk hazard management are inclusive and informative of vulnerable communities and gender at all levels 2. Socio-economic surveys aiming to understand the differences in perceptions, impact, and access of information on climate and flood risk management amongst women, men and vulnerable groups 3. Mainstreaming gender and social inclusion (GSI) into socio-economic and Vulnerability Assessments of CC-induced flood risks to i) identify relevant GSI dimensions of existing vulnerability, e.g., damages/losses, perceptions of climate change, existing adaptation strategies, coping capacities, etc. and ii) define gender-responsive and socially inclusive adaptation options to reduce vulnerability. Outcome 2: 1. Developing ToRs and/or guidelines to address GSI dimensions as integral parts of the review and development of basin wide FRM policy framework and policies for priority sectors. 2. Develop ToR and/or guidelines to address GSI dimensions in assessments of the institutional capacity of all stakeholders, not just women's organizations, including mandates (policies, governance, procedures, etc.), resources (personnel, budget, etc.), capacity development needs (staff recruitment, training etc.) 3. Review and, as relevant, revise ToR for the Drin EWG Floods to strengthen its capacity to address GSI dimensions.</p>
<p>Have the implementation arrangements at the EE(s) been effective during the reporting period?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Have any capacity gaps affecting GP compliance been identified during the reporting period and if so, what remediation was implemented?</p>	<p>No</p>

Section 4: Grievances

<p>Was a grievance mechanism established capable and known to stakeholders to accept grievances and complaints related to gender equality and women's empowerment?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Were grievances received during the reporting period?</p>	<p>No</p>

<p>List all grievances received through the grievance mechanism during the reporting period regarding gender-related matters of project/programme activities [6]</p>	<p>For each grievance, provide information on the grievance redress process used</p>	<p>Provide the status/outcome used</p>
--	--	--

Comments

Rating

Implementing Entity				
Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating
Output 1.1 – Strengthened hydrometric monitoring networks in the riparian countries based on a unified optimized basin-scale assessment of monitoring needs	Outcome 2	"a) Detailed review of the existing coverage, physical condition and data collection procedure including the quality of data. Collect data from the relevant Riparian Institutions to get the current station coverage, equipment installed, data period and data collection procedure. b) Undertake an assessment of the monitoring network requirements for effective monitoring for strategic flood risk management, flood forecasting and early warning in the future and optimize the stations coverage. c) Undertake an assessment of the existing telecommunications infrastructure to support the telemetered and automated stations. d) Digitize all relevant historical paper format data for DRB and systematize and store within the hydrometric database. Establish guidelines, procedures, data sharing protocols and user’s manuals for the new hydrometric database. e) Assess the institutional arrangements and capacity for the operation and maintenance of the hydrometric network and develop Institutional capacity development plan for hydrometric network O&M detailing manpower and financial requirements, and training needs, for the efficient O&M of all the stations in each Riparian country. Assess existing roles and responsibilities and the capacity of staff responsible for operating and maintaining the hydrometric network. Assess the existing protocols for the collection, transmission, sharing, storage, management and use of the observed data. f) Establish mechanisms for population and maintenance of centralized basin hydrometric database g) Prepare an operational plan for the hydrometric network including transmission of data, data management, data analysis and reporting procedures. The maintenance plan will cover manpower, technical capacity, material and	Completed	Highly Satisfactory

		<p>finance requirements. h) Provide detailed specification and design including costs of all equipment and each component of the hydrometric network specified including the detailed design and bid document for the stations for future rehabilitation / new installation. i) Provide technical and financial assistance to improve hydrometric monitoring network (undertake procurement and installation of equipment). j) Review existing financing of hydrometric network O&M in each riparian country. Identify resourcing, and training needs as well as institutional arrangements for the management of the proposed new hydrometric network. k) Develop and implement O&M financing mechanisms for the hydrometric network."</p>		
<p>Output 1.2 - Improved knowledge of climate change induced flood risk, and risk knowledge sharing through the introduction of modelling tools and technologies for the strategic flood risk assessment based on EUFD and development of basin flood hazard maps</p>	<p>Outcome 8</p>	<p>a) Establish Spatial Data Initiative and data management system for project b) Undertake detailed topographic surveys of the river channel through high risk areas including all major infrastructure across the river (e.g. bridges, dams etc.) and along river banks (e.g. flood walls, levees etc.) for the Crn Drim in Macedonia. c) Acquire/purchase/commission high resolution topographic data for the floodplain areas through high risk areas of the Crn Drim in Macedonia. Aerial photographs or LiDAR sources would be recommended in order to obtain a high-resolution DEM covering the whole basin. Coarser DEM and topographic data will be used for the rest of the basin for basin wide modelling d) Using the most appropriate modelling techniques, establish numerical high-level basin wider hydrological and hydraulic models of the DRB. Undertake detailed hydrological and hydraulic modelling for the Crn Drim in Macedonia in line with EUFD and produce high resolution flood hazard inundation maps suitable for use in land use planning, development zoning, flood risk mitigation design, establishment of flood insurance criteria, raising public awareness, and emergency planning for the Crn Drim in Macedonia. Maps will be produced for a number of different return periods and for a range of climate change scenarios. Flood modelling and mapping will cover all relevant flooding mechanisms within the basin. e) Integrate detailed hydrological and hydraulic modelling for other Areas for further assessment (AFAs) being modelled by GIZ and riparian governments into the high-level river basin model, as and when they become</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Highly Satisfactory</p>

		available f) Undertake capacity assessment of relevant institutions for flood risk assessment and modelling and develop a long-term capacity development plan and training needs."		
Output 1.3 - GIS-based vulnerability, loss and damages assessment tool and database established to record, analyze, predict and assess flood events and associated losses	Outcome 8	"a) Develop and codify methods and tools for undertaking socio-economic surveys to collect necessary information to fully map the socio-economic conditions of within the basin. b) Undertake socio-economic and vulnerability assessment to fully map existing vulnerability within the DRB, in order to identify the most appropriate adaptation options to reduce vulnerability within the s basin. c) Develop a GIS-based flood risk model which integrates various spatial socio-economic data with the flood hazard maps, calculates flood risk, performs vulnerability assessment, produce vulnerability maps which will include damages and loss of life estimates and to test flood management options. d) Implement the DisInventar database in Riparian countries for the systematic recording of damage and loss. e) Develop harmonized methods, guidelines and procedures in line with Sendai Framework, for recording flood events, undertaking post-event surveys and assessing vulnerability to flooding as well as assessing the effectiveness of flood mitigation measures in reducing vulnerability and damages. f) Undertake cost-benefit options analysis using the vulnerability loss and damages model to identify options that maximize benefits as the basis for the development of the Integrated FRM strategy and plan for the basin"	Completed	Highly Satisfactory
Output 2.1 – Drin River Basin FRM Policy Framework and improved long-term cooperation on flood risk management	Outcome 7	a) Review existing FM policy and enabling environments in each riparian country and develop basin FRM policies for the implementation of FRM legislative and policy framework in line with relevant EU directives. b) Development of risk financing and risk transfer mechanisms strategy to include private sector engagement strategy for long-term implementation of risk financing and risk transfer mechanisms for national-level flood risk financing and resilience strategy. Also, to include identification or public-sector risk financing mechanisms for flood risk management. Risk financing and transfer mechanisms products and tools will be identified (if existing) and/or developed based on detailed socio-economic risk, damages and losses assessment (to be undertaken in Output 1.3). The project will undertake feasibility studies for the identified and shortlisted risk	Ontrack	Marginally Satisfactory

		<p>financing mechanisms. c) Sector FRM policies (at least 2 – energy, agriculture) - Undertake detailed technical studies (including modelling) on climate change impacts on the identified sectors (energy and agriculture) in the DRB. Consult with national sector leaders and relevant stakeholders on findings of study and invite comments on recommendations through the floods working group. Develop and codify detailed methodologies for incorporating climate-change responsive flood risk considerations into risk assessments, strategies, policies and plans for the energy and agriculture sectors. Develop and finalize robust sector FRM policies and any necessary enabling guidelines and/or tools for effective implementation of new policies.</p>		
<p>Output 2.2 – Regional, national and sub-national institutions (including meteorological and hydrological sectors) are trained in flood risk management, roles and responsibilities clarified and coordination mechanisms strengthened for effective climate-resilient FRM</p>	Outcome 2	<p>"a) Institutional mapping to identify the current relevant national and sub-national government departments with functions in flood risk management in each Riparian country. b) Institutional capacity assessment and gap analysis to include functional, resourcing, technical and financial capacity assessment. Development of long-term Institutional capacity development plan addressing resourcing, technical, and financial needs in each Riparian. Develop training programme for climate risk management and flood risk management and embed in relevant national/regional institutions to improve the technical capacity and knowledge base for climate risk management and a long-term adaptation planning for flood risk management. c) The ToR of the Drin EWG Floods will be revisited in terms of mandate, membership, resource requirements, technical capacity and technical enabling environment; data sharing and data access and technical means and tools for coordination. In consultation with riparian countries and the DCG a strategy and a five-year work program of the Drin EWG Floods will be developed and implemented. d) Deliver prioritized training to practitioners, decision-makers and communities e) The project's Knowledge Management strategy will be embedded under this Output (along with Output 3.3) and the KM tools and strategies will be developed and applied to fully embed capacity development in key institutions. "</p>	Completed	Satisfactory
<p>Output 2.3 – Drin River Basin Integrated CCA and FRM Strategy and</p>	Outcome 7	<p>Development of an integrated basin flood risk management plan for the DRB with participation of all relevant stakeholders. The</p>	Ontrack	Satisfactory

Plan Developed		plan will take a bottom-up, multi-stakeholder, consensus-based approach. This activity will be mainstreamed into the national on-going work on the development of the river basin management plans through the relevant national authorities. From the basin plan, and sub-national plans will be developed.		
Output 3.1 – Introduction of appraisal-led design for structural and non-structural measures using climate risk information and cost-benefit appraisal methods and application of methods to the detailed design of prioritized structural and non-structural measures for three riparian countries	Outcome 4	"a) Undertake optioneering for long-term FRM measures for DRB including feasibility, outline design and indicative costing. b) Undertake detailed design for structural measures to be implemented by the project. The project will undertake detailed design for implementation of structural options identified as priority measures during project development. The measures to be implemented are described under Output 3.2 and described in more detail in Annex 5. "	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Output 3.2 – Construction of structural risk reduction measures in prioritized areas	Outcome 1	During proposal development Riparian countries provided structural measures that have already been prioritised for implementation. The Adaptation Fund (AF) project will undertake the detailed design of these structures during project implementation (Output 3.1) and take account of the full river basin impact of the intervention measures. It will undertake detailed climate-risk based assessment (using models and methods developed in output 1 of the project) to appraise all options and develop the detailed design of the proposed interventions.	Delayed	Marginally Satisfactory
Output 3.3 - Strengthened local community resilience to flooding through the participatory design and implementation of non-structural community-based resilience, adaptation and awareness measures	Outcome 1	In order to ensure participatory and long-term sustainable community resilience the project will provide training to selected municipalities/communities on maintenance of non-structural intervention measures. Some non-structural measures have already been identified as part of the structural measures (e.g. for Macedonia), but it is envisaged that, during the development of the basin FRM strategy, additional non-structural measures will be identified	Ontrack	Satisfactory

Please provide the Name and Contact information of the person(s) responsible for completing the Rating section

Name	Email
Nataly Olofinskaya, Programme and Policy Specialist	nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org

Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it

started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps.

Even though the project team is spread across countries in the region, and travel were limited due to COVID-19, the project manager has been able to build a collaborative team, with regular discussions and informal communication between members, ensuring lessons learned are shared and colleagues work together to achieve project results and resolve challenges. The Project Manager, with strong technical support from the CTA have also been able to provide important feedbacks on some of the project reports to improve the quality and/or increase its relevance and scope (technical and geographical). There has been a strong demonstration of adaptive management from the team. In terms of project results, the rating can be considered "satisfactory", with a significant acceleration in project implementation over the last year of implementation, owing in part to the lifting of COVID-19 restrictions. With outputs of the completed component 1 used as foundation, and the above-mentioned support of the CTA and RPM, in line with the recommendations by the Mid-term Review (MTR) Report, the implementation of component 2, for which GWP-Med is responsible, has picked up with Output 2.2 being reached and the other ones on the way. Earlier delays in the implementation of component 2 activities have been mitigated largely through implementation of the MTR Management Response Plan, jointly by UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub, CDT Lead, Technical Advisor and Project Management Unit. Under component 3, safeguards and other preparatory work was conducted with complete infrastructures already installed in North Macedonia. The early conduct of these activities will give the opportunity for the team to take appropriate measures for operations and maintenance. With the lifting of COVID-19 restrictions, the Drin Core Group (DCG) meetings resumed in person, enhancing team interaction. Necessary meetings with national counterparts took place accordingly. In October 2023, alongside the basin-wide workshop that was held to present the Integrated Flood Risk Management Strategy, a team meeting took place to review the project's progress and challenges, discuss the need to extend the project to complete structural measures, and plan for 2024. Following recommendations by the Mid-Term review (MTR), the Drin Core Group (DCG) unanimously recommended no-cost extension, which should be used for successful completion of the Output 3.2 - construction of the structural flood protection measures. One of the main risk identified for this project is the absence of an authority for the Drin River Basin. This puts at risk the sustainability of the project, negatively impacting the potential for knowledge retention and the sharing of practices beyond the project. GWP-Med, as the secretariat for the DCG can play this role to an extent. It is however hoped that an authority will be set-up in the coming years, with GWP-Med's support. In the meantime, as mentioned above, the project team will need to carry out important advocacy activities at the national level to ensure project sustainability and the engagement of project partners.

Executing Entity / Project Coordinator

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating
Output 1.1 – Strengthened hydrometric monitoring networks in the riparian countries based on a unified optimized basin-scale assessment of monitoring needs	Outcome 2	"a) Detailed review of the existing coverage, physical condition and data collection procedure including the quality of data. Collect data from the relevant Riparian Institutions to get the current station coverage, equipment installed, data period and data collection procedure. b) Undertake an assessment of the monitoring network requirements for effective monitoring for strategic flood risk management, flood forecasting and early warning in the future and optimize the stations coverage. c) Undertake an assessment of the existing telecommunications infrastructure to support the telemetered and automated stations. d)	Completed	Highly Satisfactory

		<p>Digitize all relevant historical paper format data for DRB and systematize and store within the hydrometric database. Establish guidelines, procedures, data sharing protocols and user's manuals for the new hydrometric database. e) Assess the institutional arrangements and capacity for the operation and maintenance of the hydrometric network and develop Institutional capacity development plan for hydrometric network O&M detailing manpower and financial requirements, and training needs, for the efficient O&M of all the stations in each Riparian country. Assess existing roles and responsibilities and the capacity of staff responsible for operating and maintaining the hydrometric network. Assess the existing protocols for the collection, transmission, sharing, storage, management and use of the observed data. f) Establish mechanisms for population and maintenance of centralized basin hydrometric database g) Prepare an operational plan for the hydrometric network including transmission of data, data management, data analysis and reporting procedures. The maintenance plan will cover manpower, technical capacity, material and finance requirements. h) Provide detailed specification and design including costs of all equipment and each component of the hydrometric network specified including the detailed design and bid document for the stations for future rehabilitation / new installation. i) Provide technical and financial assistance to improve hydrometric monitoring network (undertake procurement and installation of equipment). j) Review existing financing of hydrometric network O&M in each riparian country. Identify resourcing, and training needs as well as institutional arrangements for the management of the proposed new hydrometric network. k) Develop and implement O&M financing mechanisms for the hydrometric network."</p>		
<p>Output 1.2 - Improved knowledge of climate change induced flood risk, and risk knowledge sharing through the introduction of modelling tools and technologies for the strategic flood risk assessment based on EUFD and development</p>	<p>Outcome 8</p>	<p>"a) Establish Spatial Data Initiative and data management system for project b) Undertake detailed topographic surveys of the river channel through high risk areas including all major infrastructure across the river (e.g. bridges, dams etc.) and along river banks (e.g. flood walls, levees etc.) for the Crn Drim in Macedonia. c) Acquire/purchase/commission high resolution topographic data for the floodplain areas through high risk areas of the Crn Drim in Macedonia. Aerial photographs</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Highly Satisfactory</p>

<p>of basin flood hazard maps</p>		<p>or LiDAR sources would be recommended in order to obtain a high-resolution DEM covering the whole basin. Coarser DEM and topographic data will be used for the rest of the basin for basin wide modelling d) Using the most appropriate modelling techniques, establish numerical high-level basin wider hydrological and hydraulic models of the DRB. Undertake detailed hydrological and hydraulic modelling for the Crn Drim in Macedonia in line with EUFD and produce high resolution flood hazard inundation maps suitable for use in land use planning, development zoning, flood risk mitigation design, establishment of flood insurance criteria, raising public awareness, and emergency planning for the Crn Drim in Macedonia. Maps will be produced for a number of different return periods and for a range of climate change scenarios. Flood modelling and mapping will cover all relevant flooding mechanisms within the basin. e) Integrate detailed hydrological and hydraulic modelling for other Areas for further assessment (AFAs) being modelled by GIZ and riparian governments into the high-level river basin model, as and when they become available f) Undertake capacity assessment of relevant institutions for flood risk assessment and modelling and develop a long-term capacity development plan and training needs."</p>		
<p>Output 1.3 - GIS-based vulnerability, loss and damages assessment tool and database established to record, analyze, predict and assess flood events and associated losses</p>	<p>Outcome 8</p>	<p>"a) Develop and codify methods and tools for undertaking socio-economic surveys to collect necessary information to fully map the socio-economic conditions of within the basin. b) Undertake socio-economic and vulnerability assessment to fully map existing vulnerability within the DRB, in order to identify the most appropriate adaptation options to reduce vulnerability within the s basin. c) Develop a GIS-based flood risk model which integrates various spatial socio-economic data with the flood hazard maps, calculates flood risk, performs vulnerability assessment, produce vulnerability maps which will include damages and loss of life estimates and to test flood management options. d) Implement the DisInventar database in Riparian countries for the systematic recording of damage and loss. e) Develop harmonized methods, guidelines and procedures in line with Sendai Framework, for recording flood events, undertaking post-event surveys and assessing vulnerability to flooding as well as assessing</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Highly Satisfactory</p>

		the effectiveness of flood mitigation measures in reducing vulnerability and damages. f) Undertake cost-benefit options analysis using the vulnerability loss and damages model to identify options that maximize benefits as the basis for the development of the Integrated FRM strategy and plan for the basin"		
Output 2.1 – Drin River Basin FRM Policy Framework and improved long-term cooperation on flood risk management	Outcome 7	"a) Review existing FM policy and enabling environments in each riparian country and develop basin FRM policies for the implementation of FRM legislative and policy framework in line with relevant EU directives. b) Development of risk financing and risk transfer mechanisms strategy to include private sector engagement strategy for long-term implementation of risk financing and risk transfer mechanisms for national-level flood risk financing and resilience strategy. Also, to include identification or public-sector risk financing mechanisms for flood risk management. Risk financing and transfer mechanisms products and tools will be identified (if existing) and/or developed based on detailed socio-economic risk, damages and losses assessment (to be undertaken in Output 1.3). The project will undertake feasibility studies for the identified and shortlisted risk financing mechanisms. c) Sector FRM policies (at least 2 – energy, agriculture) - Undertake detailed technical studies (including modelling) on climate change impacts on the identified sectors (energy and agriculture) in the DRB. Consult with national sector leaders and relevant stakeholders on findings of study and invite comments on recommendations through the floods working group. Develop and codify detailed methodologies for incorporating climate-change responsive flood risk considerations into risk assessments, strategies, policies and plans for the energy and agriculture sectors. Develop and finalize robust sector FRM policies and any necessary enabling guidelines and/or tools for effective implementation of new policies"	Ontrack	Marginally Satisfactory
Output 2.2 – Regional, national and sub-national institutions (including meteorological and hydrological sectors) are trained in flood risk management, roles and responsibilities clarified and coordination	Outcome 2	"a) Institutional mapping to identify the current relevant national and sub-national government departments with functions in flood risk management in each Riparian country. b) Institutional capacity assessment and gap analysis to include functional, resourcing, technical and financial capacity assessment. Development of long-term Institutional capacity development plan addressing resourcing, technical, and financial	Completed	Satisfactory

mechanisms strengthened for effective climate-resilient FRM		needs in each Riparian. Develop training programme for climate risk management and flood risk management and embed in relevant national/regional institutions to improve the technical capacity and knowledge base for climate risk management and a long-term adaptation planning for flood risk management. c) The ToR of the Drin EWG Floods will be revisited in terms of mandate, membership, resource requirements, technical capacity and technical enabling environment; data sharing and data access and technical means and tools for coordination. In consultation with riparian countries and the DCG a strategy and a five-year work program of the Drin EWG Floods will be developed and implemented. d) Deliver prioritized training to practitioners, decision-makers and communities e) The project's Knowledge Management strategy will be embedded under this Output (along with Output 3.3) and the KM tools and strategies will be developed and applied to fully embed capacity development in key institutions. "		
Output 2.3 – Drin River Basin Integrated CCA and FRM Strategy and Plan Developed	Outcome 7	Development of an integrated basin flood risk management plan for the DRB with participation of all relevant stakeholders. The plan will take a bottom-up, multi-stakeholder, consensus-based approach. This activity will be mainstreamed into the national on-going work on the development of the river basin management plans through the relevant national authorities. From the basin plan, and sub-national plans will be developed.	Ontrack	Marginally Satisfactory
Output 3.1 – Introduction of appraisal-led design for structural and non-structural measures using climate risk information and cost-benefit appraisal methods and application of methods to the detailed design of prioritized structural and non-structural measures for three riparian countries	Outcome 4	"a) Undertake optioneering for long-term FRM measures for DRB including feasibility, outline design and indicative costing. b) Undertake detailed design for structural measures to be implemented by the project. The project will undertake detailed design for implementation of structural options identified as priority measures during project development. The measures to be implemented are described under Output 3.2 and described in more detail in Annex 5. "	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Output 3.2 – Construction of structural risk reduction measures in prioritized areas	Outcome 1	During proposal development Riparian countries provided structural measures that have already been prioritised for implementation. The Adaptation Fund (AF) project will undertake the detailed design of these structures during project implementation	Ontrack	Marginally Satisfactory

		(Output 3.1) and take account of the full river basin impact of the intervention measures. It will undertake detailed climate-risk based assessment (using models and methods developed in output 1 of the project) to appraise all options and develop the detailed design of the proposed interventions.		
Output 3.3 - Strengthened local community resilience to flooding through the participatory design and implementation of non-structural community-based resilience, adaptation and awareness measures	Outcome 1	In order to ensure participatory and long-term sustainable community resilience the project will provide training to selected municipalities/communities on maintenance of non-structural intervention measures. Some non-structural measures have already been identified as part of the structural measures (e.g. for Macedonia), but it is envisaged that, during the development of the basin FRM strategy, additional non-structural measures will be identified	Ontrack	Satisfactory

Please provide the Name and Contact information of the person(s) responsible for completing the Rating section

Name	Email	Institution
Stanislav Kim, OiC Climate and Disaster Team Leader, UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub	stanislav.kim@undp.org	UNDP

Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps.

"Given that the Covid-19 pandemic outbreak coincided with the project start and lasted with various intensity throughout the reporting period, the project managed to pull off well, especially during the 2022. Adequate and timely mitigation measures were applied during the pandemic, and appropriate project governance practice was exercised through timely revisions of both the budget and work plans, each time approved by the Regional Project Board (Drin Core Group). Successful coordination with the key stakeholders in the Riparian countries, as well as with the two similar projects run by GIZ and EU-IPA teams (the former one at the basin level whereas the latter project covered the territory of Montenegro) was maintained throughout the project implementation so that detailed hydrological and hydraulic modelling for other Areas for further assessment (AFAs) modelled by the two projects were integrated into the high-level river basin model, thus overlapping having been avoided. During the reporting period the project managed to successfully complete its entire Component/Output 1 by delivery of the community Risk Prioritization Model (RPM), flood hazard and flood risk maps in the prioritized high-risk flood plain areas. Following detailed assessment by the project key experts, optimized O&M plans for national hydromet monitoring networks were developed, based upon which national hydromet networks were systematically improved by procurement of new automated monitoring stations and refurbishment of existing ones. Thus, the flood forecasting capacity of the key institutions was brought up to the higher level. Under the Component/ Outcome 2, the Global Water Partnership (GWP), as the Responsible Party, managed to deliver the institutional capacity and gap analyses, rework the ToR, Strategy and a five-year work programme of the Expert Working Group o Floods (GWP) thus partially mitigating initial delays. The project advanced well in the design of structural flood protection measures under the Outcome 3, by completing the detailed designs of prioritized measures in North Macedonia and Montenegro, and completing execution of structural measures in North Macedonia. Overall ""Satisfactory (S)"" rating reflects project's agility in catching up with the revised work plans and delivering high quality outputs. By the end of the reporting period, 58 % of the entire budget has been successfully implemented."

Other

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating
<p>Output 1.1 – Strengthened hydrometric monitoring networks in the riparian countries based on a unified optimized basin-scale assessment of monitoring needs</p>	<p>Outcome 2</p>	<p>"a) Detailed review of the existing coverage, physical condition and data collection procedure including the quality of data. Collect data from the relevant Riparian Institutions to get the current station coverage, equipment installed, data period and data collection procedure. b) Undertake an assessment of the monitoring network requirements for effective monitoring for strategic flood risk management, flood forecasting and early warning in the future and optimize the stations coverage. c) Undertake an assessment of the existing telecommunications infrastructure to support the telemetered and automated stations. d) Digitize all relevant historical paper format data for DRB and systematize and store within the hydrometric database. Establish guidelines, procedures, data sharing protocols and user’s manuals for the new hydrometric database. e) Assess the institutional arrangements and capacity for the operation and maintenance of the hydrometric network and develop Institutional capacity development plan for hydrometric network O&M detailing manpower and financial requirements, and training needs, for the efficient O&M of all the stations in each Riparian country. Assess existing roles and responsibilities and the capacity of staff responsible for operating and maintaining the hydrometric network. Assess the existing protocols for the collection, transmission, sharing, storage, management and use of the observed data. f) Establish mechanisms for population and maintenance of centralized basin hydrometric database g) Prepare an operational plan for the hydrometric network including transmission of data, data management, data analysis and reporting procedures. The maintenance plan will cover manpower, technical capacity, material and finance requirements. h) Provide detailed specification and design including costs of all equipment and each component of the hydrometric network specified including the detailed design and bid document for the stations for future rehabilitation / new installation. i) Provide technical and financial assistance to improve hydrometric monitoring network (undertake procurement and</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Highly Satisfactory</p>

		installation of equipment). j) Review existing financing of hydrometric network O&M in each riparian country. Identify resourcing, and training needs as well as institutional arrangements for the management of the proposed new hydrometric network. k) Develop and implement O&M financing mechanisms for the hydrometric network."		
Output 1.2 - Improved knowledge of climate change induced flood risk, and risk knowledge sharing through the introduction of modelling tools and technologies for the strategic flood risk assessment based on EUFD and development of basin flood hazard maps	Outcome 8	" a) Establish Spatial Data Initiative and data management system for project b) Undertake detailed topographic surveys of the river channel through high risk areas including all major infrastructure across the river (e.g. bridges, dams etc.) and along river banks (e.g. flood walls, levees etc.) for the Crn Drim in Macedonia. c) Acquire/purchase/commission high resolution topographic data for the floodplain areas through high risk areas of the Crn Drim in Macedonia. Aerial photographs or LiDAR sources would be recommended in order to obtain a high-resolution DEM covering the whole basin. Coarser DEM and topographic data will be used for the rest of the basin for basin wide modelling d) Using the most appropriate modelling techniques, establish numerical high-level basin wider hydrological and hydraulic models of the DRB. Undertake detailed hydrological and hydraulic modelling for the Crn Drim in Macedonia in line with EUFD and produce high resolution flood hazard inundation maps suitable for use in land use planning, development zoning, flood risk mitigation design, establishment of flood insurance criteria, raising public awareness, and emergency planning for the Crn Drim in Macedonia. Maps will be produced for a number of different return periods and for a range of climate change scenarios. Flood modelling and mapping will cover all relevant flooding mechanisms within the basin. e) Integrate detailed hydrological and hydraulic modelling for other Areas for further assessment (AFAs) being modelled by GIZ and riparian governments into the high-level river basin model, as and when they become available f) Undertake capacity assessment of relevant institutions for flood risk assessment and modelling and develop a long-term capacity development plan and training needs."	Completed	Highly Satisfactory
Output 1.3 - GIS-based vulnerability, loss and damages assessment tool and database established	Outcome 8	"a) Develop and codify methods and tools for undertaking socio-economic surveys to collect necessary information to fully map the socio-economic conditions of within the basin. b)	Ontrack	Highly Satisfactory

<p>to record, analyze, predict and assess flood events and associated losses</p>		<p>Undertake socio-economic and vulnerability assessment to fully map existing vulnerability within the DRB, in order to identify the most appropriate adaptation options to reduce vulnerability within the s basin. c) Develop a GIS-based flood risk model which integrates various spatial socio-economic data with the flood hazard maps, calculates flood risk, performs vulnerability assessment, produce vulnerability maps which will include damages and loss of life estimates and to test flood management options. d) Implement the DisInventar database in Riparian countries for the systematic recording of damage and loss. e) Develop harmonized methods, guidelines and procedures in line with Sendai Framework, for recording flood events, undertaking post-event surveys and assessing vulnerability to flooding as well as assessing the effectiveness of flood mitigation measures in reducing vulnerability and damages. f) Undertake cost-benefit options analysis using the vulnerability loss and damages model to identify options that maximize benefits as the basis for the development of the Integrated FRM strategy and plan for the basin"</p>		
<p>Output 2.2 – Regional, national and sub-national institutions (including meteorological and hydrological sectors) are trained in flood risk management, roles and responsibilities clarified and coordination mechanisms strengthened for effective climate-resilient FRM</p>	<p>Outcome 2</p>	<p>"a) Institutional mapping to identify the current relevant national and sub-national government departments with functions in flood risk management in each Riparian country. b) Institutional capacity assessment and gap analysis to include functional, resourcing, technical and financial capacity assessment. Development of long-term Institutional capacity development plan addressing resourcing, technical, and financial needs in each Riparian. Develop training programme for climate risk management and flood risk management and embed in relevant national/regional institutions to improve the technical capacity and knowledge base for climate risk management and a long-term adaptation planning for flood risk management. c) The ToR of the Drin EWG Floods will be revisited in terms of mandate, membership, resource requirements, technical capacity and technical enabling environment; data sharing and data access and technical means and tools for coordination. In consultation with riparian countries and the DCG a strategy and a five-year work program of the Drin EWG Floods will be developed and implemented. d) Deliver prioritized training to practitioners, decision-makers and communities e) The project’s Knowledge</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Satisfactory</p>

		Management strategy will be embedded under this Output (along with Output 3.3) and the KM tools and strategies will be developed and applied to fully embed capacity development in key institutions. "		
Output 2.3 – Drin River Basin Integrated CCA and FRM Strategy and Plan Developed	Outcome 7	Development of an integrated basin flood risk management plan for the DRB with participation of all relevant stakeholders. The plan will take a bottom-up, multi-stakeholder, consensus-based approach. This activity will be mainstreamed into the national on-going work on the development of the river basin management plans through the relevant national authorities. From the basin plan, and sub-national plans will be developed.	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Output 3.1 – Introduction of appraisal-led design for structural and non-structural measures using climate risk information and cost-benefit appraisal methods and application of methods to the detailed design of prioritized structural and non-structural measures for three riparian countries	Outcome 4	"a) Undertake optioneering for long-term FRM measures for DRB including feasibility, outline design and indicative costing. b) Undertake detailed design for structural measures to be implemented by the project. The project will undertake detailed design for implementation of structural options identified as priority measures during project development. The measures to be implemented are described under Output 3.2 and described in more detail in Annex 5. "	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Output 3.2 – Construction of structural risk reduction measures in prioritized areas	Outcome 1	During proposal development Riparian countries Montenegro and North Macedonia provided structural measures that have already been prioritised for implementation. The Adaptation Fund (AF) project will undertake the detailed design of these structures during project implementation (Output 3.1) and take account of the full river basin impact of the intervention measures. It will undertake detailed climate-risk based assessment (using models and methods developed in output 1 of the project) to appraise all options and develop the detailed design of the proposed interventions.	Ontrack	Marginally Satisfactory
Output 3.3 - Strengthened local community resilience to flooding through the participatory design and implementation of non-structural community-based resilience, adaptation and awareness measures	Outcome 1	In order to ensure participatory and long-term sustainable community resilience the project will provide training to selected municipalities/communities on maintenance of non-structural intervention measures. Some non-structural measures have already been identified as part of the structural measures (e.g. for Macedonia), but it is envisaged that, during the development of the basin FRM strategy, additional non-structural measures	Ontrack	Highly Satisfactory

	will be identified		
--	--------------------	--	--

Please provide the Name and Contact information of the person(s) responsible for completing the Rating section

Name	Email
Odeta Cato, Interim Regional Project Manager	odeta.cato@undp.org

Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps.

The overall progress during the reporting period has been rated as "Satisfactory (S)", as project activities planned for current reporting period progressed on track to achieve most of its major outcomes/outputs with only minor shortcomings. Following the successful completion of its Component/Outcome 1, moving forward, the activities under Component 1 will concentrate on capacity building for all riparian participants. This phase will involve knowledge and training initiatives at both national and regional level. The project has put emphasis on improving the efficacy of delivering the Component 2, implemented by the Responsible Party (RP), Global Water Partnership (GWP). As a follow up to the recommendations provided by the Mid-term Review (MTR), the MTR Management Response Plan was developed, and in line with it Project Management Unite (PMU) has provided full technical support to the RP in order to bring this Component back on track. Another focus was on implementation of Outputs 3.1 and 3.2, appraisal-led design of structural measures and construction thereof, respectively. These Outpus have been reached by the project component in North Macedonia, construction of structural measures in Montenegro will start in Q1 2024, while the design of structural measures in Albania has commenced during the Q4 2023. For construction of structural measures in Albania and Montenegro and activities on strengthening community resilience and oversight of Operational Plans for flood defense for Municipalities in North Macedonia , a no-cost project extension will be sought timely. Project has delivered 58 % of the entire project budget, thus largely mitigating initial delays caused by COVID-19 pandemic outbreak, which nearly coincided with the commencement of the project implementation and lasted with various intensity during the first two years of implementation. The flood hazard and flood risk maps delivered within the Outcome 1, with detailed granularity of community risk in the nominated flood risk areas, provided a good foundation for appraisal-led design of future community flood protection structural and non-structural measures and policy development, within Components 3 and 2, respectively. The maps and relevant socio-economic analyses have already been used during the development of the Drin River Basin Flood Risk Financing and Risk Transfer Mechanisms Strategy and FRM policies in energy and agruculture from the Component 2, and the Flood Risk Management Plans for the communities at risk in North Macedonia and Albania under Component 3. Togehter with the mapping techniques and methodologies, the maps were presented to the key project stakeholders at the basin-wide workshop in Tirana where the practitioners from the relevant national instiutions and academia were trained in flood mapping techniques and usage. Full complementarity has been established by other project intitatives, GIZ run "Adaptation to Climate Change through Flood Risk Management" Project, and EU IPA funded "Support to Implementation and Monitoring of Water Management in Montenegro" Project so that any overlaps in the activities were avoided. With the latter project still ongoing, the project provided technial support to hydraulic and socio-economic modelling of some Areas of Potentially Significant Flood Risk (APSFs) in Montenegro. The Project has modelled and mapped the APSFRs high-risk flood plains in Albania as designated by relevant authorities (National Water Management Administration), while the entire Crn Drim sub-basin in North Macedonia was modelled and mapped in detail, in line with the Project Document. Previously established effective partnerships with the key national beneficiaries and partnering institutions, such as the National Hydrometeorological Services, Water Management Administrations and relevant ministries in the riparian states, were successfully maintained during the reporting period. The Project continued to actively include practitioners and management from these institutions in delivery of outputs, facilitating specialized, tailored-out trainings in parallel.

Overall Rating

Overall rating

Satisfactory

Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps.

"The overall progress during the reporting period has been rated as "Satisfactory (S)", as project activities planned for current reporting period progressed on track to achieve most of its major outcomes/outputs with only minor shortcomings. Following the successful completion of its Component/Outcome 1, the project has put emphasis on improving the efficacy of delivering the Component 2, implemented by the Responsible Party (RP), Global Water Partnership (GWP). As a follow up to the recommendations provided by the Mid-term Review (MTR), the MTR Management Response Plan was developed, and in line with it Project Management Unite (PMU) has provided full technical support to the RP in order to bring this Component back on track. Another focus was on implementation of Outputs 3.1 and 3.2, appraisal-led design of structural measures and construction thereof, respectively. These Outputs have been reached by the project component in North Macedonia, construction of structural measures in Montenegro will start in Q1 2024, while the design of structural measures in Albania has commenced during the Q4 2023. For construction of structural measures in Albania and Montenegro a no-cost project extension will be sought timely. Project has delivered 58 % of the entire project budget, thus largely mitigating initial delays caused by COVID-19 pandemic outbreak, which nearly coincided with the commencement of the project implementation and lasted with various intensity during the first two years of implementation. The flood hazard and flood risk maps delivered within the Outcome 1, with detailed granularity of community risk in the nominated flood risk areas, provided a good foundation for appraisal-led design of future community flood protection structural and non-structural measures and policy development, within Components 3 and 2, respectively. The maps and relevant socio-economic analyses have already been used during the development of the Drin River Basin Flood Risk Financing and Risk Transfer Mechanisms Strategy and FRM policies in energy and agriculture from the Component 2, and the Flood Risk Management Plans for the communities at risk in North Macedonia and Albania under Component 3. Together with the mapping techniques and methodologies, the maps were presented to the key project stakeholders at the basin-wide workshop in Tirana where the practitioners from the relevant national institutions and academia were trained in flood mapping techniques and usage. Full complementarity has been established by other project initiatives, GIZ run "Adaptation to Climate Change through Flood Risk Management" Project, and EU IPA funded "Support to Implementation and Monitoring of Water Management in Montenegro" Project so that any overlaps in the activities were avoided. With the latter project still ongoing, the project provided technical support to hydraulic and socio-economic modelling of some Areas of Potentially Significant Flood Risk (APSFRs) in Montenegro. The Project has modelled and mapped the APSFRs high-risk flood plains in Albania as designated by relevant authorities (National Water Management Administration), while the entire Crn Drim sub-basin in North Macedonia was modelled and mapped in detail, in line with the Project Document. Previously established effective partnerships with the key national beneficiaries and partnering institutions, such as the National Hydrometeorological Services, Water Management Administrations and relevant ministries in the riparian states, were successfully maintained during the reporting period. The Project continued to actively include practitioners and management from these institutions in delivery of outputs, facilitating specialized, tailored-out trainings in parallel."

Project Indicators

List of indicators

Type of Indicator (indicators towards Objectives,	Indicator	Baseline	Progress Since Inception	Target for Project End
---	-----------	----------	--------------------------	------------------------

Outcomes, etc...)				
Objectives	Total Number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (disaggregated by sex) with reduced vulnerability to flood risks; Number of beneficiaries relative to total population	0	"Direct beneficiaries: 94,850 (51% women)/ 5.9% of DRB population Indirect beneficiaries: 800,000 (51% of women)"	"Direct beneficiaries: 190,000 people (50.6% women) / 12% of the DRB population Indirect beneficiaries: 1.6 million people living in DRB (50.6% women)"
Objectives	Availability of high-quality flood hazard and risk information generated and disseminated to stakeholders on a timely basis	Gaps in observation and flood risk information hamper effective flood forecasting and EWS, development of basin-level integrated CCA and FRM strategy and plan and climate resilient sectoral planning	"High-quality flood hazard inundation maps and flood risk information maps for the prioritized areas of potentially significant flood risk (APSFRs) generated and disseminated, in coordination with relevant national authorities. (a) Flood Forecasting (FF) part of the FFEWS coverage enhanced both spatially and altitudinally by 20% "	"Enhanced food hazard and risk information for DRB is available and used for: (a) enhanced FFEWS (in cooperation with GIZ) (b) Climate-informed Drin River Basin Integrated CCA and FRM Strategy and Plan and implementation capacities are in place (c) Sectoral planning "
Objectives	Number and level (where relevant) of effective coordination mechanisms for climate-resilient FRM in DRB (Level 1 = no coordination mechanism; Level 2= coordination mechanism in place; Level 3 = coordination mechanism in place, meeting regularly with appropriate representation (gender and decision-making authorities); Level 4 = coordination mechanism in place, meeting regularly, with appropriate representation, with appropriate	"1 coordination mechanism: Drin Core Group/MOU: Level 3 The Drin Coordinated Action was established to promote joint action for the coordinated management of the shared water resources in the basin. The MoU does not currently specifically address joint actions required for cooperation on flood risk management. The existing coordination and bilateral agreements are insufficient for a truly transboundary river basin approach to flood risk	"State and the efficiency of work among the coordination mechanisms for the climate resilient FRM, is as follows: (a) DCG (Level 3) (b) EWGF (Level 2), (c) DRB Framework Agreement on FRM (Level 1) (d) DRB SAP is informed of climate-induced flood risks and integrated resilient FRM measures (Level 2)"	"4 coordination mechanisms: (a) DCG/MOU: Level 4 (b) Drin Expert Working Group on Floods: Level 4 (c) DRB Framework Agreement on FRM (d) DRB SAP is informed of climate-induced flood risks and integrated resilient FRM measures"

	information flows and monitoring of action items/issues raised)	management. "		
--	---	---------------	--	--

Comments

Lessons Learned

Implementation and Adaptive Management		
Describe any changes undertaken to improve results on the ground or any changes made to project outputs (i.e. changes to project design)	Opportunities	No changes have been made to project outputs, outcomes or activities. Project Objective and Results Framework remain valid.
Have the environmental and social safeguard measures that were taken been effective in avoiding unwanted negative impacts?	Opportunities	"Environmental and social safeguard measures identified through the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) and the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) for the completed structural flood protection measures in North Macedonia, have proved effective in avoidance of undesired negative impacts. The ESIA and ESMP development processes were in fully aligned with both, the national legislation and the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (SES), which allowed for full public insight and participation during these processes. However, during the public insight process an NGO decided to file a grievance on the environmental impact of the Sateska River structural measure directly to UNDP HQ Social and Environmental Compliance Unit (SECU), as stated under the ESP Compliance section. SECU has carried an independent investigation into the complaint, still ongoing. The project has fully complied with its requirement and is awaiting the results. Implementation of

		<p>the safeguard measures during the execution of civil works on structural measures in North Macedonia was overseen by construction supervision (independent team of engineers, all licensed by the state and separately commissioned to oversee the construction works), Environmental and Social Safeguards Engineer, Project Management Unit (National Project Coordinator, Regional Project Manager and Chief Technical Advisor). No registered negative environmental impacts during the construction validated the effectiveness of the designed safeguards measures. Monitoring over the implemented measures will continue during the remainder of the project implementation cycle."</p>
<p>How have gender considerations been taken into consideration during the reporting period? What have been the lessons learned as a consequence of inclusion of such considerations on project performance or impacts? List lessons learned specific to gender, detailing measures and project/programme-specific indicators highlighting the role of women as key actors in climate change adaptation.</p>	<p>Challenges & Opportunities</p>	<p>"The following gender considerations were taken into account during the reporting period: While delivering the tailored specialized training to the practitioners from the public institutions, number of female attendants has been 42.5%, exceeding the target of 30% likewise during the previously implemented training exercises. Thus, cumulative average of women participating at the trainings since the inception has reached 48%. Implementation of the adaptation planning activities, i.e. development of community Flood Risk Management (Action) Plans, has targeted 104,000 community residents in Albania and North Macedonia, out of which 51.2% were women. Data used for the development of these plans, and also for the Integrated basin-wide CCA and FRM Strategy and Plan, were gathered during the implementation of the previously completed project</p>

		<p>Component 1. There, the unavailability of the census data disaggregated down below the municipal level, including the data disaggregated by gender, was addressed by the ground truthing of the riskiest communities.. As a lesson learned, when properly conducted, the ground truthing, makes a powerful validation tool for the s/e data obtained through desktop research or acquired from the national institutions."</p>
<p>Were there any delays in implementation? If so, include any causes of delays. What measures have been taken to reduce delays?</p>	<p>Challenges</p>	<p>"• The global Covid-19 outbreak nearly coincided with the commencement of the project. Despite UNDP's timely reaction by taking advantage of contemporary digital technologies, such as teleworking and telecommuting via online platforms, using online data base, satellite imagery datasets, etc., which allowed for maintaining momentum over implementation of some activities, the imposed lockdown and other measures during pandemic nearly brought most of the key government institutions to a halt. Thus, effective coordination with the key stakeholders was limited, especially during the months following the pandemic outbreak and throughout the most part of 2020. Even after effective communication and coordination with external stakeholders was fully restored, the remaining travel restrictions negatively impacted most of the project activities from the Component 1 that required intensive field missions throughout the basin to perform data gathering, field assessments, monitoring and meetings with stakeholders in remote areas. The pandemic extended well into 2021 and heavily affected timeliness of</p>

		<p>the project activities. However, project implementation particularly picked up during 2022 and 2023 with gradual lifting of the travel ban, which resulted in successful completion of the Component/ Outcome 1 in 2022. • Further, negative effects of the pandemic also reflected in the frequent changes in the government, particularly in Montenegro where the government changed three times since 2020. • Data gathering by the project was hampered by the issues with census data not being published in both Albania and North Macedonia, which project addressed by facilitating ground truthing in the areas of high flood risk. • Finally, cyber-attacks at the government e-infrastructure in Montenegro and Albania in 2022 nearly paralyzed operations of public institutions for some time, thus adding limited impact on timelines of project activities"</p>
<p>What implementation issues/lessons, either positive or negative, affected progress?</p>	<p>Challenges & Opportunities</p>	<p>"A lack of basin-level institutional frameworks to deal with flood risk management has posed challenges to the project team. Mechanisms that do exist, such as the Drin Core Group (DCG) and its subsidiary the Expert Working Group on Floods (EWGF) based on a memorandum of understanding between riparian nations signed more than a decade years ago to consider transboundary issues in the basin, are temporary in nature and do not provide the certainty of well-developed long-term frameworks. The policies under development by this project will need to be implemented and enforced by the riparian governments, however, that is hardly achievable via the aforementioned mechanisms as they lack legal power. Thus, the</p>

		<p>project has supported development of the UNDP-implemented, GEF-funded project “Implementing the Strategic Action Programme of the Drin Basin to strengthen transboundary cooperation and enable integrated natural resources management”, which under its umbrella aims to establish a Drin River Basin commission, and the implementation of which is expected to start in 2024.”</p> <p>Further to the recommendations of the EU Floods Directive (2007/60/EC) for the basin-wide flood management, the Project has found the transboundary approach to be superior in terms of cost effectiveness. Specifically, in the use of subject expertise, including through hired consultants, information can be deployed over a larger, supranational area to gain cost efficiencies. In addition, by virtue of a cooperative approach that considers knock-on effects of interventions in one place, on another place costly maladaptation outcomes are avoided. By considering impacts of interventions across the whole project area, the transboundary approach ensures that the risk of negative and costly outcomes is mitigated and that benefits are shared widely across the basin.</p>
--	--	--

Has the project already reached mid term or project completion?(yes/no).

Yes

Climate Resilience Measures	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing climate adaptation measures that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?	Reported in PPR3
What is the potential for the climate resilience measures undertaken by the project/programme to be	Reported in PPR3

replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?	
Readiness Interventions (Applicable only to NIEs that received one or more readiness grants)	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in accessing and implementing climate finance readiness support that would be relevant to the preparation, design and implementation of future concrete adaptation projects/programmes?	N/A
How have the outputs (such as manuals, guidelines, procedures or the experience from providing peer support, etc) from employing readiness grants been used to inform institutional capacity needs, gender issues, and environmental and social aspects in developing and implementing concrete projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?	N/A
Concrete Adaptation Interventions	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing concrete adaptation interventions that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes implementing concrete adaptation interventions?	Reported in PPR3
What is the potential for the concrete adaptation interventions undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?	Reported in PPR3
Knowledge Management	
How has existing information/data/knowledge been used to inform project development and implementation? What kinds of information/data/knowledge were used?	Reported in PPR3
Has the existing information/data/knowledge been made available to relevant stakeholder? If so, what channels of dissemination have been used?	Reported in PPR3
Please list any knowledge products generated and include hyperlinks whenever possible (e.g. project videos, project stories, studies and technical reports, case studies, training manuals, handbooks, strategies and plans developed, etc.)	Reported in PPR3
If learning objectives have been established, have they been met? Please describe.	Reported in PPR3
Describe any difficulties there have been in accessing or retrieving existing information (data or knowledge) that is relevant to the project. Please provide suggestions for improving access to the relevant data.	Reported in PPR3
Has the identification of learning objectives contributed to the outcomes of the project? In what ways have they contributed?	Reported in PPR3
Innovation	
Describe any innovative practices or technologies	Project successfully probed usage of satellite imagery

that figured prominently in this project.	for gathering the climate parameters necessary for creating virtual precipitation basin-wide models. By this, the gaps were filled in the historical meteorological data series obtained from national hydromet services, important for validation of the developed hydrological and hydraulic models.
Complementarity/ Coherence with other climate finance sources	
Has the project been scaled-up from any other climate finance? Or has the project build upon any other climate finance initiative?	Yes
If you answered yes, kindly specify the name of the Fund/Organization.	GEF funded, UNDP implemented “Enabling transboundary cooperation and integrated water resources management in the extended transboundary Drin River Basin” project

Results Tracker

Goal: Assist developing-country Parties to the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change in meeting the costs of concrete adaptation projects and programmes in order to implement climate-resilient measures.

Impact: Increased resiliency at the community, national, and regional levels to climate variability and change.

Is this the mid-term or terminal project performance report? Midterm

Impact: Increased resiliency at the community, national, and regional levels to climate variability and change

Core Indicator: No. of beneficiaries

		Total	% of female beneficiaries	% of Youth beneficiaries
Baseline information	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	0	0	0
Baseline information	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	0	0	0
Baseline information	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0	0
Target performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	190000	50.6	24
Target performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	1600000	50.6	24
Target performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	1790000	50.6	24
Performance at mid-	Direct beneficiaries	94850	51	24

term	supported by the project			
Performance at mid-term	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	900000	51	24
Performance at mid-term	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	994850	51	24
Performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	94850	51	24
Performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	900000	51	24
Performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	994850	51	24

Outcome 1: Reduced exposure to climate-related hazards and threats

Indicator 1: Relevant threat and hazard information generated and disseminated to stakeholders on a timely basis

	Number of targeted stakeholders - Total	Number of targeted stakeholders - % of female targeted	Hazards information generated and disseminated	Overall effectiveness
Baseline information	0	0	Inland flooding	2: Partially effective
Target performance at completion	1790000	50.6	Inland flooding	4: Effective
Performance at mid-term	94850	50.6	Inland flooding	3: Moderately effective
Performance at completion				

Output 1.1 Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated

Indicator 1.1: No. of projects/programmes that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments

	No. of projects/programme that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments	Sector	Scale	Status
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term	1	Disaster risk reduction	National	3: Risk and vulnerability assessments completed or updated

Performance at completion					
Output 1.2 Targeted population groups covered by adequate risk reduction systems					
Core Indicator 1.2: No. of Early Warning Systems					
	No. of adopted Early Warning Systems	Category targeted	Hazard	Geographical coverage	Number of municipalities
Baseline information					
Target performance at completion					
Performance at mid-term	3	2: Monitoring and warning service	Inland flooding	National	6
Performance at mid-term	3	4: Response capability	Inland flooding	National	12
Performance at mid-term	3	1: Risk knowledge	Inland flooding	National	12
Performance at completion					

Outcome 2: Strengthened institutional capacity to reduce risks associated with climate-induced socioeconomic and environmental losses

Indicator 2: Capacity of staff to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events from targeted institutions increased

	Number of staff targeted - Total	Number of staff targeted - % of female targeted	Sector	Capacity level
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term	50	30	Disaster risk reduction	3: Medium capacity
Performance at completion				

Output 2.1 Strengthened capacity of national and sub-national centres and networks to respond rapidly to extreme weather events

Indicator 2.1.1: No. of staff trained to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events

	Total staff trained	% of female staff trained	Type
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term	81	53	Public
Performance at completion			

completion				
Indicator 2.1.2: No. of targeted institutions with increased capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability risks				
	Type	Scale	Sector	Capacity Level
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term	Public	National	Disaster risk reduction	3: Medium capacity
Performance at completion				

Output 2.2. Increased readiness and capacity of national and sub-national entities to directly access and program adaptation finance

Indicator 2.2.1: No. of targeted institutions benefitting from the direct access and enhanced direct access modality

	Number of beneficiaries	Scale	Sector	Capacity Level
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term	6	National	Other	3: Medium capacity
Performance at completion				

Outcome 3: Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes

Indicator 3.1: Increase in application of appropriate adaptation responses

	Percentage of targeted population applying adaptation measures	Sector
Baseline information		
Target performance at completion		
Performance at mid-term		
Performance at completion		

Output 3.1: Targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities

Indicator 3.1.1: Percentage of targeted population awareness of predicted adverse impacts of climate change, and of appropriate responses

	No. of targeted beneficiaries	% of female participants targeted	Level of awareness
--	-------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Output 3.2: Stenghtened capacity of national and subnational stakeholders and entities to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning

Indicator 3.2.1: No. of technical committees/associations formed to ensure transfer of knowledge

	No. of technical committees/associations	% of women represented in committes/associations	Level of awareness
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Indicator 3.2.2: No. of tools and guidelines developed (thematic, sectoral, institutional) and shared with relevant stakeholders

	No. of tools and guidelines	Type	Scale
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Outcome 4: Increased adaptive capacity within relevant development sector services and infrastructure assets

Indicator 4.1: Increased responsiveness of development sector services to evolving needs from changing and variable climate

	Project/programme sector	Geographical scale	Response level
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term	Disaster risk reduction	Regional	3: Moderately responsive (Some defined elements)
Performance at completion			

Core Indicator 4.2: Assets produced, developed, improved or strengthened

	Sector	Targeted asset	Changes in asset (quantitative or qualitative)
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term	Water management	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strengthened)	5: Fully improved
Performance at mid-term	Disaster risk reduction	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strengthened)	5: Fully improved
Performance at completion			

Indicator 4.1.1: Vulnerable development sector services and infrastructure assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability

Indicator 4.1.1: No. and type of development sector services to respond to new conditions resulting from climate variability and change

	Number of services	Type	Sector
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term	3		Water management
Performance at completion			

Outcome 5: Increased ecosystem resilience in response to climate change and variability-induced stress

Indicator 5: Ecosystem services and natural resource assets maintained or improved under climate change and variability-induced stress

	Natural resource improvement level	Sector	Type
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Output 5: Vulnerable ecosystem services and natural resource assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability

Core Indicator 5.1: Natural Assets protected or rehabilitated

	Natural asset or Ecosystem (type)	Total number of natural assets or ecosystems protected/rehabilitated	Unit	Effectiveness of protection/rehabilitation
Baseline information				

Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Outcome 6: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas

Indicator 6.1: Increase in households and communities having more secure access to livelihood assets

	No. of targeted households	% of female headed households	Improvement level
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Indicator 6.2: Increase in targeted population's sustained climate-resilient alternative livelihoods

	No. of targeted households	% of female headed households	% increase in income level vis-à-vis baseline	Alternate Source
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Output 6 Targeted individual and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts, including variability

Indicator 6.1.1: No. and type of adaptation assets created or strengthened in support of individual or community livelihood strategies

	Number of Assets	Type of Assets	Sector	Adaptation strategy
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Core Indicator 6.1.2: Increased income, or avoided decrease in income

	Number of households (total number in the	Income source	Income level (USD)

	project area)		
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Outcome 7: Improved policies and regulations that promote and enforce resilience measures

Indicator 7: Climate change priorities are integrated into national development strategy

	Integration level
Baseline information	
Target performance at completion	
Performance at mid-term	2: Most not integrated
Performance at completion	

Output 7: Improved integration of climate-resilience strategies into country development plans

Indicator 7.1: No. of policies introduced or adjusted to address climate change risks

	No. of Policies introduced or adjusted	Sector	Scale	Type
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term	0	Disaster risk reduction	Regional	Environmental policy
Performance at completion				

Indicator 7.2: No. of targeted development strategies with incorporated climate change priorities enforced

	No. of Development strategies	Regulation	Effectiveness
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term	0	4: Enforced (Most elements implemented)	4: Effective
Performance at completion			

Outcome 8: Support the development and diffusion of innovative adaptation practices, tools and technologies

Indicator 8: Innovative adaptation practices are rolled out, scaled up, encouraged and/or accelerated

at regional, national and/or subnational level			
	Sector of innovative practice	Geographic Scale	Type
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term	Disaster risk reduction	Regional	Innovation rolled out
Performance at completion			

Output 8: Viable innovations are rolled out, scaled up, encourages and/or accelerated

Indicator 8.1: No. of innovative adaptation practices, tools and technologies accelerated, scaled-up and/or replicated

	No. of innovative practices/ tools technologies	Sector	Status	Effectiveness
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term	1	Disaster risk reduction	Undertaking innovative practices	3: Moderately effective
Performance at completion				

Indicator 8.2: No. of key findings on effective, efficient adaptation practices, products and technologies generated

	No. of key findings generated	Type	Effectiveness
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term	2	Innovative product	3: Moderately effective
Performance at completion			